

ST. PETER DAMIAN

HIS ATTITUDE TOWARD THE JEWS AND THE OLD TESTAMENT¹

● David Berger

INTRODUCTION

A cursory examination of the career of St. Peter Damian (1007-1072) would probably yield the impression that his was a significant role in the development of anti-Semitism in the high middle ages. Damian was a powerful force in heightening medieval piety through his advocacy of semi-eremitic monasticism, his stressing the adoration of the Virgin, and his contribution to the tremendous upheaval in early medieval values that culminated in the Gregorian reform. There can be little doubt that a deeper and more widespread piety was a key factor in the tremendous upsurge of Judaeophobia that came with the crusades. Furthermore, Damian wrote the first full-scale anti-Jewish work produced on the continent of Europe in two centuries, and the preserved history of Italian polemics of this nature begins with him. The impression is clear. We must now determine whether or not it is accurate.

Damian, of course, cannot be held responsible for the indirect effect that the cult of Mary may ultimately have exercised in fostering a hatred for Jews. Damian as an individual must be

David Berger, Educational Vice-President of Yavneh, is a Woodrow Wilson Fellow at Columbia University, where he is pursuing the graduate study of Jewish History; he is studying for ordination as well at Yeshiva University.

judged on the basis of the attitude that he expresses in his writings, and it is to these writings that we now must turn.

Before doing so, however, we must take cognizance of a most important fact. The attitude of a medieval Christian toward the Jews could be closely related to, and often reflected in, his attitude toward the Old Testament and its law. In Damian's case, there is special reason for interest, because his anti-Jewish works deal almost exclusively with the Old Testament and because he is associated with the replacement of "the judging, wrathful, distant God of the Old Testament. . . by the loving, self-abnegating Son of the New Testament, with his weeping and charitable Mother."¹ How real was this dichotomy in Damian's own eyes, and what were his feelings toward that part of the Bible which he shared with the Jews? These are questions that we shall try to answer in the second part of this paper.

The issues raised in both of the parts of this paper have, needless to say, continuing relevance. For these issues provide the background against which the current trends in the relations between Rome and Jerusalem must be studied.

I

DAMIAN AND HIS ATTITUDE TOWARD THE JEWS

The status of the Jews in eleventh century Italy was far from ideal. The scattered references that we possess tell of a number of vicious anti-Semitic accusations. After an earthquake in Rome in 1020 or 1021, Jews were savagely punished for having mocked a crucifix. Rabbi Meshullam ben Kalonymus of Lucca wrote to R. Hai, the Gaon in Babylonia, about an "upheaval" in his town — either a persecution or a defeat by an army. In 1062, Jews in Aterno were accused of committing a ritual outrage on an image of Jesus in their synagogue on Good Friday. An attempt at a program of forced conversion in Benevento (c. 1065) drew a strong protest from Pope Alexander II, but the attempt is significant in gauging the attitude of Italian Christians toward the Jews.¹

Earlier in this century, the rumor had spread through France

and Italy that the Jews were responsible for Moslem persecution of Christians in the Holy Land. In France, this rumor led to a campaign of forced baptisms (1007) which was stopped only through Papal intervention.² Such reports could not have passed entirely without effect in Italy, at least in the realm of personal relations between individual Christians and Jews.

Nevertheless, three or four incidents in a century, even granted the paucity of sources, do not constitute a bleak picture of the overall situation. It would appear that the Jews of Italy enjoyed relative tranquillity; anti-Semitic incidents, however, kept them aware of the painful lack of long-term, meaningful security.

There had been a lull in the Jewish-Christian polemic in Europe during the late ninth, tenth, and early eleventh centuries. It is true that Bernhard Blumenkranz maintains that "this polemic is a ringing manifestation of the intellectual vitality of the middle ages. This vitality was not at all limited (to any period) . . . ; we can observe it throughout our period."³ The fact, however, is that an examination of Blumenkranz's own survey of the literature⁴ shows that since 846, when Amolon wrote his *Liber Contra Judaeos*, no major anti-Jewish work appeared on the continent till Damian. The anonymous *Altercatio Aecclesie contra Synagogam*, written between 938 and 966, is probably an English creation.⁵ The only other lengthy, major references are in Ratherius' *Qualitatis Conjectura*⁶ (tenth century) and three sermons delivered by Fulbert of Chartres in 1009.⁷

In Italy, written polemics simply did not exist in the middle ages before Damian. Even oral disputations are mentioned most infrequently. Alcuin (c. 750-760) describes a disputation between a Jew named Julius and a Master Pater of Pisa at Pavia.⁸ Achimaz of Oria describes how an archbishop called in a Rabbi Chananel for a religious discussion at the end of the tenth century, and the *Vita* of the anchorite Simeon in the *Acta Sanctorum* describes a discussion he had with a Jew on religious matters during a meal at Lucca in 1016. The authenticity of both these sources is open to question.⁹

Damian, then, appears in a time and place where the social situation would not have drawn his special attention to the Jews

and where the polemical tradition was weak to say the least. Did he have a desire to change the relationship between Christians and Jews? Did he wish to revive the Judaeo-Christian polemic?

Peter Damian became involved in many controversies which he disliked and for which he was temperamentally unsuited. His strongest inclination was toward a semi-eremitic monasticism in which he could "avoid human contact."¹⁰ Patricia McNulty maintains that it was "to his credit that he did not stand aside or refuse to aid the Roman Church in her need."¹¹ The truth of the matter is that Damian agreed to become a cardinal only under threat of excommunication and constantly requested permission to return to a monastic life. Thus, though Damian's was a highly emotional nature,¹² he would have preferred to utilize his emotions in the relationship between himself and God; only the most compelling necessity drove him to direct them toward society. His advocacy of self-flagellation¹³ is but one manifestation of the enormous energies he was willing to devote to his personal monastic life. Basically, then, in the words of R. Biron, "he was a contemplative man by temperament."¹⁴ His involvement in the battle for reform brought him more personal frustration than fulfillment. Why should such a man enter into the acrimonious polemic between Christian and Jew?

First of all, the *Antilogus contra Judaeos* and the *Dialogus inter Judaeum Requirentem et Christianum e contrario Respondentem*¹⁵ were not written through Damian's own initiative; they are in essence, a *responsum* to a letter from the Egyptian bishop Honestus requesting material with which to counter Jewish arguments. We shall see later that Honestus did not make a very wise choice in choosing Damian. In any event, the latter was not particularly enthusiastic about fulfilling the task, and he characteristically compared this battle with the far more important struggle undertaken daily by every conscientious monk.

"But," he writes, "if you wish to be a soldier of Christ and fight for him courageously, then take up arms as an illustrious warrior against the vices of the flesh, the contrivances of the Devil — an enemy that will indeed never die — rather than against the Jews who will soon be almost destroyed from the face of the earth."¹⁶

Nevertheless, he undertakes to do as Honestus requested, and he states three reasons for doing so. First, it is disgraceful for a churchman to hear calumnies against Christianity and remain silent through ignorance. Second, such silence could arouse doubts in the minds of loyal Christians. And finally, Damian expresses the hope that Jews may be converted by well-presented Christian arguments.¹⁷

Damian keeps this third purpose in mind throughout the *Antilogus* and *Dialogus*. At the beginning of the *Antilogus*, he writes, "When someone begins a dispute about this matter, he should be warned not to exasperate his opponent with insults or haughtiness. But he should soothe his mind with benevolent charity and most patient gravity, for a stony heart which was able to be all the more stubborn when bitterness was poured forth can perhaps be softened toward belief by modest sweetness of words."¹⁸

Such confidence in the soft and moderate approach is not new in the history of Christian polemic. Maxim, an Arian bishop (c. 365-c. 430), wrote in his *Tractatus Contra Judaeos*, "We speak thus against them not with a desire to harm... We wage a lively battle for people's salvation... We seek to save them by conversion... Therefore, we who seek the truth do not look for (captious) quarrels."¹⁹ We find a similar attitude in Gregory the Great who said that only preaching can effect a sincere conversion.²⁰

At the end of the *Dialogus*, this hope turns into a ringing exhortation to his fictitious Jewish opponent. "Therefore, O Jew, listen now to my advice and you may have God, who is now angry at you, well-disposed toward you... Desert the error of Jewish blindness, and direct yourself to the truth of Evangelical grace... May the God of your fathers cast aside the old veil of ignorance from your heart, and, with the darkness of error dispelled, he will besprinkle you with the new light of His knowledge."²¹

The basic method that Damian uses to bring about this hoped-for conversion is the accumulation of Old Testament passages which, to his mind, prove that Jesus is the Messiah, that God consists of three persons, etc. "In this truly naive way," write

Vogelstein and Rieger, "through the piling up of Biblical passages, does Damian seek to demonstrate the truth of Christianity to the Jews."²² Actually, this method was the classic Christian approach in dealing with Jews, and it begins in the Gospels themselves. The most influential medieval work of this type was Isidore of Seville's *De Fide Catholica ex vetere et novo testamento contra Judaeos*,²³ and Damian was certainly not alone in considering this the basic method of attack.

The Jews, in fact, could be most thankful for this naiveté, for it is when Christians became less optimistic and less naive that more virulent and dangerous anti-Semitism appeared. And, indeed, not all Christians were naive. As early as the seventh century, Julian of Toledo felt little hope of converting the Jews and wrote against them mainly for Damian's second reason — confirming Christians in their faith. Julian was closely associated with the anti-Jewish policy of seventh century Spain and wrote in his *De Comprobatione Aetatis Sextae*, that the Jews are a sick part of the body of the Spanish people.²⁴ His attitude is most clearly reflected by the judgment that the worst thing about France is that it is a "a brothel of Jews blaspheming our Savior and Lord."²⁵ Clearly, Julian's pessimism arose from contact with actual Jews, not merely those mentioned in books. Did Damian retain his optimism despite contact with Jews, or did his hopes result from ignorance?

It would appear that the latter is true. Damian does not seem aware of the implications of a polemic with Jews. It should have been obvious to him that the Jews have their own interpretations of the verses he quotes. Yet he pretends that no Jewish commentator has ever dealt with the plural verb in *Genesis* 1:27 ("Let us make man in our image"). He expects such far-fetched evidence of the Trinity as the thrice-repeated word "holy" in *Isaiah* 6:3 to carry weight with Jews.

Damian almost never reaches the second stage of debate in the exegesis of a verse. It is true that the inherent weakness of the Christian case in the area of "testimonies" is partially to be blamed, but certainly an attempt can be made to disprove some of the typical Jewish refutations of Christian interpretations. Let us take, for example, *Genesis* 49:10,²⁶ one of the few verses where something resembling a plausible case can be made for the

Christian argument. Damian spends about two or three lines on it²⁷ without mentioning any possible Jewish explanations. When Fulbert of Chartres, a far superior polemicist, deals with this verse, he dwelt mostly on the refutation of Jewish exegesis.²⁸ In only one place does Damian bother to refute Jewish interpretations. This is where he tries to show that certain Psalms must refer to Jesus and not to David or Solomon.²⁹

As a whole, then, by neglecting to deal with Jewish exegesis, Damian must certainly have failed in helping Honestus. Furthermore, he did not deal at all (except with regard to the Law) with questions initiated by Jews, e. g., "How could Jesus have been the Messiah if none of the Messianic prophecies have been fulfilled?" We must thus accuse Damian of incredible negligence or else conclude that his knowledge of Jews and their arguments was minimal. Since none of his other writings betray a familiarity with Jews, we are led to the conclusion that the latter explanation is correct.

If this is true, then the use of stereotyped anti-Jewish expressions in other theological, exegetical, or homiletical works becomes far less significant. Gregory the Great, for example, who displayed a most humane attitude toward the Jews in his correspondence, is virulently antisemitic in his Biblical commentaries, where Jews are symbolized by camels, wild asses, and serpents.³⁰ Damian, who seems to have had hardly any contact at all with Jews, can scarcely be blamed or considered unusual for using phrases that, as we shall see, were a hackneyed part of patristic and early medieval literature.

There are a number of passages in which Damian uses very harsh language about the Jews. Perhaps the most extreme instance is in the *De Sacramentis per Improbos Administratis*³¹ where he discusses Jewish accusations that Jesus associated with sinners. These accusations, he says, "are the root and entire matter whence the wild furor of Jewish envy (or "spite") against the Lord grew hor (*unde feralis in Dominum furor Judatici livoris incanduit*); hence did the malice of their poisonous bile conspire toward his death (*hinc in mortem ejus viperini fellis malitia conspiravit*)."

A virruperative passage. But who is the primary object of

attack here? Not the Jews, but neo-Donatist Christian heretics. Damian here hit upon a tactic which, as we shall see later, was quite common. First, he succeeds in equating Jews — and the ancient Pharisees at that — with Donatists. The next step is to bitterly malign the Jews (an easy and non-controversial task in a treatise intended for Christians) and let the virulence of these statements apply, by implication, to Donatists as well.

Furthermore, every anti-Jewish term in this passage has a "respectable" history in earlier writings. First, the term "feralis," with its allusion to wild beasts. As early as the fourth century, the Jews are referred to as a "feralis secta."⁸² In 387, this image was used by John Chrysostom in his sermons against the Jews, where he stated that Jews are "wilder than all wild beasts."⁸³

Taio of Saragossa referred to the "furor (saevitia) of the Jews against Christ."⁸⁴ The term "livor" appears in the statement of Angelomus of Luxeuil (died c. 855) referring to the "depravity of evil intention which the Jewish perfidy wished to stretch forth from the quiver of its spite (Iivor)."⁸⁵

The image of the Jew as a serpent ("viperinus") appears elsewhere in Damian as well. In the *Antilogus*, he asks his Jewish adversary not to behave like "a slippery serpent."⁸⁶ Elsewhere, he compares the Jews to an ass, saying that "the ass used by Abraham represents the uncomprehending stupidity of the Jews."⁸⁷ We have seen above that both these comparisons are found in the exegetical works of Gregory the Great. In the fourth century, the Synod of Jerusalem complained of "Jewish serpents and Samaritan imbeciles listening to sermons in Church like wolves surrounding the flock of Christ."⁸⁸ Of course, Damian's lack of original imagery is largely attributable to the fact that almost every possible negative image had already been applied to the Jews. The key point for this passage is that Damian had a special (anti-Donatist) reason for his violence here.

In other passages, the Jew is naturally condemned for his disbelief.³⁹ Jews are audacious,⁴⁰ and, what is most frustrating of all, they are blind.⁴¹ The theme of the Jews' blindness is extremely common in medieval literature. It was especially annoying to Christians, because the Jews after all were the carriers

of the testimony of Jesus' advent, yet they could not see what they showed others. Leo the Great (c. 391-461) wrote, "Carnal Israel does not understand what it reads, nor does it see what it shows."⁴² This phenomenon troubled a man like Damian greatly, for he seems deeply convinced that the testimonies he quotes are quite irrefutable.

In discussing the story of David and Absalom, Damian compares those concubines with whom David would not have relations upon his return to Jerusalem to the Jews. "The concubines... are those who persevere in guarding the old law... Nor does that celestial bridegroom approach them, for, as it were, he is designated to offer his fellowship to women prostituted by the Devil, and, because they have been polluted by adultery, he gives them a book of repudiation."⁴³ It is especially interesting and indicative of the extent to which Damian is imbued with Old Testament concepts that in a passage where he assails the old law his entire allegory is based upon divorce — a feature of that law — and that he uses the very term "repudii libellum" (ספר כריזות of Deuteronomy 24:3). The same phrase is found in the writings of Rabanus Maurus (d. 856) who said, "Understand that the Jews have received a book of repudiation, and have been completely forsaken by God."⁴⁴ Damian would have had great difficulty in substantiating the charge of adultery; at most, the Jews may have been frigid. He was, however, impelled to make this charge because of the Biblical story on which he was commenting, for the concubines had had relations with Absalom.

Another instance in which Damian makes an almost incomprehensible anti-Jewish statement because of a Biblical passage he is allegorizing is found in his speech *De Inventionem Sancti Crucis*. In discussing the passage in II Kings 1:6-7, he says, "And the axe cut down the trees on the banks of the Jordan because the Wisdom of God deigned to correct the impious Jews by the severity of his preaching, standing on the banks of the river of our mortality, hewing them down like barren trees in the stiffness of their pride..."⁴⁵ What follows is the descent to hell and the resurrection of Jesus. Certainly no Jews were "hewn down" before the resurrection by the preaching of Jesus. It is even quite difficult to determine just what Damian means. But a commitment

to allegory will often drive a commentator to uncomfortable lengths.

There is one strongly anti-Semitic sermon printed among Damian's works, but it is one of nineteen sermons printed there that were written by Nicholas of Clairvaux. This sermon is *De S. Stephano Protomartyre*.⁴⁶

We have seen, then, that almost all of Damian's anti-Jewish references are either stereotyped phrases or results of the exigencies of exegesis. They certainly would not seem to classify him as a significant anti-Semite. Further examination, as we shall see, will reinforce this impression.

Damian knows, of course, that before the birth of Jesus, Jews were religiously superior to Gentiles. At Jesus' birth, "The voice of the angels spoke to the Jews, as to reasonable men; the star of heaven spoke to the Gentiles, since they were like the beasts of wood and field."⁴⁷ We have here, incidentally, a most unusual situation — the term Jew (and not Hebrew or Israelite) applied to pre-Christians with the result of its acquiring a non-pejorative connotation. The Jews, as Damian tells us elsewhere, then lost their claim to the title Israelite.⁴⁸ Nowhere, however, (at least not to my knowledge) does he draw the more radical conclusion that the Jews are now inferior to non-Christian gentiles. Agobard (d. 841), for example, does draw this conclusion, saying, "The Jews are worse than the other nations, for the latter never received the Law, while the former, after having received the Law, after the Prophets had been sent to them, nevertheless killed the Son of God."⁴⁹

Whether Jews are inferior, equal, or superior to heretics, was a contested point in the early middle ages. Agobard and Amolon (d. 853) felt that the Jews were worse, for they entirely reject the Church's teaching. Peter Chrysologus, Alcuin, and others considered heretics more reprehensible.⁵⁰ In a strongly antisemitic passage, Damian tells the Simoniacs that they are worse than "the Jewish perfidy itself" and than any heretical depravity.⁵¹ Thus, at least some heretics are worse than Jews, and there is no indication that any are better.

This passage and the one quoted above from the *De Sacramentis*

per Improbos Administratis are without question the most strongly anti-Jewish passages in Damian. In both cases, his wrath was excited not by Jews but by Christian heretics, and in both cases he uses his insults against the Jews as a means of attacking these heretics. This was a widespread and effective method of combating a position or group that one did not like. Thus, Cassiodorus compared Jews to Donatists⁵² and Hadrian I used this method against the iconoclasts.⁵³

In the same passage in the *De Sacramentis*, Damian maintains that it is no crime to associate and eat with sinners. It is unclear whether or not this would apply to Jews as well. A number of Church councils had forbidden the clergy to eat with Jews.⁵⁴ Agobard had written of the Jews, "We must not be joined to them by participating (with them) in food and drink."⁵⁵ Thus, it is possible that Damian would disagree with a fairly strong current in Christian tradition and permit association with Jews.

Since we are dealing with an individual who lived so close to the crusaders, we should try to determine his feelings about the use of violence toward Jews. It has been said that "the massacre of Jews in 1096... found its ultimate authority in the writings of Damian himself."⁵⁶ Is there really anything in Damian's writings to indicate approval of such an action?

In his discussion of the Jews' rejection of Jesus, Damian, it would appear, quotes a verse in Deuteronomy (18:19), as follows: "The Lord will raise up a prophet for you from your brothers: anyone who will not listen to that prophet will be exterminated ("exterminabitur") from his people."⁵⁷ This last part of the verse (from "exterminabitur") is not found in Deuteronomy. The Hebrew is *אני אעניש אתו*, the Vulgate has "ego ultor existam," and the Septuagint gives *ἐγὼ ἐκδικήσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ*. The general meaning of all three is "I (God) will punish him." Damian's version, in a work intended to combat Jews, is taken from *Acts* 3:22-23⁵⁸ where this much harsher version is found.⁵⁹ Nevertheless, it would be quite far-fetched to draw any inferences about violent action toward Jews from this quotation. First, the extermination could be left to God, as in Jewish tradition. Second, Damian himself does not discuss any such implications. And

Saviour's blood, they may live dispersed through the blows of the world."⁶⁵ There is actually a tone of pity here.

Alexander wrote a similar letter to Berengarius of Narbonne. "Let your prudence know," he writes, "that it pleases us that you protect the Jews who are under your dominion, that they not be killed. For God does not find joy through the spilling of blood, nor does he rejoice in the destruction of evil men."⁶⁶ Of course, Damian was not the only influence on Alexander, and we know that the latter's teacher Lanfranc had a rather charitable interpretation of the Jews' responsibility for the crucifixion. We must be very wary of equating Alexander's merciful tone with Damian's rather cold statement that the Jews should not be killed. Such an equation is no more than a possibility; its probability cannot be determined with any degree of certainty.

We must also remember that protection of the Jews did not always imply amicable relations with them. Raterius of Verona (c. 890-974) wrote, "It is sufficient if they (Christians) let them (Jews) live somehow, they should not let them publicly blaspheme the Lord Jesus Christ. 'We shall live under your shadow,' said the prophet of them. 'We shall live,' he said, not 'we shall enjoy ourselves.' 'And he gave them to mercy' — not to exaltation, not to friendship, not to any honor."⁶⁷ Moreover, an alternative to forced baptism was expulsion.⁶⁸ One thing, however, is clear. Damian would not have lent his authority to the massacre of Jews.

Damian's general attitude toward the Jews of his time, as far as we have been able to ascertain it, has been outlined. We must now try to determine his attitude toward their future. Where do the Jews fit in to the eschatological picture? Before we can answer this question, we must find his attitude toward a great event in the Jewish past, for all of Jewish history was determined by the rejection of Jesus and the crucifixion.

There were Christian thinkers before Damian who presented more moderate statements of Jewish guilt than might be expected. Bede maintained that though the Jews are guilty, so is every Christian sinner. Every sinner "betrays the Son of Man."⁶⁹ Lanfranc in effect conceded a point of many Jewish polemicists. "The sin of the Jews," he wrote, "enriched the world, for had

they not crucified the Lord, the cross of Christ, the resurrection and the ascension... would not have existed in the world."⁷⁰

Damian does not seem to have shared this attitude. He argues in the *Dialogus* that the Jews have been placed in eternal exile because of a crime which transcends all others — the murder of the Son of God. After all, he says, the Jews committed terrible crimes recorded in the Old Testament, yet their worst punishment was a seventy year exile. Only a truly horrible crime could explain an exile of over one thousand years, one which Damian feels sure is eternal.⁷¹

Blumenkranz maintains that with this type of argument, Damian introduced a new concept into medieval polemics — the concept of an argument from reason (*ratio*) in addition to those from authority (*auctoritas*).⁷² It is true that Damian states, "With the prophetic passages having been set forth, it pleases us to contend with you by reason alone."⁷³ But the argument following this statement — the argument set forth in the previous paragraph of this paper — is not novel at all.

Prosper of Aquitaine (d. c. 463) wrote that because of the great sin of killing Christ, "grace deserted the Jews, and their land became sterile and deserted. For all prophecy, all sacrifice and all sacraments ceased, and they passed to the humiliation of the nations."⁷⁴ The same statement is found in Peter Chrysologus⁷⁵ and in Cassiodorus.⁷⁶

Damian, then, does blame the Jews severely for the crucifixion. What will consequently become of them? Will they ever repent and be forgiven?

In discussing Zachariah 12:10, Damian prefixes the statement, "...where a little later is added (a verse) concerning the Jews' damnation."⁷⁷ This is an eschatological passage; Damian would thus seem to speak of an ultimate Jewish damnation. There certainly was such a view. Bruno of Wurzburg (d. 1045) wrote of the end of days: "The impious ones and the Jews will cry out to Christ... He will not hear them."⁷⁸

And yet Damian could not have held such a view. The hope which he expresses that the Jews will convert is found, as we have

seen above, throughout the *Antilogus-Dialogus*. The answer is probably to be found in an eschatological passage in Rabanus Maurus. The latter quotes a verse in Isaiah (10:22), "If the number of your people Israel will be as the sand of the sea, a remnant of it will return."⁷⁹ It is very likely that Damian too felt that some of the Jews would be converted either by persuasion or by God's grace while others would suffer damnation.

In Damian's mind, the Jews and the Old Testament are very closely related. They bear it as testimony, and it is only by appealing to its evidence that one can hope to convert them. Finally, adherence to the ancient law was certainly the clearest mark of a Jew.

The time has come to look at Damian and the Old Testament.

II

DAMIAN AND HIS ATTITUDE TOWARD THE OLD TESTAMENT

Peter Damian was very deeply imbued with a knowledge of the Old Testament; in fact, as McNulty says, he quotes "chiefly from the Old Testament and the Pauline Epistles."¹ He seems extremely well-versed in the Hebrew Scriptures, and they have left a very deep impression upon his writings. Throughout the *De Perfectione Monachorum*, for example, he refers to monks as Israelites.

He seems a bit unclear as to the scope of the Jewish Bible. In the *Antilogus*, he quotes a verse from *Baruch* (3:36) to prove to the Jews that Jesus was the Messiah. A book of the Apocrypha would, of course, have no authority with the Jew. Yet this mistake does not originate with Damian, and it is possible that he either copied from a predecessor without giving the matter much thought or else he may have had some defense. Gregory of Tours cited this very verse to the Jew Priscus in a disputation.² For a possible Christian defense, we may note Gilbert Crispin's *Disputatio* of

the late eleventh century where he replies to the Jew's objections by maintaining that *Baruch* was, after all, written at Jeremiah's dictation.³

Whether or not Damian had a clear conception of the precise limits of the Old Testament as defined by Jews, he did have a deep emotional attachment to its contents. And here he found himself confronted by the crucial questions: Is the Old Testament superseded? Is only its Law superseded? Perhaps part of the Law remains valid. Is that part which is superseded to be disregarded completely? If so, why then is it retained in the Bible? Why was it ever given? Did it ever have any value? If it is to be taken allegorically, then was it ever intended to be taken literally?

These problems were central to any serious medieval Christian. Many approaches are found in the long history of Christian grappling with these questions. Let us begin with proponents of the negative attitude.

In the *Dialogue with Trypho*, we find the view that the Law is an unimportant part of Scripture which was added because of the Jews' wickedness. In chapter sixteen, the author states, "Circumcision was given to you as a sign, that you may be separated from other nations and from us and that you alone may suffer that which you now justly suffer." Jerome, in Epistle 121, says that the law was a deliberate deception of the Jews by God to lead them to their destruction.⁴

John Cassian, who must have been read avidly by a monk of Damian's inclinations, draws a sharp contrast between the Old and New Testaments. Surprisingly, rather than showing that the Law is harsher (which the paragraph heading implies), he maintains that the New Testament is more effective in preventing sin. Compare, for example, the ability of sexual abstinence to prevent adultery as against that of marriage.⁵

There are passages in Damian's works which reflect a similar, very negative attitude toward the Law. He says of Jesus, "He did not scorn to be cursed, so that he might free us from the Law's curse."⁶ Concerning the Law, he quotes a verse in *Ezekiel* (20:25), "I gave them laws that are no good and precepts by

which they will not live."⁷ Here, he seems to feel that, at least when given to the Jews, the Law was a curse and an evil.

There is, however, a much different view of the Law in Christian tradition. It is one that we will do well to examine, for we shall see that there are places where Damian appears much closer to this view than to the one already described.

Perhaps the most complimentary explanation by Christians of their ceasing to obey the Law is in *Romans* 7:14-25. Paul says that he is too weighed down by sin to observe the spiritual Law.⁸

A second Pauline interpretation is to be found in *Romans* 3:21-22 and *Galatians* 3:24-26. The law was temporary and meant to be a guide to lead us to "faith in Jesus Christ."⁹

In some places, Tertullian seems to go even farther than Paul and uses the Law as a norm of conduct. He forbids the teaching of secular studies, for how can a loyal Christian teach literature when the Law prohibits the pronouncement of the names of the gods?¹⁰ He later states that "the Law prohibits to name the gods of the nations, not, of course, that we are not to pronounce their names the mention of which is required by conversation."¹¹ And so Tertullian seems to be conducting his life on the basis of at least some of the Law's precepts.

This attitude is reflected in Damian in a number of his works. In the *Dominus Vobiscum*, he is concerned with a technical question of monastic ritual. In making his point, he appeals to the authority of both Testaments and then adds, "We do not take away from or add to the authority of the Holy Scriptures because of changing circumstances, but rather the customs of the Church are preserved in them."¹² Thus, the Old Testament is to be appealed to not only in homiletical, but also in legal matters.

A perhaps more significant passage is the eighth chapter of *De Perfectione Monachorum*.¹³ Here, Damian is allegorizing the first two seven-year periods during which Jacob worked for Laban. These, he says, are the periods which every person must pass through, for the first seven years correspond to the seven commandments of the Decalogue concerned with love of one's neighbor and the last seven symbolize the seven commandments of the

Gospel which he proceeds to enumerate. Only after passing through these stages can one reach Rachel. It appears from this chapter that certain parts of the Pentateuch — namely, the moral law — are of eternal validity.

This is a time-honored Christian position. Eucher of Lyon (d. c. 450-453) wrote in his *Instructiones* as follows: "Question: What parts of the Old Testament should we abandon and what parts should we observe. Answer: We should observe commandments which pertain to the correction of life and abandon the ceremonies and the rites of sacrifices which brought forth the figures and the shadow of future events."¹⁴ We shall see later that Damian would agree completely with both parts of Eucher's response.

Leo the Great (c. 391-461) wrote that it is necessary to preserve "the moral commandments and precepts (of the Old Testament) just as they were set forth."¹⁵ Eginhard (c. 770-840), when enjoining respect for one's father, wrote, "Though this is ordained in the Old Testament, it is part of the numerous laws which the scholars of the Church have declared as valuable to Christians as to Jews."¹⁶

This division of the Law into two parts — the moral and the ritual — cannot be accomplished without much difficulty, for the borderline is extremely vague and unsteady. A similar division is found in Jewish philosophy in R. Saadiah Gaon, the division of מצוות שכליות (commandments whose purpose is comprehensible) and שטעיות (those which are inscrutable), and this division is open to the same objections. There is, of course, an important difference in the acuteness of the problem. To Saadiah, it is a question of classification; to the Christians, it is a problem of acceptance or rejection. Leo, for example, places the prohibition of idolatry among the moral precepts. This could be defended. But Tertullian's concern with the prohibition of pronouncing the name of a foreign god is a good indication that the division was not entirely along moral-ritual lines. It is true that Damian does not include that part of the Decalogue which precedes "Honor thy father and thy mother," but this could very well be because the seven years forced him to include only seven commandments.

In any event, even if Damian wanted to retain a sharp, theoretical boundary between the moral and ritual sections of the Law, the practical difficulties are such that such a position devolves into an acceptance of statutes one likes and a rejection of those that are not appealing in a good number of instances.

Thus, Damian feels that the ritual law is of course superseded. At times, he expresses the view that it was always a curse. At other times, he seems to imply that it was an unpleasant necessity; the instrument of bringing justice into the world.¹⁷ In any case, the contrast between the Old and New is quite strong in this area. We shall see presently that through allegory, even the ritual law can be shown to have eternal value. The moral law is still binding.

Before passing to a detailed treatment of Damian's allegorical explanations of ritual law, we must ask ourselves — what of the rest of the Old Testament? Did Damian feel that the entire Old Testament is infected by the same harshness found in a literal interpretation of the ritual law? Is love to be found only after the advent of the Saviour?

We may confidently answer that Damian was not aware of such a dichotomy. Tears and mercy were, to Damian, the most profound expressions of love. And in discussing the efficacy of tears, he shows how the God of Israel was moved to compassion when he saw genuine tears being shed. David, despite adultery and indirect murder, did not lose his kingdom or life — because of tears.^{17*} Hezekiah and Jerusalem were delivered — because the king wept. "Esther ensured that God would deliver the people of Israel from their common danger of death and that the sentence of hanging... should be suffered by Haman" — through tears. He quotes *Psalms* 39:13, "Listen to my weeping" (הֲשִׁיבָה אֵלַי דְּמִעֲתִי) to show that tears are efficacious.¹⁸

"The ark," he writes, "was smeared with pitch within and without, so that she should be outwardly soothed by brotherly sweetness and inwardly united in the truth of mutual love."¹⁹

Damian traces the eremitic ideal, that highest expression of man's love for God, to the Old Testament. It was of the hermit's

cell that Jeremiah said (*Lamentations* 3:26), "It is good that a man should quietly wait for the salvation of the Lord."²⁰ It was to this little room that Solomon cried out, "How fair and pleasant art thou, O love, for delights" (*Song of Songs* 7:7).²¹ Clearly, the Old Testament as a whole is a source of love, compassion, and the ideal Christian life.

There does, it seems, remain one part of the Old Testament which is worthless or worse — the ritual law. Yet, as indicated above, there is a way to redeem even this section — the way of allegory.

Immediately after quoting the verse from Ezekiel about statutes by which one cannot live, Damian continues, "Nevertheless, if we join the confession of the cross and the mystery of the Lord's passion to this law, immediately that which was bitter turns into the sweetness of spiritual intelligence."²² The cross clarifies all the hidden meaning of the Law and thus turns a curse into a source of meaningful teachings.

Allegorical interpretations of the ritual law are found throughout Damian's works. Church bells come from the trumpets of Numbers 10, from "the mystical tradition of the old Law."²³ The incense symbolizes good works; the two women of whom one is loved and the other hated are pleasure and virtue respectively.²⁴ The beautiful woman captured in war represents secular knowledge.²⁵

The one place, however, where Damian carefully and at length allegorizes a series of Old Testament laws is at the beginning of the *Dialogus*. Here he would seem to have made an important contribution to the polemic against Jews and to have enriched Christian exegesis. Blumenkranz, in his treatment of Damian in "Auteurs," does not note any major source of his allegories nor, to my knowledge, does any other scholar.

Yet the entire passage is an almost word for word plagiarism from Isidore of Seville.²⁶

The magnitude of this copying will become sufficiently evident only by a comparison of the two passages in Latin.

INTRODUCTION:

Isidore:

Nunc vero jam de quibusdam caeremoniis quid spiritualiter in his habeatur dicendum est. De quibus etiam et Judaei scrupulosissime quaerunt.

Damian:

Nunc autem de quibusdam caeremoniis, super quibus saepe scrupulosissime quaeritis... Age igitur.

PROBLEM 1

Why do Christians not practice circumcision? Answer: Baptism takes its place as a promise of the future; it was merely a prefiguration of Christ.

Isidore:

Quaeritur ergo curjam non circumdatur carne Christianus si Christus non venit legem solvere, sed adimplere. Respondetur: Ideo jam circumciditur Christianus, quia id quod eodem circucisione prophetabatur jam Christus implevit. Exspoliato enim carnalis generationis quae in illo tacto figurabatur, jam Christi resurrectione impleta est, et quod in nostra resurrectione futuram est, sacramento baptismi commendatur.

Damian:

Quaestio 1: Si Christus non venit legem solvere, sed implere, cur carne non circumciditur Christianus? Responsio: Imo jam se ideo Christianus minime circudidit quia quod circucisione prophetabatur, Christus implevit. Exspoliato quippe vitae carnalis, quae in veteti lege furat figurata, in Christi jam cernitur resurrectione completa, et quod expectamus in nostra resurrectione futurum, jam in sacri baptismatis mysterio commendatur.

PROBLEM 2

Why don't Christians observe the Sabbath? Answer: Christians rest in Christ.

Isidore:

Cum quaeritur Sabbati oriurn cur non observet Christianus, si

Damian:

Quaestio 2: Cur omittit Christianus Sabbatum colere, si Chris-

Christus non venit legem solvere sed adimplere, responderetur: Imo et id propterea non observat Christianus quia quod ea figura prophetabatur jam Christus implevit; in illo quippe habemus Sabbatum, qui dixit: "Venite ad me, omnes qui laboratis et onerati estis, et ego vos reficiam. Tollite jugum meum super vos, et discite a me quia mitis sum et humilis corde, et invenietis requiem animabus vestris" (*Matth* 11:28). Cessationem ergo Sabbatorum jam quidem supervacue ducimus observare ex quo spes revelata est nostrae quietis aeternae.

tus non venit legem solvere, sed implere? Responsio: A nobis Sabbatum ideo non servatur, quia quod tunc erat in figura praemissum per exhibitionem rei jam videmus implerum... in illo (Christo) toto cordis amore ac devotione quiescimus, ut ab omni vitiorum servili opere ac terranarum rerum ambitione cessemus. Ad quod Sabbatum celebrandum ipse provocat, dum clamat, "Venite ad me... et discite quia mitis sum et humilis corde, et invenietis requiem animabus vestris." Carnalis ergo Sabbati cultum supervacuum ducimus, cum jam illud verum et salutiferum, propter quod institutum est, celebamus.

PROBLEM 3

Why do Christians ignore the dietary laws? Answer: We now distinguish between clean and unclean in morality.

Isidore:

Cum quaeritur quare non observet differentiam ciborum quae in lege praecipitur, si Christus non venit legem solvere sed adimplere, responderetur: Imo propterea non observat eam Christianus, quia quod in illius figuris prophetabatur Christus implevit, non admittens ad corpus (quod corpus in sanctis suis in vitam aeternam praedestina-

Damian:

Quaestio 3: Si Christus non venit legem solvere, sed implere, cur Christianus negligit ciborum differentiam, quae in lege praecipitur observari? Responsio: Imo idcirco haec a Christianis ciborum differentia non admittitur, quoniam a Christo quod per hanc figurabatur, impletur. Immunditia quippe quae tunc cavebatur in cibis, nunc in mo-

vir) quidquid per illa animalia in moribus hominum significatum est.

ribus reprobarur humanis. Sicut enim sancti quique, ac justi transferuntur in corpus Christi: sic ab eo reprobi et inique tanquam cibi repellantur immundi.

PROBLEM 4

Why don't Christians bring sacrifices? Answer: Jesus' sacrifice made them unnecessary. Furthermore, sacrifices were instituted to keep Jews away from idol worship.²⁷

Blumenkranz maintains that this question was introduced to instruct Christians, for no Jew would press Christians on this matter.²⁸ The fact is that there was a heretical sect in eleventh century Italy that did sacrifice.²⁹ The whole question, however, should be applied to Isidore rather than Damian, and actually these problems do fit more readily in a Biblical commentary.

Isidore:

Cum quaeritur quare Christianus non, animalibus immolatis, carnis et sanguinis sacrificium offerat Deo, si Christus etc., responderur: . . . ea quae animalibus rerum figuris illi prophetabant immolatione carnis et sanguinis sui Christus implevit. Nam de sacrificiis eorundem animalium quis nostrum nesciat magis ea perverso populo congruenter imposita, quam Deo desideranter oblata?

Damian:

Quaestio 4: Si Christus etc. cur et animalium carnibus sacrificium Deo Christianus non curat offerre? Responso: . . . quidquid in illis hostiis typice gerebatur, totum in immolatione agni, qui tollit peccata mundi, veraciter adimpletur. . . . Quis enim nesciat eadem sacrificia potius ad hoc inobedienti populo, ne cum idolis fornicarenur, imposita, quam Deo, tanquam ipse desideraret, oblata.

PROBLEM 5

Why do Christians not eat unleavened bread on Passover? Answer: They have expelled the leaven of the old life.

Isidore:

Cum quaeritur cur azyma non observet Christianus, si Christus etc. respondetur: . . . quod expurgato veteris vitae fermento, novam viam demonstrans implevit Christus.

Damian:

Quaestio 5: Si Christus etc. cur Christianus azymam . . . non observat? Responso: quoniam expurgato veteris vitae fermento, nova conspersio spiritualiter adimplerur.

PROBLEM 6

Why do Christians not sacrifice the paschal lamb? Answer: Jesus' sacrifice made it unnecessary.

Isidore:

. . . Cur de carne agni Christianus pascha non celebret, si Christus etc, respondetur: . . . quia quo illa figura prophetabatur Agnus immaculatus sua passione Christus implevit.

Damian:

Quaestio 6: Si Christus etc. cur Christianus paschalis agni sanguine Pascha non celebrat? Responso: . . . quia postquam verus ille Agnus . . . qui significatur, superfluous judicatur.

PROBLEM 7

Why don't Christians observe the New Moon? Answer: It prefigured the new man in Christ.

Isidore:

Quam ob causam neomenias in lege mandatas non celebrat Christianus, si, etc., respondetur: . . . Celebratio enim novae lunae praenuntiabat novam creaturam, de qua dicit Apostolus: "Si qua igitur in Christo nova creatura, vetera transierunt, et facta sunt omnia nova." (II Cor. 5).

Damian:

Si etc., cur lege mandatam non celebrat neomeniam Christianus? Responso: . . . Novae quippe lunae solemnitas novam designat in homine fieri creaturam, de qua dicit Apostolus: "Si qua . . . sunt omnia nova" (II Cor. 5).

PROBLEM 8

Why do Christians not perform ritual immersions? Answer: Baptism enables us to participate in Christ's death and resurrection.

Isidore:

...Cur illa singularum quarumque immunditiarum baptismata...non observet Christianus, si etc., responderetur: Venit enim (Christus) consepelire nos sibi per baptismum in mortem, ut quemadmodum Christus resurrexit a mortuis sic et nos in novitate vitae ambulemus.

Damian:

Si Christus etc., cur Christianus illa ablutionum baptismata...non observat? Responso: Consepulti enim summo Christo per baptismum in morte; ut quomodo surrexit Christus a mortuis per gloriam Patris, sic et nos in novitate vitae ambulemus.

PROBLEM 9

Why do Christians not observe Tabernacles? Answer: The tabernacle prefigured the Church; furthermore, Christians are the tabernacle of God.

Isidore:

...Qua causa scenopegia non sit solemnitas Christianorum si etc., responderetur tabernaculum Dei fideles esse...et...jam Christus in Ecclesia sua quod illa figura prophetice promittebat implevit.

Damian:

Si etc., quid rationis objicitur, ut a Christianis Scenopegiae solemnitas non colatur. Responso: Tabernaculum Dei societas est populi Christiani, et...illud tabernaculum sanctam praefigurabat Ecclesiam.

PROBLEM 10

Why do Christians not observe the sabbatical year? Answer: It prefigures the last judgment.

The texts here are very lengthy. Suffice it to say that again the answers are identical and linguistically extremely close.

Thus, Damian does believe even the ritual law to be of permanent value, provided that it is allegorized in light of the new grace.

CONCLUSION:

Peter Damian was not, in any direct way, an important forerunner of the ideas of post-crusade Judaeophobia. Any effect that he may have had on their development took place through his contributions to popular piety rather than through his anti-Jewish writings. Damian, in fact, presents an excellent summation of the pre-crusade attitude toward the Jews, for we have seen that all his statements have a substantial history in the writings of Christians who preceded him.

Damian had very little inclination to write his anti-Jewish works. He chided Honestus for making the request, and he finally wrote the *Antilogus-Dialogus* because he felt that Christians were being humiliated and because of the naive hope of converting the Jews by these arguments. However, it seems evident that these reasons would not have impelled him to write the treatise had not Honestus asked him to.

We have concluded after examining his works that Damian probably had very little knowledge of Jews or contact with them. This ignorance of Jews and their arguments greatly decreased his effectiveness as a polemicist. Thus, the *Antilogus-Dialogus* is quite naive and, significantly, rather conciliatory toward the Jews.

Damian does have harsh things to say about the Jews in a few passages. But we have seen that the two most virulent of these were primarily motivated by hatred toward Christian heretics, and all the anti-Jewish expressions are quite hackneyed.

Damian is very clearly against using violence with respect to Jews. He does blame them quite strongly for the crucifixion, but he probably felt that a significant "remnant" would be saved at the last judgment.

As far as the Old Testament is concerned, Damian studied it

closely and loved it deeply. The moral law he considered forever valid. The ritual law may once have been a curse, but a new allegorical understanding of it made possible by the advent of Jesus endows it with sacred and eternal significance.

NOTES

1. The term "Old Testament" is used for convenience.

INTRODUCTION

1. Norman F. Cantor, *Medieval History, The Life and Death of a Civilization* (henceforth referred to as *Med. Hist.*), p. 308.

I

DAMIAN AND HIS ATTITUDE TOWARD THE JEWS

1. See Cecil Roth, *The History of the Jews in Italy*, p. 72, for the information in this paragraph.
2. Bernhard Blumenkranz, *Juifs et Chrétiens dans le Monde Occidental*, 430-1096 (henceforth referred to as *Juifs et Chrétiens*), p. 136.
3. *Juifs et Chrétiens*, p. XV. The "period" is 430-1096.
4. "Les Auteurs Chrétiens Latins du Moyen Age sur les Juifs et le Judaïsme" (henceforth referred to as "Auteurs"), *Revue des Etudes Juives* 9 (109), 1948-49, pp. 3-67; 11 (111), 1951-52, pp. 5-61; 13 (113), 1954, pp. 5-36; 14 (114), 1955, pp. 37-90; 17 (117), 1958, pp. 5-58.
5. "Auteurs," REJ 14, pp. 76ff.
6. J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina* (henceforth P. L.), 136, col. 535-7.
7. P. L. 141, col. 305-318.
8. L. I. Newman, *Jewish Influence on Christian Reform Movements*, p. 333.
9. *Juifs et Chrétiens*, pp. 68-69 and 71.
10. *De Perfectione Monachorum*, ch. 3, P. L. 145, col. 294. Translations from *De Perf. Mon.* are taken from Patricia McNulty, *St. Pietro Damiani: Selected Writings on the Spiritual Life* (henceforth *Spiritual Life*).
11. *Spiritual Life*, pp. 22-23.
12. J. Gonsette, *Pierre Damien et la Culture Profane*, pp. 16-17.

13. Boggs, in *Christian Saga*, V, 1, pp. 374-375, gives great emphasis to this element in Damian's thought.
14. *St. Pierre Damien*, p. 192. Quoted in J. Joseph Ryan, "St. Peter Damiani and the Sermons of Nicholas of Clairvaux: A Clarification," *Mediaeval Studies* 9 (1947), p. 152.
15. P. L. 145, col. 41-68. The *Antilogus-Dialogus* (it is basically one work) was probably composed c. 1070. Damian writes (col. 55) that 1040 years have passed since the fulfillment of Daniel's prophecy. From his general treatment of the passage in Daniel it would appear that fulfillment took place at the crucifixion.
16. "Sed si Christi miles esse, et pro eo viriliter pugnare desideras, contra carnis vitia, contra diaboli machinas insignis bellator arma." *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue* (henceforth referred to as *Conflict*), p. 211.
21. "Nunc igitur, Judaeae, audi meum consilium ut Deum, quem iratum habes, possis habere propitium... Desere Judaicae caecitatis errorem, et re ad Evangelicae gratiae dirige veritatem... Deus patrum morum a corde tuo vetustum ignorantiae velamen abjiciat, et, depulsis errorum tenebris, nova te cognitionis suae luce perfundat." P. L. 145. 66.
22. Herman Vogelstein and Paul Rieger, *Geschichte der Juden in Rom*, p. 268.
23. P. L. 83, col. 449-538.
24. "Auteurs." REJ 11, pp. 34-37. This pessimistic attitude toward conversion of the Jews is reflected in the statement of Freculphe of Lisieux (9th cent.) that the Jews are "naturally inimical to Christian dogma" (P. L. 106, 1199). See "Auteurs," REJ 13, p. 25.
25. "... gvod pejus his omnibus (sc. malis) est, contra ipsum Salvarorem nostrum et Dominum Judaeorum blasphemantium prostibulum habebatur." P. L. 96, col. 766. Translation by Parkes, *Conflict*, p. 342.
26. לא יסור שכמ מיהודה ומחקה מבין רגליו עד כי יבא שילח ולו יקח עינים.
27. P. L. 145, col. 46.
28. See his three speeches against the Jews, P. L. 141, 305-18.
29. P. L. 145, col. 49-53.
30. Cf. Parkes' very perceptive comments on the phenomenon in *Conflict*, pp. 219-221.
31. P. L. 145, col. 529.
32. *Conflict*, p. 185.
33. The Jews θηρίων ἀπίστων γεγονάσιον ἀγριώτεροι. P. G. 48, col. 852. In his sixth speech against the Jews, Chrysostom switches the metaphor and compares himself to a wild beast who has drunk blood (of the Jews) and cannot stop. Such a beast οὐκ ἂν ραδίως ταύτης ἀπιστοῦναι λοιπὸν τῆς θούνης, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πολλῆς ἐπι ταύτην τρέχει τὴν τράπεζαν τῆς ἐπιθυμίας. τοῦτο. he adds. καὶ ἡμεῖς πεπιόνθαμεν. *Pat. Graeca* 48, col 903. Utterly disgusting.
34. P. L. 80, col. 778.
35. P. L. 115.264. Quoted in "Auteurs," REJ 13, p. 33.

36. "... nisi ut lubricus anguis, cum captus fueris, manus evadere gestias." Earlier he said of this behavior, "ut vester mos est." P. L. 145, col. 44.
37. "Asinus autem ille quo tunc utebatur Abraham, insensata erat stultitia Iudaeorum." *Sermo de Inventione Sancti Crucis*, P. L. 144, col. 603. Tr. by McNulty, *Spiritual Life*, p. 169.
38. "Nos, nos inquietarent Iudaici serpentes et Samaritanorum incredibilis stultitia." P. L. 22, col. 769. Tr. by Parkes, *Conflicts*, p. 173.
39. "Erubeicat Iudaeus infelix, qui negat Christum de Virgine natum." *Sermo de Epiphania Domini*, P. L. 144, col. 514. I see no reason for doubting the authenticity of this sermon. Kurt Reindel's reason for such doubts is, to say the least, inconclusive. "Sermon one," he says, "in contrast to Damian's other sermons, makes a quite impersonal impression; it is almost entirely constructed out of Biblical quotations." "Studien zur Überlieferung der Werke des Petrus Damiani I," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 1959, p. 29.
40. "Qua inverecondiae mentis audacia tam claris... poteris assertionibus obviare." *Antilogus*, P. L. 145.52.
41. P. L. 145, col. 47.
42. "Carnalis Israel non intellegit quod legit, non videt quod ostendit." P. L. 54.242. Quoted in "Auteurs," REJ 9, p. 23.
43. "Concubinae... hi sunt qui in veteris legis custodia perseverant... Nec ad eos (Iudaeos) coelestis ille sponsus ingreditur, quia tanquam mulierculis a diabolo prostitutis suum praebere contubernium designatur, eisque, quia pollute sunt per adulterium, repudii dat libellum." *Epistola* 13 [ad Desiderium Abbatem et Cardinalem], P. L. 144, col. 287.
44. "Intellige accipientes Iudaeos libellum repudii, et omnino a Domino derelictos." This comes right after an explicit mention of *Deut.* 24:3.
45. "... Dei sapientia, juxta fluidum mortalitatis nostrae decursum, dignata est impios Iudaeos suae praedicationis austeritate corripere, et velut infructuosas arbores a statu rigidae superbiae desecare." P. L. 144.610. Tr. by McNulty, *Spiritual Life*, p. 174.
46. For the anti-Semitic embellishments in this sermon, see P. L. 144, col. 854, where Jews are stupid, Satans, serpents, etc. The verse in *Acts* (6:19) which serves as the basis of this part of the sermon simply says ἀνέστησαν δὲ τινες τῶν ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῆς λεγομένης... συνζητοῦντες τῷ Στεφάνῳ, καὶ οὐκ ἰσχυροὶ ἀντιστῆναι τῇ σοφίᾳ καὶ τῷ Πνεύματι ᾧ ἐλάλει. For the spurious sermons see Migne's introduction to P. L. 144 and J. Joseph Ryan, "St. Peter Damiani and the Sermons of Nicholas of Clairvaux: A Clarification," *Mediaeval Studies* 9 (1947), pp. 151-161. It is most interesting that many scholars have used these sermons in discussing Damian. McNulty even translates one (on St. Benedict). No. 69 — which lists more than seven sacraments — has been quoted very often in Damian's name.

47. "Judaus inique tanquam ratione utentibus loquitur vox angelorum, gentibus vero quasi brutis et jumentis in campis silvae loquitur linguae sive stella coelorum." P. L. 144, col. 507. Tr. by McNulty, *Spiritual Life*, p. 148.
48. "Sancti enim apostoli... Israeliticae gentis filii sunt." *Antilogus*, P. L. 145, col. 47.
49. "Judaei... nationibus pejores inveniuntur: quia illae quidem nec legem acceperunt, isti vero post datam sibi legem, post missos ad se prophetas, etiam Dei filium occiderunt." P. L. 104, 95-96.
50. *Juifs et Chrétiens*, pp. XVII-XVIII.
51. *Liber Qui Dicitur Gratissimus*, ch. 37. P. L. 145, col. 153. Humbert too maintains that we should consider "quanto sceleratiores Judaeis arbitramur istos (sc. Simoniacos)." P. L. 143, 1093C.
52. P. L. 70. 74D ("Judaei vel Donatistae").
53. P. L. 98.1255-6. See *Juifs et Chrétiens*, pp. XVI-XVII and note 11 there.
54. *Conflict*, p. 320. But compare the *Vita* of Simeon quoted above on p. 5 of this paper.
55. "...non debemus eis conjungi participatione ciborum et potuum." P. L. 104, col. 73-74, in *De Insolentia Judaeorum*.
56. *Med. Hist.*, p. 308.
57. *Antilogus*, P. L. 145, col. 46.
58. ...ἔσται δὲ πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἣτις ἔάν μὴ ἀκούσῃ τοῦ προφήτου ἐκείνου ἐξολοθρευθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ.
59. Jewish tradition does state that a transgressor of the commandment in this verse will be killed at a younger age at the hand of God. See Mishnah Sanhedrin 89a: כִּי יִמָּוֵת בְּיָמָיו... הַמַּוֵּת בְּעַד הַמִּצְוָה הַזֹּאת. This transgression involves both disbelief (*II Kings* 7:2, 19-20) and disobedience (*I Kings* 20:35-36). Cf. D. H. Hoffmann's commentary to *Deuteronomy*, *ad loc.* This tradition may have influenced the Gospel version.
60. "Unde per Psalmistam dicitur, 'Deus meus, ostende mihi bona inter inimicos meos, ne occidas eos, ne quando obliviscantur legis tuae' (Psalms 59:11-12 in the Hebrew Bible)." *Epist.* 13, P. L. 144.284-85.
61. Rahlf's, on the basis of the Gallic Psalter, prints τοῦ λαοῦ μου in his Septuagint, feeling that νόμου σου came in under the influence of *Psalms* 119, verses 61, 109, 153.
62. Cf. Cassiodorus, P. L. 69, col. 415, quoted in "Auteurs," REJ 9, p. 46, and Isidore of Seville, P. L. 83, col. 226 and 236, quoted in REJ 11, p. 18.
63. See G. Bareille in the article "Damien" in *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, vol. IV, col. 42-43.
64. *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. I, p. 286.
65. "Illi quippe srulra ignorantia, vel forte caeca cupiditate commoti, in eorum (Judaeorum) necem volebant saevire, quos fortasse divina pietas ad salutem praedestinavit... Dei misericordia servati sunt, ut, patria libertateque amissa,... patrum praejudicio in effusione san-

- guinis Salvatoris damnati, per terrarum orbis plagas dispersi vivant." P. L. 146.1386-7.
66. "Noverit prudentia vestra nobis placuisse quod Judaeos qui sub vestra potestate habitant tutati estis ne occiderentur. Non enim gaudet Deus effusione sanguinis, neque laetatur in perditione malorum." P. L. 146.1387.
67. "Suffecerat si eos vivere sinerent utcumque, non permitterent eos Dominum Jesum Christum tam publice blasphemare: "Sub umbra enim tua vivemus" dicit de eis propheta. "Vivemus," inquit, non "oblectabimur." "Et dedit eos in misericordias" — non ior extollentias, non in amicitiam, non in ullum honorem." *Qualitatis Conjectura*, P. L. 136.536.
68. Leo VII wrote to archbishop Frederick of Mayence between 937 and 939 of the Jews, "Si autem credere noluerint, de civitatibus vestris cum nostra auctoritate illos expellite," but "per virtutem autem et sine illorum voluntate... nolite eos baptizare." P. L. 132, col. 1084-5.
69. "...Filium hominis tradit." P. L. 92.271.
70. "Delictum Judaeorum ditavit mundum, quia nisi ipsi Dominum crucifixissent, crux Christi, et resurrectio, et ascensio praedicata et credita in mundo non esset." P. L. 150, col. 141.
71. P. L. 145, col. 65-66.
72. *Juifs et Chrétiens*, pp. 217-218.
73. "Libet adhuc, postpositis scilicet prophetarum exemplis, sola tecum ratiocinatione contendere." P. L. 145.64.
74. "Judaeos deseruit gratia, et facta est terra eorum sterilis atque deserta. Quia omnis prophetia, omne sacrificium, omnia ibi sacramenta cesarunt, et ad humilitatem gentium transierunt." P. L. 51, col. 309.
75. P. L. 52.512. Quoted in "Auteurs," REJ 9, p. 17.
76. P. L. 69, col. 525 and 545. Quoted in "Auteurs," REJ 9, p. 46.
77. "Ubi etiam paulo post de Judaeorum damnatione subjungitur..." I forgot to mark down the precise reference, and I don't have P. L. 145 with me. I believe that the passage is in the Epilogue to the *Dialogus*. It is interesting that Amolon knew that the Jews interpreted this verse in Zechariah in light of their belief in a Messiah the son of Joseph who would precede the Messiah son of David. P. L. 116. 148-9. Mentioned in "Auteurs," REJ 14, p. 51.
78. "Clamabunt impii et Judaei in futuro iudicio ad Christum... non exaudiet eos." P. L. 142.98.
79. P. L. 110.582.

II

DAMIAN AND HIS ATTITUDE TOWARD THE OLD TESTAMENT

1. *Spiritual Life*, p. 50.
2. See *Juifs et Chrétiens*, p. 73.

3. See Israel Levi, "Controverse entre un Juif et un Chretien au XIe Siecle," REJ 5 (1882), p. 242.
4. See *Conflict*, pp. 83-84 and 101 for the references in this paragraph.
5. "Gratia," he says, "...non ramos tantum nequitiae amputat, sed ipsas penitus radices noxiae voluntatis evellit." P. L. 49, col. 1214.
6. "Maledici non respuit, ut nos de maledicto legis absolveret." P. L. 144.608. *Spiritual Life*, pp. 171-172.
7. P. L. 144.605.
8. οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι ὁ νόμος πνευματικός ἐστίν· ἐγὼ δὲ σὰρκινός εἰμι, πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν (7.14).
9. Νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ πεφανέρωται... δικαιοσύνη τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (*Romans* 3.21-22). ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγός ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν... ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς πίστεως οὐκέτι ὑπὸ παιδαγωγόν ἐσμεν (*Galations* 3.24-25). See *Conflict*, pp. 53-54.
10. "...fidelis litteras doceat...cum lex prohibeat, ut diximus, deos pronuntiarī." *De Idolat.* X. Quoted in Saul Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*, p. 111, note 78.
11. *De Idolat.* XX. Translation by Lieberman, p. 112.
12. This custom "a Veteris Novique Testamenti auctoritate descendit. Sicut ergo divinarum Scripturarum auctoritati nil pro rerum varietate subtrahitur, nil augetur: sed potius in his ecclesiastica consuetudo servatur." P. L. 145.234.
13. P. L. 145.303-4.
14. "Interrogatio: Quae de veteri Testamento relinquere vel quae ob servare debemus?
Responso: Debemus observare mandata quae ad corrigendam vitam moresque pertinet: relinquere autem caeremonias ritusque sacrificiorum, quae figuras atque umbram fururis tunc rebus praenulerunt." P. L. 50.781.
15. "...mandata vero et praecepta moralia sicut sunt edita." See P. L. 54.188-89.
16. Quoted in "Auteurs," REJ 13, p. 27 from *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Epist. 5, 115.
17. "Moses, the faithful servant ("fidelis famulus"), brought the commandments of naked justice; Christ, our truly loving (pius) Lord tempered the harsh severity of the Law." P. L. 145.315, *Spiritual Life*, p. 117.
- 17*. Cf. *Eliyahu Rabba* ch. 2.
18. *De Perf. Mon.*, ch. 12. P. L. 145.308.
19. *De Perf. Mon.*, ch. 24. P. L. 145.326. *Spiritual Life*, p. 134.
20. *Dominus Vobiscum*, ch. 19. P. L. 145.249. *Spiritual Life*, p. 78.
21. *Dom. Vob.*, P. L. 145.250. *Spiritual Life*, p. 79.
22. "Cui tamen legi si confessio crucis et Dominicae passionis mysterium copulatur, protinus quod amarum fuerat, in spiritualis intelligentiae dulcedinem vertitur." P. L. 144.605.

23. "... ex antiquae legis mystica traditione descendit." P. L. 145.315-16.
Spiritual Life, p. 118.
24. *De Vera Felicitate et Sapientia*, P. L. 145.834-836.
25. *De Perf. Mon.*, P. L. 145.307.
26. *Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum — in Leviticum*. P. L. 83.336-39.
27. Cf. *Leviticus* 17:7. This idea was made famous in Jewish circles by Maimonides. He however, believed that they would nevertheless be reinstated in the time of the Messiah.
28. "Auteurs," REJ 17, p. 39.
29. *Juifs et Chrétiens*, p. 58.

