

**Order and Emotion:**  
**The Rhetoric of Disgust in Peter the**  
**Venerable's *Adversus Iudaeos***

**By**  
**Evan Jones**

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral  
Affairs in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Masters of Arts

in

History

Carleton University  
Ottawa, Ontario

©2016  
Evan Jones

## Abstract

This thesis examines the definition of religious orthodoxy promulgated by Peter the Venerable in the *Adversus Iudaeos*, a twelfth-century anti-Judaic polemic. Scholars have thus far categorized this polemic as a typical and traditional guidebook designed to aid monks in the refutation of Jews using scripture, logical argumentation, and an engagement with post-biblical Jewish holy text (and in this case, the *Talmud*). Despite this categorization, scholars have neglected to discuss the role of emotions in categorizing Judaism. I argue that Peter uses the emotional rhetoric of disgust to alter the traditional polemical purpose ascribed to it. When Peter compares Jews to “useless vomit”, he suggests that a Jewish way of thinking is filthy and worthy of disgust. These acts allow Peter the ability to unify and define his own version of Christian thought, and contrast it with the framework of thinking adopted by his rival monastic group, the Cistercians.

## Acknowledgements

There is probably no possible way I could every repay all the amazing people that made this thesis what it is today. Some four years ago, I was a simple teachers college graduate with only a fool's dream to come and make my mark on graduate level learning. Yet here I stand today with thesis in hand and a much deeper appreciation for the all those that supported me and pushed me to never settle for anything less than my best.

This thesis is dedicated to my family, who always loved me unconditionally and instilled in me the value of education. This past year was fraught with change and yet Mom, Dad, and Stephen were constantly there to help out in any way they could. Thank you.

This thesis is dedicated to Marc Saurette, who went above and beyond the role of a supervisor on countless occasions. The amount of interruptions and headaches I caused this man are staggering, yet Marc was always patient and supportive with me and he often knew just what to say. It was an honor and a privilege to be his student, and I would like to say that I did him proud.

This thesis is also dedicated to my friends, both old and new. They made me feel like family, and stepped up when I needed them most. For all those sofa talks and office banter that lasted way longer than it should have, I thank you. To that end, this section would like to thank in particular Nick Courchesne, Thomas Marlatt, Mike Novacaska Rob Blades, Brad Wiebe, Adam Lake, and Emily Cuggy as well as the entire 2016 graduating class. These people truly made my masters degree memorable.

I would also like to dedicate this thesis to Mélanie Bédard, because she never stopped believing in me. Regardless of what happens, I know that I am fortunate to have her as a supporter.

And finally, I would like to dedicate this thesis to Joan White and all the faculty members that made my academic journey so memorable. Their tireless work in order to improve the student experience is nothing short of exceptional, and I believe that I am leaving Carleton in the best possible hands going forward.

## Table of Contents

Abstract.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Acknowledgments .....	ii
Table of Contents .....	iv
<b>1 THE WORKS AND TIMES OF PETER THE VENERABLE .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Peter the Venerable and the Context Surrounding the <i>Adversus Iudaeos</i> .....	3
1.2 Representing the Man .....	5
1.3 Writing to Defend, Writing to Counter .....	10
1.4 What other Scholars have said about the <i>Adversus Iudaeos</i> .....	12
1.5 The <i>Adversus Iudaeos</i> Reconsidered.....	16
<b>2 The <i>Adversus Iudaeos</i>: A Twelfth-Century Anti-Judaic Polemic Re-Examined</b>	<b>21</b>
2.1 The <i>Adversus Iudaeos</i> .....	22
2.2 Shared Arguments Against the Jews .....	27
2.3 Peter's Divergence from Conventional Anti-Judaism.....	29
<b>3 Disgust and Demarcation: Peter's use of Emotion as a means of Renegotiating Jewish Identity in Christendom.....</b>	<b>38</b>
3.1 Rhetoric and Emotion in the <i>Adversus Iudaeos</i> .....	39
3.2 Modern Scholarship and Disgust .....	43
3.3 Modern and Medieval Disgust.....	46
3.4 Peter the Venerable and the Image of the Disgusting Jew Examined .....	47
3.5 Disgust and Peter's Use of Invectives .....	50
<b>4 Audience and Identity: Examining the Implications of Disgust and how Peter Uses Disgust as a Means to Define and Support Cluniac Identity .....</b>	<b>53</b>
4.1 Peter's Use of Disgust and the Creation of an Authority Figure .....	54
4.2 Peter's Fictive Audience and its Relation to Christendom .....	56

4.3	Jews as both a Framework of Thinking and an Identity .....	59
4.4	Peter's Target Audience and what Disgust Communicates .....	62
<b>5</b>	<b>Closing Thoughts: A Polemic Re-Examined .....</b>	<b>67</b>
	<b>Appendix .....</b>	<b>71</b>
	<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>75</b>

## THE WORKS AND TIMES OF PETER THE VENERABLE

Now truly what Isaiah (often mentioned above, not your prophet but ours) said about you [the Jews], among many other things, seems fulfilled in you: “They have broken the eggs of asps and have woven the webs of spiders....” [Is 59, 5-6]. The eggs that you incubate are not like the eggs of hens that are either useful themselves as food or so that some fowl would emerge from them that suits human need, but they are the eggs of asps which, once they have been broken by you, infect you with the deadly poison of impiety.<sup>1</sup>

These last lines of the *Adversus Iudaeos*, a twelfth-century anti-Judaic polemic written by the Cluniac abbot Peter the Venerable, depicts the Jews as dangerous pestilential things. When Peter describes Jews as weaving spider webs and incubating the eggs of asps, he is not simply making a biblical allusion to the book of Isaiah as an authoritative text, but rather seeks to associate the Jews with a biblically-defined image of disgust and abhorrence. These lines are typical of a crescendo of invective against the Jews that comprise the last book of Peter’s work in which the Jews are painted as sub-human, bestial, and filthy. Peter chose to finish his polemic with such invective, I argue, as the final part of a consistently employed affective strategy meant to convince the reader of the disgusting nature of Jewish thought and belief. With this image, Peter seeks to create a clear divide between what is human (Christian) and what is sub-human (Jews), and in so

---

<sup>1</sup> Peter the Venerable, *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, trans. Irvn M. Resnick (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2013), 285. Translated from Peter the Venerable, *Adversus Iudaeorum Inueteratam Duritiem*, ed. Yvonne Friedman (Turnhout: Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 58, 1985), chp. IV, p. 152: *Vere nunc apparet in uobis impletum quod sepe supra nominates Ysaias, iam non uester sed noster propheta, inter multa similia de uobis ait: Oua aspidum ruperunt et telas aranae textuerunt. Qui comederit de ouis eorum morietur et quod confotum est erumpet in regulum. Et telae eorum non erunt in uestimentum neque operientur operibus suis. Non sunt oua quae fouetis ouis gallinarum similia utu el per se sint utilia ad escam, uel inde aliquod uolatile humanis commodis aptum procedat, sed sunt oua aspidum, quae a uobis rupta et mortifero uos impietatis ueneno inficiant.* This work will hereafter cited by short title *Adversus Iudaeos*, followed by chapter and page reference of edition (and page reference of translation in brackets).

doing, he extends the traditional polemical style of Anti-Judaic writings. Jews are described as disgusting animals with only a bestial understanding of the Old Testament. This use of emotional rhetoric is novel for twelfth-century polemics and his work is more critical of Jewish belief than other anti-Judaic works of his time. Because of this difference, my thesis seeks to explore the purpose behind Peter's negative representations of the Jews and to understand how they fit with his larger rhetorical strategy of the *Adversus Iudaeos*.

This thesis proposes that Peter uses a polemical style and emotional rhetoric to argue that Judaism is something to avoid. By doing so, he condemns Judaisers and a Jew-like way of thinking while juxtaposing his own version of Christianity as pure. This purpose contrasts the work of fellow contemporary anti-Judaic polemicists, who were more concerned with the act of refuting the Jews as a people. My thesis focuses on contextualizing the *Adversus Iudaeos* in order to prove that scholars have overlooked Peter's intended purpose. And while Peter does bring up a traditional set of arguments against the Jews (as I will show in chapter two), Peter's use of invective and emotional rhetoric change the purpose ascribed to it.

To argue this point, this chapter will first examine and identify the major thematic events which influenced the creation of the *Adversus Iudaeos*. To that end, I shall survey a selection of elements of Peter's life that will more readily contextualise Peter's polemic on the Jews.

## 1.1 Peter the Venerable and the Context Surrounding the *Adversus Iudaeos*

In order to show Peter's polemical purpose one must first understand the crucial elements of Peter's life which surrounded and affected the creation of the *Adversus Iudaeos*. To that end, I will focus on the elements of Peter's life that led him to respond to issues of growth and disunity. Because Peter was writing as the head of an established monastic order, his demonization of a Jewish way of thinking is directly related to the practical act of unifying a Cluniac audience, as I will show in chapter four.

Peter was born between 1092 and 1094 and died in 1156. Very little is known about his early life, although Peter later professes that he came from a noble family.<sup>2</sup> Scholars are certain, however, that he entered the monastery as an oblate.<sup>3</sup> Peter later transferred to Cluny proper at the age of seventeen. In 1122 he was elected abbot after the short abbacy of Hugh II and became the ninth abbot of Cluny.<sup>4</sup>

Peter's early years as abbot were marked by serious division. Just after his election, Peter's position was undermined by a former abbot, Pontius (or Pons) of Melgueil (c.1075-1126) and the monks at Cluny who were still loyal to him. Pontius had left his post, and was on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land when Peter was elected. Pontius returned in 1125, and sought to regain his former title by violence. Pontius eventually failed in his attempts at re-conquest, but the support that Pontius received from his former

---

<sup>2</sup>The status of this family was discussed most recently in Saurette's work on friendship; "Peter the Venerable and Secular Friendship," in *Friendship in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age*, ed. Albrecht Classen and Marilyn Sandidge (New York: De Gruyter, 2010), 276. In this chapter he draws specifically on the work of Constable to justify his claim. See: Peter the Venerable, *The Letters of Peter the Venerable*, ed. Giles Constable (Cambridge: Princeton University Press, 1967) vol.1, 132.

<sup>3</sup> Jean Leclercq, *Pierre le Vénérable* (Paris: Editions de Fontenelle, 1946), 6-7.

<sup>4</sup> Marc Saurette, "Rhetorics of Reform: Abbot Peter the Venerable and the Twelfth-Century Rewriting of the Cluniac Monastic Project" (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 2005), 14.

monks reflected a deep division and the presence of factionalism in Cluny during his abbacy.<sup>5</sup>

Saurette notes that Peter spent the first decade of his rule dealing with restless monks who resisted Peter's eventual reforms and travelling to other Cluniac monasteries to implement further changes.<sup>6</sup> While Saurette focuses on the divisions among Cluniac monks in the early twelfth century, scholars such as Giles Constable highlight its growth and renewal.<sup>7</sup> As the ninth abbot of Cluny (1122-1156), Peter was the head of Cluny at the height of its prestige and power.<sup>8</sup> This power corresponded to a massive influx of monks that entered the monastery. Constable describes a fivefold increase of monks at Cluny between the years 1050 and 1120.

Saurette has argued that Cluny's institutional ethos went through a dramatic shift during Peter's reign through the use of text as a vehicle for change.<sup>9</sup> Peter's writings are therefore critical to the understanding of how he redefined and unified Cluniac monasticism. Peter, as both his contemporaries and modern scholars can attest, cultivated an image of himself as a reformer, a fatherly corrector, and a defender of both Cluny and Christendom. These elements of Peter's self-image are critical to an understanding of how he composed and positioned the *Adversus Iudaeos*,

---

<sup>5</sup> Giles Constable, "From Hugh I to Hugh V," in *The Abbey of Cluny*, ed. Giles Constable (Berlin: Lit, 2010), 272.

<sup>6</sup> Marc Saurette, "Rhetorics of Reform." 14.

<sup>7</sup> Other scholars who would contrast this negativity include Dominique Iogna-Prat and his discussion of the relationship Cluny had with the papacy: *Order and Exclusion Cluny and Christendom face Heresy, Judaism and Islam*, trans. Graham Edwards (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002), 79; and Yvonne Friedman, and her discussion of the last great abbot of Cluny: introduction to *Adversus Iudeorum Inveteratam Duritiem*, by Peter the Venerable (Turnhout Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 58, 1985), I.

<sup>8</sup> Constable refers to Cluny's peak period of influence as being in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries: Constable, "From Hugh I to Hugh V," 266.

<sup>9</sup> Saurette, "Rhetorics of Reform." 2.

## 1.2 Representing the Man

The historical record has bequeathed only a partial picture of Peter the Venerable, much of which is of his own making. From his writings, Peter's identity as abbot, nobleman, and Cluniac are repeatedly emphasized as key features of his self-defined identity. Generally, historians have sought to link him to wider twelfth-century trends, portraying him as (among other things) a reformer, a fatherly corrector, and a defender of both Cluny and Christendom more generally. These representations are not necessarily true; however they are some of the representations and tropes that historians have used and that are directly related to the formation of the *Adversus Iudaeos*.

As I will show in chapter four, when Peter gives Judaism negative connotations he is implicitly clarifying and emphasizing that his own version of Christianity is correct. The act of clarifying his belief directly relates back to and complements his efforts to craft his own representation as a reformer, a fatherly corrector, and a defender. As will be shown, Peter corrects and reforms his readership through the use of alterity in the *Adversus Iudaeos*, and he defends against those who would argue for a more literal reading of the Bible or Church doctrine. This section will therefore examine in depth these character traits in an effort to give context to how Peter decided to write the *Adversus Iudaeos*.

### *Reformer*

When Jean Leclerq talks about Peter's reforms, he refers to them as both practical and ideal.<sup>10</sup> Peter's ideal monastic vision was based on living a more austere life. These

---

<sup>10</sup> Jean Leclerq, *Pierre le Vénérable*, 140.

reforms were in constant renegotiation with his monks (as Scott Bruce later suggests) but these renegotiations show that Peter was practical with his idealism, while still pushing for his vision.<sup>11</sup> Iogna-Prat has argued that Cluny, according to Peter was ultimately constructed to reflect the notion that it was the universal Church.<sup>12</sup> And Saurette confirms his idea that Peter wanted Cluny to be the model of Christendom.<sup>13</sup> Peter envisioned himself as the centre of the Cluniac monastic order.<sup>14</sup> He was the leader, and it was up to others to follow his lead in terms of the reforms he established. This ideal was crafted on the very foundations of the monastic order, as his framework was based principally on reason and the rule of St. Benedict, and the admiration of a more primitive eremitic world.<sup>15</sup> To that end, Peter weighed his options, and after a decade of establishing himself as abbot Peter announced forty-eight separate reforms in 1132.<sup>16</sup> Of those, twenty-seven dealt with quasi-liturgical issues, seven dealt with proper attire, five dealt with food and consumption, five dealt with newcomers or the noviciate, and finally, four dealt with the issue of silence. After this set of reforms was put in place, Peter later goes into depth about the reasons for change. The majority of these rationales had biblical allusions, or express Peter's desire to have his monks more strictly adhere to the *Rule of St. Benedict*.<sup>17</sup> Martin has argued that Peter's reforms and subsequent enforcement were one of Peter's major concerns of his abbacy, and reflect a sense of responsiveness to the

---

<sup>11</sup> Bruce, *Cluny and the Muslims of la Grande-Freinet*, 75-6.

<sup>12</sup> Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion*, 83.

<sup>13</sup> Saurette, "Rhetorics of Reform," 10.

<sup>14</sup> Gillian Knight, *The Correspondence between Peter the Venerable and Bernard of Clairvaux* (New York: Routledge, 2002), 30.

<sup>15</sup> Leclercq, *Pierre le Vénérable*, 113.

<sup>16</sup> For a more in depth look, see – David Knowles, "The Reforming Decrees of Peter the Venerable," in *Petrus Venerabilis, 1156-1956, Studies and Texts Commemorating the 8<sup>th</sup> Centenary of his Death*, ed. Giles Constable et al. (Romae: Herder, 1956), 1-20.

<sup>17</sup> Jean-Pierre Torrell and Denise Bouthillier, *Pierre le Vénérable et sa Vision du Monde: Sa Vie, son Oeuvre, l'Homme et le Démon* (Leuven: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, 1986), 33.

new values of his age.<sup>18</sup> According to Peter, Cluny had the potential to be the model for Christendom. Those who did not follow this ideal were in need of guidance and fatherly love. It is from here that Peter associated himself with paternalism and the support of his monks.

### *Fatherly Corrector*

The Latin word *abbas* (abbot) comes from *abba*, the old Aramaic word for father. Fatherhood was thus not surprisingly a key identity for medieval abbots. Scholars have argued that Peter saw himself as both an educator and a man whose duty it was to correct his fellow monks. For example, Torrell conceives of Peter as a kind father, who was a mentor for those who misunderstood scripture.<sup>19</sup> Saurette extends the paternal definition to note his harsher disciplinary side, by examining the corrective powers of a medieval Cluniac abbot (such as Peter) would have had in imprisoning disobedient monks.<sup>20</sup> This ability to correct, guide, and punish if necessary is the basis of paternal care according to Benedict. Thus in governing his monks, Peter was fulfilling his duties as an abbot. This trait is represented when Peter gives his own account of an interaction with a heretical (Apollinarian) Cluniac monk.

Bruce discusses a time just after Peter's election as abbot, where he scolded a fellow Cluniac for embracing the errors of Apollinarius of Laidicea, a fourth century bishop who advocated for his own version of Christian doctrine.<sup>21</sup> This encounter is outlined in a letter, where Peter scolded the monk for his false belief and his unwitting

---

<sup>18</sup> Janet Martin, introduction to *Peter the Venerable: Selected Letters*, ed. Janet Martin (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1974), 3.

<sup>19</sup> Jean-Pierre Torrell and Denise Bouthillier, *Pierre le Vénérable et sa Vision du Monde*, 153.

<sup>20</sup> Saurette, "Rhetorics of Reform." 5.

<sup>21</sup> Bruce, *Cluny and the Muslims of la Grande-Freinet*, 76.

acceptance of the devil. This act of scolding again is played out in one of Peter's calls for reforms, when he scolds the monks of Cluny for their consumption of red meat; which was a major infraction at the time.<sup>22</sup> In scolding and correcting his own monk's incorrect beliefs and practices, Peter was protecting his flock and punishing those who would go astray. Iogna-Prat had argued that these letters shows Cluny as a refuge, which protected fellow Christians from the heresies and the devil.<sup>23</sup>

Martin has argued that Peter wanted to reform and defend Christianity more generally through the use of polemics such as the *Adversus Iudaeos*.<sup>24</sup> I shall argue that this desire to reform and defend Christianity is based on Peter's wish to clarify and correct Christian belief and contrast it with a Jew-like way of thinking identified within the *Adversus Iudaeos*. Peter's later defense of these beliefs is what causes him to be represented as a defender.

### *Defender*

To contextualise Peter's role as a defender, one must first recognize the major impact that the Cistercians and other orders had in defining Cluniac identity.<sup>25</sup> Gillian Knight describes the alluring prestige of the Cistercians in the twelfth-century and how their prestige and growing influence forced the Cluniac order to respond to some scathing accusations.<sup>26</sup> Intriguingly, among the Cistercian accusations was the suggestion that the Cluniacs were Jew-like: too focused on the corporeal realm of luxury and gluttony.

---

<sup>22</sup> Martin, introduction, 4.

<sup>23</sup> Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion*, 37 and 172.

<sup>24</sup> Martin, introduction, 5.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.

<sup>26</sup> Gillian Knight, *The Correspondence between Peter the Venerable and Bernard of Clairvaux*, X.

Knight has shown that the main problem Cistercians had with the Cluniacs was that the Cluniacs were not adhering to a stricter version of the *Rule*.<sup>27</sup>

Scholars depict Peter as a protector or a defender of Cluny's honor.<sup>28</sup> This desire to protect Cluny from outside detractors was crucial to the long term success of Cluny as an institution, and so Peter's need to defend Cluny's monastic practices reflected both a paternal need to protect and "a means of survival."<sup>29</sup> Peter responded passionately and aggressively to those who would critique the standards of Cluniac monasticism. His ability to respond effectively to outside dissent created and reinforced the image of Peter as a defender of Cluny.

Iogna-Prat even argues that Peter felt he was called to defend the Church more generally.<sup>30</sup> Peter's three polemics against religious Others reflect this calling. Peter's polemics against the Jews and the Saracens are of particular importance as they represent a desire to more fully engage with the scripture of the enemies of Christendom. Peter was the first 'born Christian' to procure sections of the *Talmud*.<sup>31</sup> And through the commission of a Latin translation of the *Qur'an*, he is also known by scholars as the man who brought a more accurate depiction of Islam to central Europe.<sup>32</sup> Both these acts of translation in particular stress that Peter wanted to address the enemies of the Church more accurately. He did so because he felt that he was called to be a defender of Cluny and Christendom against their detractors through the engagement with their holy texts.

---

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., 23.

<sup>28</sup> Leclercq, *Pierre le Vénérable*, 163.

<sup>29</sup> Torrell and Bouthillier, *Pierre le Vénérable et sa Vision du Monde*, 36.

<sup>30</sup> Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion*, 2.

<sup>31</sup> Petrus Alfonsi was the first Christian to procure portions of and write against the *Talmud*, but he was a Jewish convert.

<sup>32</sup> Bruce, *Cluny and the Muslims of la Grande-Freinet*, 101.

### 1.3 Writings to Defend and Writings to Counter

Peter wrote three polemics on the subject of the religious Other. Scholars are unsure of whether Peter wanted them to be a collection, but it seems that Cluniac monks chose to sort his works in an effort to make his polemics a collection post-death.<sup>33</sup> Peter started writing the first polemic in 1138, entitled *Contra Petrobrusianos Hereticos*, and it is about the heresies that existed around the diocese of Embrun, Die and Gap.<sup>34</sup> In this text, Peter uses biblical citation, along with the words of Church fathers to prove that the Petrobrusians belief is based in error. In so doing, he used reason and logic to support his points, making this element a commonality which exists between the *Contra Petrobrusianos* and the *Adversus Iudaeos*.

After writing the *Contra Petrobrusianos*, Peter resolves to condemn the Jews through the same means. Peter started writing the *Adversus Iudaeos* in 1143, and the main focus of this text is to prove that Jesus of Nazareth was the prophesized Messiah. The final polemic is entitled *Contra Sectam Saracenorum* and Peter began to write it just after the failure of the Second Crusade in 1153.<sup>35</sup> This polemic is notably shorter than the previous two, although one could attribute this brevity to Peter's death roughly three years later. Peter's final words on the subject of the Muslim faith echo the main purpose of the text; which is to argue that: "Mohammad is therefore not a prophet."<sup>36</sup> Peter explicitly states that the intended audience of his third polemic (*Contra Sarracenos*) is a Christian one in the prologue, and notes its purpose as providing the Church a shield from

---

<sup>33</sup> Friedman, introduction to *Adversus Iudeorum Inveteratam Duritiem*, xxxiv.

<sup>34</sup> Bruce, *Cluny and the Muslims of la Grande-Freinet*, 78.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 93.

<sup>36</sup> *Non est igitur propheta* *Ibid.*, 98.

the heretical views of Islam. Peter's prologue against the Jews however, calls Jews out directly, and begs them to convert so that they may not face the punishment of killing Christ.<sup>37</sup>

Bruce and Iogna-Prat have argued that these texts are unified in their method. In all three of these texts, the use of scripture, the works of Church fathers, and logic form the basis of Peter's argumentation.<sup>38</sup> And even though there are large gaps in time which separate the creation of these three polemics, both Bruce and Iogna-Prat treat them in remarkably similar terms. Both authors see that Peter uses reason and scripture to prove that the *Talmud* and the *Qur'an* are diabolical in nature. These holy texts, along with the belief system of the Petrobrusian, are routinely condemned and called the products of the devil because they contradict Scripture when applied logically. He disproves the tenets of Islam, for example, by showing that Mohammad was not a prophet in the tradition of Old Testament prophets through the examination of the works of Isaiah and the Psalms.<sup>39</sup> When Peter confronts the heretical Petrobrusians, he is quick to use the Acts of the Apostles to show that Christian orthodoxy has biblical precedence in regards to issues like infant baptism.<sup>40</sup> Peter is seen to be the enforcer of ecclesiastical order.<sup>41</sup> And while those similarities in arguments imply a single goal, it also implies that these three polemics are easily connected to one another despite the wide range of topics and attacks. This method of study however implies a commonality that I argue is simply not there. When Peter the Venerable addresses the Jews, he does so in a way that alters the

---

<sup>37</sup> Peter the Venerable, *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, 51.

<sup>38</sup> Bruce, *Cluny and the Muslims of la Grande-Freinet*, 78-79, 93-98.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 72.

<sup>40</sup> Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion*, 192.

<sup>41</sup> Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion*, 114-115. and Bruce, *Cluny and the Muslims of la Grande-Freinet*, 78-9.

traditional polemical model that contemporaries have adhered to. That argument is the focus of chapter two.

There has been new scholarship in recent years on inter-religious dialogue in Peter's polemics. To that end, scholars have expanded their focus of research to include the polemics of Peter the Venerable. These efforts have complemented the works of scholars who study the rise of anti-Judaic thought, and who have long seen Peter's work against the Jews as a precursor to modern day anti-Semitism.<sup>42</sup> As I focus on Peter's work against the Jews, the next section will therefore explore the ways in which scholarship has categorised and interpreted the *Adversus Iudaeos* within the context of wider anti-Judaic thought.

#### **1.4 What Other Scholars have said about the *Adversus Iudaeos***

Above, I have argued that historians have viewed the *Adversus Iudaeos* as part of a larger body of text which encompasses all of Peter's polemical writings against the enemies of Christianity. Both Iogna-Prat and Bruce highlight that the purpose of polemical Othering was to cement the developing ideas of Christian orthodoxy around Christian ideology. But I propose that a new way of interpreting the *Adversus Iudaeos* seems possible when its particular context is taken into account. But before we examine my proposed method of interpretation, I will first examine the ways in which scholars have understood the *Adversus Iudaeos* and how they think it fits within the wider anti-Judaic genre.

---

<sup>42</sup> Robert Chazam, "Twelfth Century Perceptions of the Jews: A Case Study of Bernard of Clairvaux and Peter the Venerable," in *From Witness to Witchcraft*, ed. Jeremy Cohen (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996), 198-199.

The first way scholars understand Peter's work is through the study of Peter's motivations. Both Friedman and Anna Sapir Abdulafia belong to this trend, which relates to Cluny's financial situation during the twelfth century. Both authors highlight the growing economic uncertainty that abbots such as Peter the Venerable faced, which stemmed from a dwindling number of donors, coupled with a growing number of expenditures.<sup>43</sup> Because of this fact, historians such as Friedman have connected Peter's attitude towards the Jews to the stereotypical role Jews had in western Christendom: moneylending. She comments "in Peter's personal dependence on Jewish moneylenders is to be found the cause of his general attitudes towards the Jews."<sup>44</sup> In this type of scholarly work, Peter's polemic is reduced to a personal grudge against the Jews. In this instance, Peter's views are determined by the financial difficulties that Cluny faced. While neither historian claims this financial difficulty to be the sole reason Peter wrote the work, they do place a significant amount of weight on the notion that Peter hated the Jews for their economic role.

Friedman's depiction seems problematic, especially since Funkenstein has argued that Peter the Venerable's *Adversus Iudaeos* is quite typical of the anti-Judaic genre. Funkenstein's argument corresponds to a need to categorise the *Adversus Iudaeos* within a broader narrative of authority and anti-Jewish discourse. To that end, scholars such as Funkenstein have marked out Peter as participating in this new tradition of Anti-Judaic polemical writing. Funkenstein argues that polemics of this time period focused more on

---

<sup>43</sup> Yvonne Friedman, "An Anatomy of Anti-Semitism: Peter the Venerable's Letter to Louis VII, King of France (1146)," in *Bar-Ilan Studies in History*, Ed. Pinhas Artzi (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1984), 95.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 96.

alienation and exclusion rather than dogmatic clash of beliefs.<sup>45</sup> Funkenstein classifies twelfth- and thirteenth-century polemics into four types: the old pattern, which focused solely on scriptural proofs and the works of Church fathers to reveal the superiority of Christian doctrine; the rationalistic polemic, which attempted to prove and support Christian dogma using logical argumentation; the accusations/attacks against the *Talmud* or any post-biblical Jewish scripture; and the use of Old Testament, and at times post-Biblical Jewish literature, to prove the logic and nature of Christ as Messiah.<sup>46</sup> Peter, in this case study, is shown to contain all of these characteristics. He uses a staggering amount of Scripture to prove his point, he argues logically for the inclusion of Christ as the culmination of Jewish prophecy, and he saves a chapter at the end for the condemnation of post-biblical scripture (in this case the *Talmud*). Funkenstein argues here that Peter is the culmination of what a typical twelfth-century polemic should look like, as Peter contains all the characteristics that one may see in part when examining other polemics of the time period. To his credit Peter does use many of the same arguments but Peter's style and structure contains some subtle but key differences that I will explore in chapter two.

This classification of a typical polemical effort has led Friedman to argue that this polemic was made to be a textbook for monks to engage with Jews.<sup>47</sup> This argument would imagine a situation in which Jewish scholars actively sought out Benedictine monks for debate.<sup>48</sup> For this reason, and because Friedman's introduction is the most

---

<sup>45</sup> Amos Funkenstein, *Perceptions of Jewish History* (Berkeley: University of California Press 1993), 171.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 173.

<sup>47</sup> Scott Bruce, *Cluny and the Muslims of la Grande-Freinet* (Ithaca: Cornell University press, 2015), 106.

<sup>48</sup> Bernhard Blumenkranz, *Juifs et Chretiens Dans Le Monde Occidental, 430-1096* (Paris: Mouton, 1960), 136.

influential piece of literature on the *Adversus Iudaeos*, modern scholarship on Peter the Venerable has generally accepted that this text was made to address a monastic Christian audience for the purpose of wider refutation.

While Funkenstein focuses specifically on defining what a typical twelfth-century Anti-Judaic polemic is, Chazam is more interested with the development of modern day Anti-Semitism, and its precedence within medieval polemics. When Chazam discusses twelfth-century Christian perceptions of the Jews, he also uses Peter's polemic as a case study to show how polemical writers employ and reinforces negative connotations of the Jews.<sup>49</sup> Chazam also identifies and categorizes three separate themes that he believes are quite common within twelfth-century anti-Judaic discourse: the repetition of traditional biblical connotations of Jewishness (stubborn or stiff-necked); animal imagery or comparison that has a biblical precedence; and finally, broad expressions of contempt for Jews as enemies or as partners in the satanic.<sup>50</sup> Peter is seen as the model case study here, as throughout his work he accuses the Jews of being stubborn<sup>51</sup>, animalistic<sup>52</sup>, and partnering with the devil for some nefarious purpose.<sup>53</sup> Chazam sees Christians such as Peter the Venerable increasingly trying to demonize the Jews. Studies like Chazam's are

---

<sup>49</sup> Robert Chazam, "Twelfth Century Perceptions of the Jews," 187.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., 196.

<sup>51</sup> The Jews are called stubborn repeatedly in the opening prologue. Here is the best example, found just after Peter calls the Jews in: "Clearly your eyes are blind, your ears are deaf, your hearts are stone. Peter the Venerable, *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, 49. *Adversus Iudaeos*, Prol. (p. 1): *Caeci plane oculis, surdi auribus, lapidei cordibus*.

<sup>52</sup> Peter questions Jewish humanity when opening his chapter against the *Talmud*: "Now why should you not be called a wild animal, why not a beast, why not a beast of burden?" Peter the Venerable, *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, 211. *Adversus Iudaeos*, Chp. 5 (p.125): *Cur enim non dicaris animal brutum, cur non bestia, cur non iumentum*.

<sup>53</sup> Peter assumes the Jews are in a league with Satan when he says: "... I affirm that neither you nor the entire synagogue of Satan when gathered together will be able to explicate these words so sacred..." when referencing the Psalms and their relationship to Jesus. See: Peter the Venerable, *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, 65. *Adversus Iudaeos*, Chp. 1 (p.14): *Sed credo, immo scio, immo affirmo, quod nec tu, nec tota partier congregata synagoga Sathanae uerba ista tam sacra, tam diuina...*

crucial because they attempt to track the spread and evolution of anti-Semitic thought through the study of polemics.

Each scholar shown above has a different way of categorizing the *Adversus Iudaeos* and a different way of understanding the effect it had on the growing discontent with Jews in Christian dominated Europe. However I hope to explore a different model of interpretation. As much as scholars argue that this text was used as a tool to refute the Jews in society, I shall argue that Peter's intentions were not geared towards the disputation of Jews as people- though Peter's work was used for that end some ninety years later.<sup>54</sup>

By focusing on situating this text in the context of Peter the Venerable and his readership, I shall argue that Peter's intentions are focused on Judaism as a malleable identity, which can be divorced from Jews as a people. Scholars have rightly seen patterns in the works of similar anti-Judaic writers. But in categorizing Peter's work with other polemics, the key differences that show vastly different intentions are left out.

## 1.5 The *Adversus Iudaeos* Reconsidered

The crucial difference between my approach and previous scholarship is the way I examine how Peter treats the Jews and Judaism. By placing the *Adversus Iudaeos* in the context of what Peter the Venerable wanted to achieve, I propose that the *Adversus Iudaeos* was made to establish proper Christian belief and contrast it with a Jewish way

---

<sup>54</sup> We can look further to the disputation of Paris, some ninety years after Peter the Venerable's death. During this time, massive popular discontent of the Jews fuelled the creation of this disputation, in which Saadia Eisenberg argues that the *Talmud* was effectively put on trial. Furthermore, Christian accusers repeatedly used Peter the Venerable's translation of the *Talmud* to lay their charges. See: "Reading Medieval Religious Disputation: The 1240 "Debate" Between Rabbi Yehiel of Paris and Friar Nicholas Donin"(Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 2008), 14.

of thinking. When Peter discussed the Jews as a people, he made clear and practical suggestions in regards to their treatment. This practicality is shown in Peter's letter to King Louis IX.<sup>55</sup> Peter advocated that the Jews should be made to pay for the Second Crusade (due to the fact that the Jews obtained their money through illegal/unethical means). Peter concluded in this letter that Louis should "Spare their lives but take away their money" (*Reseruetur eis uita, auferatur pecunia*).<sup>56</sup> This letter demonstrates that Peter had plans for the Jews of his time. These plans are not seen anywhere in the *Adversus Iudaeos*. Peter does not advocate killing the Jews, but he does not advocate stealing from them or repossessing their property either. This shift, I propose, is because Peter is more concerned with what Judaism represents to Christianity than what actual Jews are doing.

I propose that Judaism for Peter is a committed focus on the materialistic, as Jews are accused of being too focused on the material realm and too blindly devoted to biblical law.<sup>57</sup> This framework of understanding is contrasted with a focus on the spiritual realm, and the use of reason to find meaning. Peter is therefore separating Judaism from the Jew, and treats these two things differently as a result. This separation is in contrast to the

---

<sup>55</sup> A description of Peter's practical view on the Jews as demonstrated through his letters to Louis IX can be found in: Yvonne Friedman, "An Anatomy of Anti-Semitism: Peter the Venerable's Letter to Louis VII, King of France (1146)," 87-102.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 330.

<sup>57</sup> Jews are typically shown as focusing too much on the letter of the law. Here Peter is calling the Jews out for it after referencing the prophecy of Isaiah: "I am compelled to tarry over this useless shell of the letter that alone they [the Jews] are accustomed to chew over like cattle": Peter the Venerable, *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, 64. *Adversus Iudaeos*, Chp. 1 (p 13): *Nam quia Iudaeis loquens medullam sacri psalmi quam fastidiunt, tangere prohibeor, et circa inutilem litterae corticem, quem solum pecudum more rodere solent morari compellor, dicite iuxta btutum intellectum uestrum.*

arguments put forth by Friedman and Resnick, who argue that this polemic was meant to be used as a guide for Christian monks to refute the Jewish peoples.<sup>58</sup>

I propose that the key characteristic of Judaism for Peter is defined by the “blind devotion” to law or scripture. This devotion is characterized by an unwillingness to seek or apply reason or revelation to a pre-existing code. Judaism for Peter, moreover, is a framework of thinking. For Jews, this mindset means not allowing the New Testament to render the old law and the old system of belief obsolete. Applied to a Christian-centered world, however, and Judaism becomes a method of critique. All Christians accept the revelation of the New Testament, and that is the fundamental difference brought forth by polemicists such as Peter.

But twelfth-century monasteries followed more than just Scripture. For many orders this commitment meant living one’s life in accordance with the Rule of Benedict (hereafter referred to as the *Rule*). This *Rule* laid the foundation for medieval monasticism. This *Rule* was the subject of inter-monastic debate and Peter, as abbot of Cluny, was called upon to defend and justify his interpretation of the *Rule*.<sup>59</sup> His most ardent critic was the head of the now burgeoning Cistercian order, Bernard of Clairvaux. Peter’s main critique of Bernard was what he called his Jew-like adherence and devotion to the *Rule*. I will argue that Peter contrasts this devotion with what he thought to be a more rational interpretation which focused on abbatial discretion and compassion alongside scripture. This viewpoint was designed to convince a Benedictine audience that his own monastic order was superior.

---

<sup>58</sup> Yvonne Friedman, introduction to *Adversus Iudeorum Inveteratam Duritiem*, xxi.

<sup>59</sup> Gillian Knight, *The Correspondence between Peter the Venerable and Bernard of Clairvaux*, 25-52.

I propose that the *Adversus Iudaeos* is both a subtle defense of Cluniac values, and a scathing indictment of a Jew-like framework of thinking that he suggests others, such as the Cistercian order, had adopted. Judaism then becomes a malleable identity that can be grafted onto a Christian host. This categorization alters the scope that other scholars have ascribed to the *Adversus Iudaeos*. By considering Peter's context and readership, we see a different purpose and framework of understanding that is not bound to the confines of what a twelfth-century polemic should say and do. To argue for this new method of categorisation I shall examine the *Adversus Iudaeos* in conjunction with Peter's history and with an examination of the reader's experience.

I shall argue for this new categorisation in a three stage process. The next chapter shall focus on the content of the *Adversus Iudaeos*, and how the content and structure of the text is similar to many other traditional polemics of the time, with a few crucial differences which alter the purpose of the text. To do so I shall examine the text in conjunction with the works of one of Peter's contemporaries: a fellow polemicist Petrus Alfonsi. Chapter three shall examine the connotations that Peter places upon the framework of Jewish thought. When Peter discusses Judaism as a malleable identity, he does so in a way that creates a sense of aversion, disgust, or recoil. This aversion alters and replaces the positive connotations that influential Church figures such as Augustine had advocated for. The final chapter explores the reader's experience. This chapter argues that Jews could not be the target of Peter's monologue and that Benedictine monks are the intended audience. This chapter also explores the message that Peter wanted to convey. Peter wanted to use established patterns that would depict him as an authority figure who fought against a Jewish identity, both as it appears in the Cistercian

interpretation of the *Rule* and more generally. Peter also wanted to convey that Judaism contains nothing of worth and should be avoided.

THE *ADVERSUS IUDAEOS*: A TWELFTH-CENTURY ANTI-JUDAIC  
POLEMIC RE-EXAMINED

“Approach you, Oh Jews – you, I say who even to this day deny the son of God. How long will you wretches fail to believe the truth?”<sup>60</sup> This opening calls Peter’s fictive audience in, as if he is about to give a sermon on the Jew’s transgressions. Peter follows up this quotation from Quodvultdeus, by chastising the Jews for their stubbornness and their blindness when confronted with the majesty of Christianity. This opening and timing suggest that Peter sought to defend and argue for Christianity – much like he intended when he wrote against Islam in the *Contra Saracenos* years later. Like other anti-Judaic polemics, Peter the Venerable’s *Adversus Iudaeos* main theological argument was attempting to demonstrate conclusively that the Messiah had come and that the Messiah was Jesus of Nazareth. The *Adversus Iudaeos* argues this point through the use of scripture, through reason, and through the use of the works of Church fathers.

This chapter will examine the *Adversus Iudaeos* to explore the ways in which Peter both engaged with contemporary anti-Judaic writing of the time, and how he innovated. To that end, I shall argue that Peter is largely traditional in his scope and argumentation, with a few minor but key differences which alter the purpose ascribed to it. The two innovations are the use of invective to further condemn the Jew, and the use of rhetoric to structure his work. This chapter will explore Peter’s style, his use of

---

<sup>60</sup> Peter the Venerable *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews* trans. Irven M. Resnick (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2013), 49. *Advesus Iudaeos*, prol. (p.1): *Vos ego, uos, inquam, ego conuenio, o Iudei, qui usque in hodiernum negatis Filium Dei. Quo usque, miseri, ueritati non cerditis?*

invective, and his evidence, in order to show how Peter participated within a wider twelfth-century anti-Judaic discourse.

## 2.1 The *Adversus Iudaeos*

The *Adversus Iudaeos* is a highly structured and organized piece of writing. The most recent edition divides the work into a prologue and five separate chapters. Each chapter is focused on a specific argument that disproves an aspect of Jewish belief, while at the same time provides a counter-argument which would support Christian doctrine.<sup>61</sup> Iogna-Prat has argued that Peter used the classical conventions of rhetoric to compose each chapter.<sup>62</sup>

In the prologue, or *Salutatio*, Peter simply calls his fictive Jewish audience into his presence. He does so by insulting the stubbornness of the Jews and telling them that the light of reason will soon shine down on the sons of Abraham.

In the first chapter, or *Narratio*, Peter introduces the argument which underlies the work as a whole: that the Jewish Messiah is the son of God, and that Jesus is that Messiah. Peter starts this chapter, by rebuking the claim that David is the son of God. Referencing scriptural authority, Peter centers his debate around Psalm 2:7-8:

The lord hath said to me [David]: Thou art my son; this day I have begotten to thee. Ask of me and I will give thee the Gentiles for thy inheritance, and the uppermost parts of the earth as thy inheritance.<sup>63</sup>

Peter clarifies the literal interpretation of this passage that David was the son of God only in title whereas Jesus derives of God's existence. God, Peter continues, promised the

---

<sup>61</sup> Irvn Resnick, introduction to *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, by Peter the Venerable (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2013),4.

<sup>62</sup> Dominique Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion Cluny and Christendom face Heresy, Judaism and Islam*, trans. Graham Edwards (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002), 102.

<sup>63</sup> Psalm 2: 7-8, cited in Peter the Venerable, *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, 53. – Please note that all biblical citations refer to the Latin Vulgate unless otherwise stated.

Messiah all lands as inheritance, but David only received two nations. Moving to an allegorical understanding of this text, Peter argues that this passage refers to Jesus, who received all power and glory of heaven and earth. Peter, through the use of scripture, proves his own argument and refutes the Jewish position (*Confirmatio* followed by *Refutatio*)

Chapter two of the *Adversus Iudaeos* focuses on proving that Christ is shown to be the son of God. Christ is associated with the light while Jews live in darkness. Peter first examines the tale of Sodom and Gomorrah, and notes that God, in the text, refers to the two parts of the self. The crux of this argument can be found in his treatment of Psalm 44: 8: “Therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness.”<sup>64</sup> This double mention of God, Peter argues, refers to God and the Son. And since God the Son is equal to God the Father, Jesus in this passage is receiving an anointment of grace. Jews, Peter argues, believe this citation to be God talking to David’s descendants. Peter rebukes that argument by going down the line of David’s descendants and belittling their accomplishments. Peter then compares these finite accolades to Jesus’s eternal kingdom, which is not subject to invasions or a change in rule. Solomon, Peter admits, is blessed, but not as much as Jesus, who has his empire multiplied and magnified by God. He contrasts this terrestrial kingship with Jesus and his complete rule over a spiritual kingdom, which is infinite and unbound by time and space.

Chapter three of the *Adversus Iudaeos* argues that Jews have a “brutish”<sup>65</sup> hope to return back to the Promised Land, based on the words of Ezekiel (37:2), who says: “I will

---

<sup>64</sup> Dominique Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion Cluny and Christendom face Heresy, Judaism and Islam*, trans. Graham Edwards (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002), 289.

<sup>65</sup> Peter the Venerable, *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, 102.

take the children of Israel from the midst of the nations whither they are gone, and I will gather them on every side and will bring them back to their own land.” This Promised Land, however, is emphasized as meek, temporal and finite. Jewish hope is identified as vain and foolish, since the Jews are bound to this idea that they want a king that is rich and full of temporal wealth. Peter clarifies the weaknesses of the flesh and the failings of temporal rulers. Peter then cites David describing the richness of God’s Kingdom. Peter emphasizes that no mere mortal could control this kingdom. Jesus is the only person who could, since he is both divine and everlasting. Peter argues that the prophecy of David foretelling the coming of the Messiah is fulfilled since Jesus is in the line of David. Jesus is emphasized as the hope for dead Jews to resurrect and find salvation in heaven. This resurrection and joining of a spiritual kingdom is critical, because it trumps any promise of an earthy kingdom and an earthly realm.

Chapter four of the *Adversus Iudaeos* argues against the idea that the Savior remains to come in the future. Peter refutes this argument by arguing that Jesus is the Savior and that he is better than any Jewish king (both past and future). Peter then goes on to list all the kingdoms and empires which have ruled over the Jews. Peter justifies this emphasis by stating that the Jews are inherently stubborn peoples, who are conquered repeatedly but fail to admit defeat. Peter expands upon this condemnation by quoting Daniel’s prophecy about the coming of the anointed saint of saints (see Daniel 9:22-27). This event, Peter argues, was supposed to be the fulfillment of the covenant between God and humanity, but Jews broke this covenant by killing Christ. Jews are depicted as focusing too much on the laws of Moses, which are not eternal like Jesus. Peter compares Moses’ actions with the works of great saints and argues that Christians have far more

holy people than Jews (which would show that God prefers the new covenant made by the new chosen people).

Chapter five of the *Adversus Iudaeos* focuses solely on the Jews' supposedly "ridiculous fables"<sup>66</sup> i.e. the *Talmud*. In this chapter, Peter uses the perception of the *Talmud*'s falsity to argue for Jewish incompetence. This argument may be caused by Peter's refusal to believe that Jews could understand any scripture allegorically, based on their failure to believe in Jesus as the Messiah. Peter emphasises in chapter five that the *Talmud* contains no moral or spiritual truths about the universe, and condemns it to the eternal fire.<sup>67</sup> Peter begins this argument by taking select passages out of the *Talmud* and contrasting them with passages of the Old Testament to prove their falsehood. Peter has many problems with the *Talmud* but the main focus seems to be that the *Talmud* depicts God as human-like. In the *Talmud*, God is depicted as learning from the Jews, feeling anger and crying once a day.<sup>68</sup> God, Peter argues, is shown in human terms, which is ridiculous because God to Peter is so far removed from the corporeal. Peter finishes his polemic with an appeal to emotion (*Perroratio*), in which he describes the Jews as incubating asps with a deadly poison made to ensnare and infect. This attempt though is foiled by their own incompetence, as the Jews only seem to catch the vilest of people.

---

<sup>66</sup> Peter the Venerable, *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, 211.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 247-52.

<sup>68</sup> Peter begins his discussion of the Talmud as such: "...let there be a quick transition as your prophet says... since it is offensive to tarry long over so many wicked things. You say as you read in that heavenly and truest text, your *Talmud* that every day God cries once a day, producing two tears from his eyes into the great sea..." Peter the Venerable, *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, 244-5. *Adversus Iudaeos*, chp. 5 (p. 150): *Sufficiant ergo ista de istis, et ut propheta uester ait, ad uerborum abominationes et blasphemias longe maiores hiis uidendas, quia tot nefandis diu immorari tedet, celer transitus fiat. Dicitis et in caelesti illa et ueracissima scriptura uestra Thalmuth legitis Deum cotidie semel in die plorare et ab eius oculis duas prodeuntes lacrimas in magnum mare decidere et has illum esse.*

Peter's main arguments against the Jews are: that Jesus of Nazareth was the prophesized Messiah and has already come; that Jews are too focused on the material realm and the reconstruction of a terrestrial kingdom; and that the *Talmud* is a flawed holy text since it depicts God as anthropomorphized.

In these major arguments that Peter presents, no argument is in itself novel and the overall progression of his argument seems similar to contemporary anti-Judaic discourse. In particular, Peter the Venerable's *Adversus Iudaeos* seems quite close in nature to the polemical work of Petrus Alfonsi, a twelfth-century Jewish convert to Christianity who wrote the *Dialogue against the Jews* (ca. 1109). Petrus Alfonsi, as Resnick suggests, is also likely one of the few identifiable sources of Peter the Venerable's *Adversus Iudaeos*.<sup>69</sup> In Friedman's introduction, she suggests that Peter the Venerable used the *Dialogue against the Jews* as his source for the *Talmud* (although Peter never openly admits to his source on the *Talmud*, scholars such as Resnick have echoed this thought).

Funkenstein identifies Petrus Alfonsi's work as a paradigmatic twelfth-century Anti-Judaic work.<sup>70</sup> Like Peter the Venerable's *Adversus Iudaeos*, the *Dialogue against the Jew* has a myriad of scriptural proofs to support Petrus Alfonsi's points.<sup>71</sup> Secondly, Petrus is keen to prove the nature of Christ using reason, and his opponent is open and honest in his admittance that the protagonist has bested him through logic.<sup>72</sup> But it is

---

<sup>69</sup> Yvonne Friedman, introduction to *Adversus Iudeorum Inveteratam Duritiem*, by Peter the Venerable (Turnhout Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 58, 1985), xiv.

<sup>70</sup> See: Amos Funkenstein, *Perceptions of Jewish History* (Berkeley: University of California Press 1993), 171.

<sup>71</sup> Irvn Resnick, introduction to *Dialogue Against the Jews*, by Petrus Alfonsi (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2006), 285-288.

<sup>72</sup> At the end of the polemic, the Jewish detractor exclaims that "Certainly, God gave you a great deal of his wisdom to you and illuminated you with his great reasoning power (*Ratio*) that I am unable to vanquish."

probably this last point that makes Petrus' work such an apt comparison. Both Petrus and Peter write a polemic using the *Talmud* as a base of attack and are among the first to do so. This shared focus fits with Funkenstein's 'traditional model' which suggests that twelfth-century polemics were becoming more aware and more hostile to post-biblical Jewish additions to the scriptural cannon.<sup>73</sup>

## 2.2 Shared Arguments Against the Jews

The main purpose of this section will be to prove that Peter followed a traditional model of polemic through his mirroring of typical Anti-Judaic arguments found in the *Dialogue Against the Jew*. To that end, I will show that Peter's work and arguments have precedence within the field of wider anti-Judaic literature. This mirroring would not come as a surprise to Friedman, who has argued that "nothing new could be said, and nothing old could be convincing."<sup>74</sup>

To start, both Petrus and Peter argue that Jesus of Nazareth is clearly the Messiah and has already come. Peter argues this point through the use of the Psalms and the words of Isaiah. This argument is not novel, and we can see that it has precedence in the works of Petrus Alfonsi. After outlining the prophecy of David in his own words, Petrus says:

"But to whom better than to Christ can we apply this prophecy?... For he himself was

---

Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogue Against the Jews*, trans. Irven Resnick (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2006), 273. Translated from Petrus Alfonsi, *Der Dialog des Petrus Alfonsi: seine Überlieferung im Druck und in den Handschriften Textedition*, ed. Klaus-Peter Mieth (Inaug. Diss. Freien Universität Berlin, 1982), chp. XII, p. 143: *Multum certe sue tibi deus dedit sapientie et te magna illustravit ratione, quem vincere nequo, immo tu obiectones meas confutasti ratione* This work will hereafter cited by short title *Der Dialog des Petrus Alfonsi*, followed by chapter and page reference of edition (and page reference of translation in brackets).

<sup>73</sup> Amos Funkenstein, *Perceptions of Jewish History*, 171.

<sup>74</sup> Yvonne Friedman, introduction to *Adversus Iudeorum Inveteratam Duritiam*, IX.

both the servant of God and his elect, in who God was well pleased.”<sup>75</sup> Petrus goes on to list all the qualities that Isaiah ascribes to a prophet, and applies it to Jesus. Both Petrus and Peter follow a traditional mode of polemical argumentation, by leaning on the Psalms and other books to prove that Christ is the Messiah.

Another main argument that Peter holds against the Jews is the critique that Jews are too willing to concern themselves with the material realm, as opposed to Christianity and Christ (as Messiah), who is focused on the eternal kingdom. Petrus goes through much the same thought process when describing the eternal kingdom of God, and how Jesus oversees it. When Petrus describes the qualities of heaven, he is quick to point out that the Jews have become blind to deeper spiritual meanings because of their carnality and materialism. Petrus states that: “

To be sure if I were to treat this with some believer I would say no more [about the greatness of heaven]. Whereas because you are without faith and understand only what is so obvious as to be nearly palpable, I will explain to you a little more explicitly....<sup>76</sup>

This emphasis is because when the antagonist Jew talks about holy spaces he exclusively refers to the physical realm. This discussion leads the Christian to assume that Jews are too focused on the material world. In both these texts, the authors make attempts to describe the grandeur of the eternal realm, but express doubts that the Jews could actually

---

<sup>75</sup> Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogue Against the Jews*, 202. *Der Dialog des Petrus Alfonsi*, chp. 9 (p.95): *Sed et hanc, O Moyses, prophetiam, ad quem melius quam ad Christum applicare possumus? Ipse namque et dei servus et electus eius fuit, in quo complacuit sibi deus.*

<sup>76</sup> Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogue Against the Jews*, 241. *Der Dialog des Petrus Alfonsi*, chp. 11 (p. 121): *Quod si inde cum fideli aliquo agerem, aliud sane non responderem. Quia vero tu incredulus es et nil nisi grossum quid et, quod quasi palpari possit, intelligis ideo aliquantulum tibi grossius respondebo et quia per hoc boni aliquid crediturum te esse desidero.*

comprehend it. This creation of doubt in the minds of the reader is typical of twelfth-century polemicists, as Friedman notes.<sup>77</sup>

Petrus's own assault on the *Talmud* has many parallels with the content of chapter five of Peter's *Adversus Iudaeos*. Petrus' problem with the *Talmud* is that God is depicted as corporeal. When addressing the fact that God feels anger in the *Talmud*, Petrus discusses anger as a physical reaction, "Anger is, after some word that is unpleasant has been heard, when red choler, that is bile, boils over and is diffused over the liver and mixes with the blood". Petrus goes on to say that: "This does not suit God in any way unless he is composed of the four elements. God, however, is not subject to such features."<sup>78</sup> In this quotation Peter is shown to mirror the claims made by Petrus. The main problem that both of these authors have with the *Talmud*, is that God is anthropomorphised.

These three main arguments have shown that Peter is not novel in his arguments against the Jews. Peter is simply repeating what has already been said about the Jews and in so doing, has remained relatively traditional in regards to the content and evidence he uses to disprove Jewish belief.

### **2.3 Peter's Divergence from Conventional Anti-Judaism**

Thus far I have argued that Peter the Venerable is traditional in his argumentation. There are two clear divergences that separate the *Adversus Iudaeos* from a more traditional model that the *Dialogue* exemplifies. The main difference is one more of tone

---

<sup>77</sup> Yvonne Friedman, introduction to *Adversus Iudeorum Inveteratam Duritiam*, XI.

<sup>78</sup> Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogue Against the Jews*, 66. *Der Dialog des Petrus Alfonsi*, chp. 1 (p. 14): *Ira est, cum audito aliquo, quod displiceat verbo colera rubea, id est fel fervet et super epatem diffunditur et sanguini commiscetur.... Deus autem talibus non subiacet liniamentis.*

than content and concerns Peter's representation of the Jews in the text. Peter is far more severe to the Jews than his traditional counterpart. When Peter believes that he has given an adequate and logical response to an argument put forth (either by himself or by a Jew), he often finishes with invective designed to emphasise his superiority in the debate.

Petrus, in his work, contrasts this invective, by scolding his Jewish counterpart for his foolishness but never goes farther.<sup>79</sup> Petrus Alfonsi's lack of invective is typical for most polemics of the time period, and is one of the most subtle but crucial innovations that Peter enacts.<sup>80</sup> I argue that Peter's unforgiving style relates to a subtle reframing of the 'Jewish Witness', a theological argument dating to the early Church.

The Christian position on the Jews was largely static since roughly the fifth century C.E., when the 'theory of Jewish witness' was advanced by Augustine of Hippo. Augustine argues that Jews occupy a sacred space within Christendom. Augustine states that Christians should, "slay them not... so that they may not forget your law."<sup>81</sup> The law here refers to the apocalyptic sections of the Bible referring to the second coming of Jesus Christ, whom the Jews do not believe to be the Messiah. Augustinian witness theory states that the Jews cannot realise their error unless they are made witness to the Final Judgment and the truth of Christian salvation. In Augustine's writings and subsequent restatements of this theological position, Jews are depicted as a "stunted"

---

<sup>79</sup> An example of this condemnation is after Petrus debunks the notion that God exists in the physical realm. After citing the *Talmud*, Petrus exclaims "Are these not the most foolish things? If we lay out all the things that your sages have written down similar to things like these, we would fill up many books with tales of nonsense just as they have." Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogue Against the Jews*, 95. *Der Dialog des Petrus Alfonsi*, chp. 1 (p. 32): *Nonne hec omnia fatuissima sunt? Quod si omnia, que doctores vestri similia his conscripserunt, poneremus, multos sicut et ipsi libros nugarum fabulis impleremus.*

<sup>80</sup> Peter Damian for example, calls Jews stubborn and blind in his polemic, but never goes further. In the same fashion, Odo of Cambrai attacks the Jews for their stubbornness, but later attributes this stubbornness to a confusion that the Jews have in regards to the sacred nature of Incarnation. David Berger, *Persecution, Polemic, and Dialogue* (Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2010), 186-187, 265-268.

<sup>81</sup> Paula Fredricksen, *Augustine and the Jews* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 326.

people, who know the truth but do not admit it. Therefore Augustine suggests that they should be pitied, since they perceivably lack the depth of reason and belief required to become proper Christians. And thus they should be allowed to live, according to Augustine, at the mercy of Christians so as to respect the wishes of God who, according to Timothy 1-2:5, wants to save all peoples. Jews are considered cursed and compared to Cain: not slain, but scattered, and made to bear witness to Christian salvation.

This notion of being cursed is peculiar in Augustine's work for the simple reason that it is often contrasted with positive images of the Jews as God's Chosen people. Jews, in Augustine's work, have a quasi-sacred role which is derived from the impact God had on their early history. And so as much as Jews are cursed, Augustine recognises that their customs and laws were divinely inspired and worthy of respect.<sup>82</sup> Part of this reverence is based on the respect that Augustine had for Jewish ancestry. Augustine places emphasis on the notion that the Jews safeguarded the basis of Christian doctrine until the coming of Christ. This respect for Jews continues through Late Antiquity and in the Early Middle Ages, as Ora Limor argues, as Christians continued to represent Jews as possessing keys to Christian knowledge, with the ability to unlock or protect relics related to the sacred. Jews, she argues, "did not accept the sanctity of Christian traditions, [but] they were nevertheless regarded as the ones who could identify them and confirm their authenticity."<sup>83</sup> Jews were therefore considered useful in Christian society, albeit grudgingly, for their role as curators and authenticators of Christian ancestry.

---

<sup>82</sup> Ibid., 316.

<sup>83</sup> Ora Limor, "Christian Sacred Space and the Jew," in *From Witness to Witchcraft*, ed. Jeremy Cohen (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996), 56.

Friedman has already suggested that Peter was heavily influenced by the works of Augustine and the 'doctrine of the Jewish witness'. Friedman argues this point by showing that Peter cites the same Psalm as Augustine (Psalm 58:12) when discussing the Jews in the *Adversus Iudaeos*, and using the same metaphor of a wandering Cain when discussing a cursed Jewish status.<sup>84</sup> The fundamental principle that underpinned the concept of Jewish witness focuses on the idea that Jews should not be killed or exterminated. Both Petrus and Peter never argue for the murder of Jews.<sup>85</sup> However, both authors strip away the utility that the Jews had traditionally been granted. The underlying theme in both these polemics rests on the fact that the Jews cannot interpret the Old Testament properly because they are too focused on the material realm.<sup>86</sup> And in emphasising this perspective, both these authors (and the traditional model in general) reduce the utility that the Jews have in Christian society. When Peter and Petrus critique the Jewish framework of understanding using the Hebrew Bible, they are implicitly stating that they are able to use the Bible in a way that supersedes the ancient knowledge of Jewish rabbis. When Peter calls Jews forward in his prologue, he explicitly states that he will refer to the great men of Judaism to prove that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah.<sup>87</sup> Petrus follows a similar line of reasoning in his own prologue, where he states

---

<sup>84</sup> Yvonne Friedman, "An Anatomy of Anti-Semitism: Peter the Venerable's Letter to Louis VII, King of France (1146)," in: *Bar-Ilan Studies in History*, Ed. Pinhas Artzi (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1984), 88-89 and Peter the Venerable, *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, 232.

<sup>85</sup> Although Peter does suggest that the Jews should be forced to monetarily contribute for the crusades in subsequent letters to the King of France at the time. See: Yvonne Friedman, "An Anatomy of Anti-Semitism", 100.

<sup>86</sup> In chapter three, Peter chastises his Jewish audience for wanting to return to the height of Jewish civilisation. Peter compares this temporal kingdom with the kingdom of Christ, which is both never-ending and greater than any earthly city. See Peter the Venerable, *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, 129.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, 51.

that he will use the great words of Moses and others to prove the folly of Jewish belief.<sup>88</sup> The arguments that follow use Jewish scripture against the Jewish faith, and in so doing, these authors strip away the Jews' utility in transmitting the Hebrew Bible to Christian inheritors. In other words, these two Anti-Judaic writers are removing Jews from their holy text and in turn reconstructing themselves as the sole inheritor of scripture through the monopolisation of Old Testament interpretation.

By arguing for a reduced position for Jewish knowledge, Peter has remained largely faithful to the traditional Anti-Judaic polemical model- until his representations of the Jews are considered. Instead of simply calling the Jews foolish or blind, as the more traditional Petrus does, Peter demonizes the Jewish mode of interpretation as abhorrent. To this end, Peter focused almost entirely on the negative attributes of Judaism in an attempt to create an irrational and bestial image of the Jew in the minds of the reader. When Peter begins his account of the *Talmud* in the final chapter of his polemic, he states:

But if I have satisfied every human being, then I have satisfied you too, if, nonetheless, you are human. In fact, I do not dare avow that you are human, lest perhaps I lie, because I recognize that that rational faculty that separates a human from the other animals or wild beast and gives precedence over them is extinct or, rather, buried in you... now why should you not be called a wild animal, why not a beast, why not a beast of burden?<sup>89</sup>

This emphasis completely undermines the positive connotations that Augustine attributes to the sacred nature of the Jews. Because the Jews were seen as both beneficial and

---

<sup>88</sup> Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogue Against the Jews*, 44-45.

<sup>89</sup> Peter the Venerable, *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, 211. *Adversus Iudaeos*, Chp. 5 (p.125): *Quod si omni homini, tunc et tibi, sit amen homo es. Hominem enim te profiteri ne forte mentiar, non audeo, quia in te extinctam, immo sepultam quae hominem a caeteris animalibus uel bestiis separat eisque praefert rationem agnosco.... Cur enim non dicaris animal brutum, cur non iumentum.*

accursed, Peter felt it necessary to remove any trace of positivity when referring to them. Peter takes this opportunity and space that he has created to further emphasize the negative by focusing specifically on the traits (such as stubbornness or foolishness) that caused Jews to fall into in a quasi-Cain status. When Augustine describes the cursed nature of Jewish existence, Peter expands upon this cursed status by associating it with irrationality. He does so, through his use of the Hebrew Bible, the *Talmud*, and through the use of invective to condemn the bestial Jews.

In the early chapters of the *Adversus Iudaeos*, Peter's invectives usually take the form of a comment on the stubborn nature of Jewish belief (for failing to convert or be moved by the holy text). An example of this use of invective is found in the prologue, where Peter critiques the Jews because they have not conformed to and recognised the truth that so many other peoples have. He states, "Every tongue confesses him, while you alone deny him; others see him, hear him, understand him, but you alone remain, blind, deaf like stones"<sup>90</sup> This quote emphasises the foolishness of failing to believe, by comparing the Jews to blind and deaf rocks. Later on in this same prologue, Jews are introduced as this public spectacle for the whole world to see.<sup>91</sup> This description of a public spectacle is apt for Peter, as he states that the world is laughing at the Jews and their stubborn and wretched hearts coupled with their stiff-necked observance of the old laws. In chapter one, and after a lengthy belittlement of David's temporal kingdom, Peter calls the Jews "absurd"<sup>92</sup> for their focus on the small kingdom that David governed. Jews

---

<sup>90</sup> Peter the Venerable, *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, 49. *Adversus Iudaeos*, prolog. (p.1): *Omni lingua eum confitente, soli eum negatis; aliis eum uidentibus, audientibus, intelligentibus, uos soli caeci, surdi lapidei permanetis. Caeci plane oculis, surdi auribus, lapidei cordibus.*

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, 51.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, 57.

here are categorised as impaired humans, who have their senses limited because they fail to see the truth of Christ and fail to hear proper belief.

Between the end of chapter one and chapter three the invective shifts towards a generalised attack on the humanity of the Jews. This use of invective is shown through comparison as he uses both similes and metaphors to describe the bestial nature of the Jews.<sup>93</sup> For example, at the end of chapter one Peter states, “I am compelled to tarry over this useless shell of the letter that alone they [the Jews] are accustomed to chew over like cattle....”<sup>94</sup> In this passage, Jews are like animals, who struggle over even the most obvious of readings of the Old Testament. Peter begins chapter three with a similar statement. After stating that he is in love with and is filled with divine wisdom, he claims that the Jews are in love with carnal filth, not unlike animals with “bovine intellect [which] possesses your [Jewish] heart...”<sup>95</sup> Later on in this same chapter, he asks his fictive Jewish audience, “Surely if my discussion is with a man and not with a beast, then pay careful attention...”<sup>96</sup> Jews, however, are shown as failing at listening, which leads Peter to compare the Jews with cows, asses or vile vermin.<sup>97</sup> In these typical comparisons, Peter strips the human element from the Jews and replaces this humanity with animalistic traits.

---

<sup>93</sup> Peter refers to the Jews as a bestial on pages: 64, 66, 85, 92, and 102.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, 64.

<sup>95</sup> Peter the Venerable, *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, 64. *Adversus Iudaeos*, Chp. 1 (p 13): *Nam quia Iudaeis loquens medullam sacri psalmi quam fastidiunt, tangere prohibeor, et circa inutilem litterae corticem, quem solum pecudum more rodere solent morari compellor, dicite iuxta butum intellectum uestrum..*

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*, 130.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, 131

Peter escalates the severity of his invectives in the last third of his polemic. In this section Peter connects Judaism to elements of sickness and disease.<sup>98</sup> In chapter three, Peter calls the Jews “rabid dogs” who bark for the death of Jesus.<sup>99</sup> The emphasis on their diseased nature removes any positive connotations that a dog might have, while the act of murdering Christ places further emphasis on the depraved state of the Jews. Chapter four witnesses the Jews acting like “useless vomit” that is spewing forth onto Christendom.<sup>100</sup> This vomit is then walked over by Gentiles. Chapter five concerns the *Talmud*, and how the Jews supposedly departed from the acts and teachings of the Old Testament. Peter openly condemns this departure, comparing Jewish foolishness to a disease, which has the ability to infect others.<sup>101</sup>

Through the use of negative imagery, Peter re-enforces and escalates the negative attributes of Jewish status. He starts by critiquing Jewish stubbornness, then moves to unfavorable comparisons to animals, and then finishes his polemic with comparisons to disease. His initial emphasis on irrationality degrades and casts aside the Jews. By focusing on the supposed bestial nature of the Jew as God’s chosen, Peter re-enforces the notion that they have fallen, both in terms of utility and in terms of basic humanity. When the Jews fail to see the ramifications of reason that are being presented, they lose the ability to reason (or perhaps they were never able to reason). Peter therefore bases the very nature of humanity on the ability to accept Christological reasoning in relation to the Old Testament.

---

<sup>98</sup> Peter refers to the disgusting nature of the Jews on pages 122, 123, 131, 146, 191, 215, 226, 243, 280, and 285.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid., 122.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid., 146.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid., 244.

In this chapter I have argued that Peter's work against the Jews is similar to traditional Anti-Judaic polemics. Because of these traditional elements, scholars have often grouped the *Adversus Iudaeos* with other anti-Judaic polemics of the time period. This categorisation however, neglects the key differences that nuance this work. One of the two main differences is in Peter's use of invectives. These scathing words and comparisons are novel for twelfth-century Anti-Judaic polemics, and reflect Peter's desire to condemn a Jewish framework of thinking in the eyes of his reader. When Peter compares Jews to animals or filth, he makes it clear that Jews are not simply foolish or stubborn, but rather subhuman. This use of invective, which is absent from a traditional model that Petrus Alfonsi exemplifies, is one of the two critical differences between Peter the Venerable's work and other twelfth-century polemics. The second main difference is in how Peter uses classical rhetoric to structure his work. This use of classical rhetoric is critical, since it allows for an element of emotion to permeate within a traditional mode of expression. The use of rhetoric and emotion is the subject of chapter three.

## DISGUST AND DEMARCATION: PETER'S USE OF EMOTION AS A MEANS OF RENEGOTIATING JEWISH IDENTITY IN CHRISTENDOM

In the previous chapter, I argued that the content of Peter the Venerable's *Adversus Iudaeos* distinguishes itself not in its theological argumentation, but in the intensity of its anti-Judaic vitriol. A second main difference that I wish to explore in this chapter, which relates to this negativity, is his polemical style and invective. Whereas Petrus Alfonsi and others write dialogues in which a fictive Jewish interlocutor acknowledges Christian superiority, Peter structures his work as a logical, but ultimately berating sermon.<sup>102</sup> Peter casts himself as a sermonizer, speaking out against the alleged condemnations of the Jews using Classical rhetoric to structure his work. As a written work ostensibly written as a piece of persuasive speech, the rhetorical structure of the *Adversus Iudaeos* accepts that creating an impact on the reader is its most important goal. For Classical and medieval rhetoric, the emotions were key targets of a rhetorician's arsenal. This is particularly true of Peter the Venerable's *Adversus Iudaeos*. Peter, through the use of emotion, removes any doubt as to the disposition that the reader should have when thinking about the Jews. The main feeling Peter wants the reader to have when thinking about the Jews is that of disgust. When Peter refers to the Jews as "useless

---

<sup>102</sup> Underlying all of these literary trends however, is the fact that very few peoples were actively writing polemics at this time. Bernard Blumenkranz and his survey of polemicists during this period, shows that since 846 CE, no major anti-Jewish work had appeared on the European continent until Peter Damian's in the early eleventh century. This lull of anti-Judaic literature which categorised the ninth, tenth, and early eleventh centuries meant that later medieval polemicists had the freedom to redefine their own style and form. And the form that the overwhelming majority of polemicists used was that of a dialogue. Bernhard Blumenkranz, *Juifs et Chretiens Dans Le Monde Occidental, 430-1096* (Paris: Mouton, 1960), 136.

vomit spewing forth”, he reinforces a message not just that the Jews have lost their utility, but that they should be avoided at all costs. This chapter will therefore examine the emotion of disgust, and how medieval peoples understood disgust and the disgusting. This discussion will then narrow to discuss how Peter understood disgust, and what words he used to indicate and categorise the disgusting. This appeal to emotion, however, is bound to Peter’s use of classical rhetoric to structure his text.

### 3.1 Rhetoric and Emotions in the *Adversus Iudaeos*

Dominique Iogna-Prat has already shown that Peter used the classical conventions of rhetoric to compose his polemical writings.<sup>103</sup> A classical rhetoric possesses six key stages: the *Salutatio*, the *Narratio*, the brief *Divisio*, the *Confirmatio*, the *Refutatio*, and the *Perroratio*. Apart from the *Salutatio* each chapter of the *Adversus Iudaeos* has each rhetorical part within each of the five chapters presented. The *Salutatio* (or introduction) is only found within the prologue of his text, since it is there where he calls Jews in, as if to give a sermon on their errors. The remaining five stages are: the *Narratio*, which is the account of the relevant context; followed by the *Divisio*, or statement of issues and the plan the author/speaker will take to cover them; the *Confirmatio*, or proof of one’s own case in conjunction with the *Refutatio*, or disproof of the opponent’s case, and finally the *Perroratio*, or recapitulation with an emotional appeal.<sup>104</sup>

Peter’s use of rhetorical structure identifies the *Adversus Iudaeos* as unlike any other anti-Judaic piece of writing of this time period. This difference is largely due to the

---

<sup>103</sup> Dominique Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion Cluny and Christendom face Heresy, Judaism and Islam*, trans. Graham Edwards (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002), 102.

<sup>104</sup>: James Murphy, “Rhetoric,” in *Medieval Latin*, ed. Frank Anthony Carl Mantello and A. G Rigg (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1996), 630.

fact that every other twelfth-century polemicist (such as Petrus Alfonsi) prefers to use a dialogue when refuting the Jews. Peter's use of the monologue to structure his work was a major determinant on his use of invective - for the simple fact that Peter could not show a defeated Jew using a monologue. A dialogue, such as the one employed by Petrus Alfonsi, can have the antagonist grovel, show foolishness, or admit defeat. After being corrected about the nature of God, the Jew in Petrus Alfonsi's work cries out: "You have corrected me well, thanks be to God; I have learned good sense in your words"<sup>105</sup> In contrast, Peter's work cannot have the Jew admit defeat because Peter the orator is the only one speaking. Peter needs to be more severe in his use of emotion because he needs to make it clear to his audience that he has vanquished his theoretical Jews.

The base function of rhetoric is to affect the reader or listener, for the purpose of persuasion.<sup>106</sup> At times this persuasion is in reference to a specific future decision that the audience has to take, either individually or collectively. But that does not seem to be the intention of Peter's polemic. Rather, as Kennedy identifies, rhetoric can also be used to influence and alter values and beliefs.<sup>107</sup> The doctrine of the 'Augustinian Witness' I argue, is what Peter's persuasive speech seeks to address, and his goal is to alter the relationship of Judaism to Christendom in the eyes of his reader. When Peter uses the Old Testament to argue that the Messiah has come, he does so in a way that would show that the ancient knowledge of the Hebrews is irrelevant. This emotional appeal allows the author to reinforce and clarify the message that he is trying to convey. As Plato argues, an

---

<sup>105</sup> Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogue Against the Jews*, trans. Irven Resnick (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2006), 159. *Der Dialog des Petrus Alfonsi*, chp. 5 (p.70): *bene me deo gratias correxisti in verbis tuis sensum didici*.

<sup>106</sup> George Kennedy, *A New History of Classical Rhetoric* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 4. For a medieval perspective on rhetoric, see: Ernst Breisach, introduction to *Classical Rhetoric and Medieval Historiography*. ed. Ernst Breisach. (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1985), 1-4.

<sup>107</sup> George Kennedy, *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*, 4.

appeal to emotion in rhetoric is crucial to arouse the appropriate emotional reaction in an audience that may not be persuaded by logic alone.<sup>108</sup>

Peter's polemic against the Jews makes use of an appeal to the emotions as a way to demonstrate the absolute defeat of a Jewish detractor. In his final few words of the climax of the *perroratio* of the *Adversus Iudaeos*, Peter closes with the following remarks:

Now truly what Isaiah (often mentioned above, not your prophet but ours) said about you [the Jews], among many other things, seems fulfilled in you: "They have broken the eggs of asps and have woven the webs of spiders...." [Is 59. 5-6.] The eggs that you incubate are not like the eggs of hens that are either useful themselves as food or so that some fowl would emerge from them that suits human need, but they are the eggs of asps which, once they have been broken by you, infect you with the deadly poison of impiety.<sup>109</sup>

This last sentence is crucial, since it identifies the Jews as bodies of infection, capable of spreading their disease of impiety throughout the world. Afterwards, Peter references the catastrophic effects that this infection may have on Christendom but he is confident that the ineptitude of the Jews will limit any evil that it may inflict upon the world.<sup>110</sup>

As a proper part of the *perroratio*, this image represents a distillation of all that came before in the polemic. Rather than summarizing his arguments, Peter chooses to re-emphasise that Judaism is both in error and worthy of contempt through strong negative

---

<sup>108</sup> Peter Mack, "Argument and Emotion in *Troilus and Criseyde*," in *Medieval Rhetoric: A Casebook*, ed. Scott Troyan (New York: Routledge, 2004), 108.

<sup>109</sup> Peter the Venerable *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews* trans. Irvn M. Resnick. (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2013), 285. *Adversus Iudaeos*, chp. V (p.186): *Vere nunc apparet in uobis impletum quod sepe supra nominates Ysaïas, iam non uester sed noster propheta, inter multa similia de uobis ait: Oua aspidum ruperunt et telas aranae textuerunt. Qui comederit de ouis eorum morietur et quod confotum est erumpet in regulum. Et telae eorum non erunt in uestimentum neque operientur operibus suis. Non sunt oua quae fouetis ouis gallinarum similia utu el per se sint utilia ad escam, uel inde aliquod uolatile humanis commodis aptum procedat, sed sunt oua aspidum, quae a uobis rupta et mortifero uos impietatis ueneno inficiant...*

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, 286.

images. This contempt is bound to the notion that the Jews have lost their humanity.

When Peter refers to the Jews as useless vomit “spewing forth onto Christendom”<sup>111</sup> he is representing Judaism as a source of illness or disease.

But what are we to make of claims like this? We have these words that compare Jews to sickness and disease, and we have it in the place that rhetoric demands that Peter have an appeal to emotion. Being twenty-first century scholars, we must tread carefully, as the emotions we see before us may not translate to a modern lexicon of emotion that we may feel is innate and universal. As Barbara Rosenwein argues in her work on emotional communities, emotions are not fixed and culturally defined but fluid.<sup>112</sup> This statement suggests a type of emotional relativism, which would make Peter’s use of invective and rhetoric impossible to understand or relate to. But Rosenwein does not stop there. In a later chapter she argues:

There is, then, no reason to worry that studying the emotions of the Western Middle Ages is any more anachronistic than studying its university ideas, or political institutions. To be sure, all were different from their manifestations today, but in every case the historian can have fair hopes of entering sympathetically into a mind-set that is not entirely foreign to her own. Western emotions have persisted over the long haul.<sup>113</sup>

The aspect of entering sympathetically into the mind-set of another is critical to the development of this thesis. When Peter describes the Jews as spewing forth or incubating asp eggs, he is painting a clear picture in the mind of his reader: specifically that of danger, infection, and pollution. These are all ideas we today would associate with the

---

<sup>111</sup> Ibid., 146. *Adversus Iudaeos*, chp. IV (p.73-74): *Exinde postquam terra illa olim a Deo data Iudaeis Iudaeos uniuersos uelut innutilia pectoris purgamenta exspuit eosque peruniuersum orbem terrarum disseminans, pedibus omnium gentium conculcandos exposuit.*

<sup>112</sup> Barbara Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006), 3-4.

<sup>113</sup> Ibid., 55-56.

experience of fear or disgust. I will argue below that disgust is the closest modern equivalent to the emotion that Peter wanted to associate with the Jews.

This chapter now turns to examine how Peter uses emotional rhetoric, one primarily evoking the feeling of disgust as a final peroration to simplify and reinforce his message about Judaism. To do so, this chapter will first examine how scholars have analysed and interpreted disgust. The next section therefore will examine the elements of disgust that Nussbaum and Miller outline, and compare them to both the medieval definition of disgust, and how Peter himself presents it.

### **3.2 Modern Scholarship and Disgust**

While it might be easy to assume that the feeling of disgust is universal and trans-historical, scholars have increasingly argued for the cultural and historical variability of their definition and experience.<sup>114</sup> Since the 1960's, there has been considerable debate on the concept of emotional universality. Social constructivists have argued that the act of feeling an emotion is far more variable, and is influenced by social situations, psychological dispositions and cultural norms.<sup>115</sup> In this way one could argue that a modern scholar could never interact with or interpret the range of emotions that a medieval person could feel. Despite this wave of social constructivism, psychologists maintain the existence of several base emotions (such as anger, surprise, and disgust) that are universal in human societies. That is not to say that the expressions of these base emotions are universal, but rather some element of these emotions are present in all

---

<sup>114</sup> Carolyne Larrington, "Diet, Defecation, and the Devil: Disgust and the Pagan Past," in *Medieval Obscenities*, ed. Nicola McDonald (New York: York University Press, 2006), 140.

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, 143.

human societies. Medieval people therefore may have a different view of what constitutes the disgusting, but at least their feeling of disgust is relatable and universal.

So what is disgust? Scholars like Martha Nussbaum identify it as an anticipatory fear.<sup>116</sup> Disgust is wholly bound to the future, as concerns about action or inaction in the face of disgust threaten our own physical safety. Disgust is our aversion to a contaminant. We want to avoid and distance ourselves, lest we risk being contaminated. This need to keep one's distance can, when applied to the social realm, lead to the creation of social boundaries that may make us feel secure. Some examples of modern social boundaries include laws against homosexuality or public drunkenness. When these barriers break down, we may have a sense of mortal fear that we are somehow accelerating our own demise.<sup>117</sup> This feeling of disgust can relate to the physical thing that we are disgusted by (such as feces or vomit) or it can be socially engineered in order for us to justify creating laws and barriers that will distance ourselves from perceived social outliers (gays, Jews, etc.).<sup>118</sup> Disgust, applied in this way, "evokes magical ideas of contamination and impossible ideas of purity and immortality."<sup>119</sup> Nussbaum brings up two crucial points. This magical idea of contamination, for Nussbaum, often refers to our own bodies, which are inherently producing that which disgusts us, be that vomit, feces, or otherwise. This desire for purity and immortality essentially denies us of our own humanity, and rejects our own existence within the corporeal realm.

---

<sup>116</sup> Martha Nussbaum, "Secret Sewers of Vice: Disgust, Bodies and the Law," in *The Passions of Law*, ed. Susan Bandes (New York: New York University Press, 1999), 23.

<sup>117</sup> Martha Nussbaum, *Hiding from Humanity: Disgust, Shame, and the Law* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 94.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*, 110-111.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*, 14.

Scholars also see disgust as a means of creating a social hierarchy without compromise.<sup>120</sup> Disgust, when implemented effectively, creates a rigid social hierarchy that simplifies a society into a binary.<sup>121</sup> In this way, disgust functions as a community builder and a powerful tool for exclusion based on abstract principles of purity.<sup>122</sup> This type of disgust, however, is socially constructed, since policy makers can create an atmosphere where certain social/cultural acts can be associated with disgust. To create this atmosphere which links the act to the disgusting, a moralising community must associate a condemned act with the primary elicitor of disgust (and in Larrington's case study, it is the emphasis on the connection between communal bathrooms and the description of rot and excrement).<sup>123</sup>

With this research in mind, disgust appears to be future fear or a desire to avoid a corrupting or contaminating force. Disgust moreover is bound to the notion of purity, and the striving for an ideal proximity to the corrupt, be that socially or in regards to physical space. We can also define disgust as a polarizing emotion, capable of simplifying a narrative into binary categories of pure and corrupt.

These common elements are crucial to understanding how Peter uses emotional rhetoric. How are we to find disgust in a Latin text which never uses the word? To broach this issue, the next section will discuss how modern scholars can discuss emotional rhetoric for the Middle Ages.

---

<sup>120</sup> William Ian Miller, *The Anatomy of Disgust* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), 156.

<sup>121</sup> A type of binary Miller mentions is rich versus poor, and cultured versus uncivilised. *Ibid.*, 220.

<sup>122</sup> Carolyne Larrington, "Diet, Defecation, and the Devil: Disgust and the Pagan Past," 144.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, 145.

### 3.3 Modern and Medieval Disgust

To answer what was ‘medieval disgust’ this section will consider the work of Carolyne Larrington. Her article, entitled ‘Diet, Defecation and the Devil’ focuses on the spread of Catholicism in Scandinavia during the eleventh century. This case study is crucial because it provides a model which is relatively contemporary to that of the *Adversus Iudaeos*. In Larrington’s work, Christians are condemning pagan fables and practices, such as communal bathrooms, as disgusting. In her work we see pagan stories becoming more overtly concerned with Christianity, as the Christian heroes are often depicted as clean, while the pagan antagonist is usually associated with or has some contact with filth or rotting meat. Larrington argues that the Scandinavians already associated excrement with disgust, and so the pagan’s shared experience of disgust was the basis for a Christian moralising effort.<sup>124</sup>

From Larrington’s discussion, we can see that issues related to the body are intimately related to the concept of medieval disgust. Feces and vomit have a purpose for Christianity as builders of a moral community. By associating excrement with a pagan past, Larrington has argued that paganism was ultimately related to hell, something that one wants to avoid. This comparison furthermore creates a moral community, which associates and internalises the fictive relationship paganism has with the unpleasant, and establishes a simplified community based on the abstract binary of purity and the disgusting. By defining disgust in this way, Larrington mirrors and reaffirms the work done by authors such as Miller and Nussbaum, but her focus is more on the linkage between social practices and disgust. When Larrington describes Christians linking pagan

---

<sup>124</sup> Ibid., 148.

practices to the disgusting, she identifies that medieval missionaries related cultural practices they did not approve of to things like feces, disease, vomit, pollution, and filth. These vocabulary words have become the basis of my research on medieval disgust that you will see below.

Peter, in his polemic against the Jews, is similar to this case study. Peter is the voice of Cluniac monasticism – a key arbiter of Church doctrine in the twelfth century. I argue that he wants to create a moralised community and Peter is fighting against a mental framework (nostalgia for the past in the case of Larrington, and a more literal interpretation of scripture in the case of Peter). Through this study I will argue that medieval disgust is inherently bound to the corporeal. This next section will return to Peter, and how he conceptualized disgust.

### **3.4 Peter the Venerable and the Image of the Disgusting Jew Examined**

In order to properly understand how Peter used disgust, we will return to the foundations of Peter's writings. Peter the Venerable is above all a twelfth-century Latin writer. As such, I will explore Peter's Latin word choices in order to determine Peter's intended message. To do so, I have developed a lexicon or cloud of associated vocabulary related to disgust. Basing myself on the works of Larrington, I have developed a list of the possible emotional words that Peter could have used and medieval readers likely understood. These words are broken up into two sections: words that relate to the modern concept of disgust (Table one), and words that are related to the modern concept of the

objects of disgust (Table two).<sup>125</sup> From here we can see that there are many ways that Peter could have connected the Jews to the disgusting. His word choice however, is critical to the message that he is trying to convey. Each word listed has a slightly different connotation. And so, to narrow down the exact message that Peter wanted to convey, I will examine the frequency with which these words are found in the *Adversus Iudaeos*. Table three and table four are the culmination of that study. Table three focuses on the frequency with which Peter uses a word related to the modern concept of disgust in his writings. Table four focuses on the frequency with which the emotional word list relating to the objects of disgust appear. The numbers that you see correspond to the amount of times that the word appears in Peter the Venerable's writing. Beside that number is (in brackets) the work that the word is found most in. And since this thesis revolves around the *Adversus Iudaeos*, if the word is not most prevalent in the *Adversus Iudaeos*, I will make note of how many times it is found in there (if any). I have taken the step of bolding the most prevalent words that Peter uses.

From these tables we can see what disgust means to Peter and the message that Peter wanted to compare the Jews to. The three words that Peter uses most to describe disgust in the *Adversus Iudaeos* are *fastidio*, *piget*, and *taedet*. *Fastidio* is related to loathing, shrinking away from, or flinching, which implies a bodily reaction of hating, but more importantly, pulling away. The same goes for *piget*. *Piget* is associated with irking or pains, which again implies an immediate or delayed physical reaction of pulling away. *Taedet* is more focused on anger, since the word is associated with loathing, but it too implies that the object of disgust offends, which deepens the need to pull away or

---

<sup>125</sup> To compile a list of the objects of disgust, I looked to Larrington's treatment of medieval disgust. To this end, I focused on and searched terms relating to feces, disease, vomit, excrement, filth, and pollution.

maintain distance. This pulling away or aversion would complement the definition of disgust that was created by scholars such as Miller and Nussbaum. However, the words that Peter uses most emphasize that the critical element of disgust for Peter is that of aversion or pulling away

However, and as Larrington argues, disgust can be grafted onto a social, political or religious group through the use of comparisons. Peter uses the words *foeditas*, *insanitas*, *polluo*, *sordes* and *turpis* most often when describing what it means to be a Jew. *Insanitas* is particularly prevalent, but is also relatively expected, since Peter's base arguments stem from the notion that the Jews lack the ability to reason (thus making them irrational or insane thus *insanitas*). *Insanitas* is related to disease in the Latin language, which would reinforce the idea that *insanitas* is something to avoid. *Insanitas*, however, does imply a sense of humanity, as a person who is insane might justifiably be unsound (as the connotation suggests) but might still be considered human. That is where words like *foeditas* and *polluo* come in. These words denote a sense of uncleanness, repulsiveness, or foulness. Foulness is actually a perfect modern English word to describe what Jews are to Peter. Perhaps long ago the Jews were palatable, and nourishing, but their views are now long past their expiration date and in need of revelation. Both these tables show that Peter understood and defined disgust as something to avoid. So when Peter says "So if you choose not to do this [when talking about taking up a spiritual understanding] but instead decide to remain in your customary insanity..."<sup>126</sup> Peter is

---

<sup>126</sup> Peter the Venerable, *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, 104. *Adversus Iudaeos*, chp. 3 (p. 43): Abjicite ergo, si mihi creditis, sensum, cum quo semper non sensati, sed insensati apparebitis, et sumite intellectum, quo veritatem agnoscere, quo Christum suscipere, quo regem et regnum, non quale sentitis, sed quale sentiunt Scripturae, mereamini adipisci. Hoc si non vultis, sed in insania solita permanere decernitis,

conveying to his audience that Judaism is something to stay away from, lest they be insane as well. The next step is to examine some specific examples to see if this definition of Peter's disgust applies to his use of invectives.

### 3.5 Disgust and Peter's Use of Invectives

As discussed in chapter two, Peter uses a wide variety of invectives which colour his work. Furthermore, these invectives seem to escalate in severity. Peter calls the Jews stubborn or hard-headed in chapter one of the *Adversus Iudaeos*. Chapters two and the early parts of chapter three accuse the Jews of being bestial, and in the final chapters, Peter describes the Jews as objects of disgust.

The first instance of Peter's use of the images of disgust is in chapter three. Peter begins chapter three by saying that the Jews are "taught to love always carnal filth."<sup>127</sup> This association makes it clear that Jews are somehow related to or associated with pollution. Later on in this same chapter, Peter calls the Jews the "Dregs /excrement of the human race."<sup>128</sup> This quote makes it clear the sub-human status of Jews as it relates back to Larrington, and her argument on excrement being related to pollution. Chapter four has a slightly more gruesome depiction as Peter, after describing the greatness of Jesus, describes the Jews as "spewing forth like useless vomit."<sup>129</sup> The description of useless is

---

et magis Scripturas sensui vestro applicare, quam sensum vestrum Scripturis inclinare disponitis, audite eas vobis resistentes, et perverso intellectui vestro contraria proponentes.

<sup>127</sup> Peter the Venerable, *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, 103. *Adversus Iudaeos*, chp. 3 (p. 42): Rapiunt alii cotidie regnum caelorum, uos feces solummodo carnales semper eruditi amare frustra prestolamini regnum terrarum.

<sup>128</sup> Peter the Venerable, *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, 122. *Adversus Iudaeos*, chp. 3 (p.

56): *O humani generis faeces!*.

<sup>129</sup> Ibid., 146. *Adversus Iudaeos*, chp. 4 (p. 73-74): *Exinde postquam terra illa olim a Deo data Iudaeis Iudaeos uniuersos uelut inutilia pectoris purgamenta exspuit eosque per uniuersum orbem terrarum disseminans, pedibus omnium gentium conculcandos exposuit.*

important because it reinforces the negative, as if vomit was not already inherently useless. This theme of vomit is reoccurring. In chapter five, Peter describes the Jews vomiting curses to both man and God.<sup>130</sup> Vomit in this text seems to have an element of disease as well. After spewing forth, the Jews are described as spreading like the plague, with infecting qualities.<sup>131</sup> In this same chapter Peter calls the Jews “impudent dogs and the foulest pigs”<sup>132</sup> thus continuing the notion that the Jews are somehow animalistic but with either no real use or with disgusting qualities. These quotes and references suggest that there are three different comparisons being made: Jews in relation to filth/feces, Jews in relation to vomit, and Jews in relation to disease/infection. Furthermore this attribute of foulness is critical since the Jews are not being related specifically with the sick, but rather what the sick produce (vomit/feces/filth/disease). This comparison further dehumanises the Jews, and fits with how both Peter defined disgust and how his reader would have understood Peter’s word choice.

From this analysis, it is clear that Peter wanted to associate Judaism with sickness, vomit and feces. And if one compares that to the Christian uses of disgust outlined by Larrington, one can see that these comparisons would lead the medieval reader to associate Judaism with the disgusting. Furthermore, I have argued that Peter’s understanding of disgust is bound to the notion of avoidance and foulness/disease. These two elements work together to persuade the reader that Judaism is something to pull away from.

---

<sup>130</sup> Peter the Venerable, *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, 226.

<sup>131</sup> *Ibid.*, 191.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid.* 244.

In closing, this chapter has focused on the emotional rhetoric that Peter uses to both simplify and reemphasise his interpretational framework. To study the role of disgust as a key element in Peter's polemic, this chapter has analyzed how modern scholarship has defined disgust, and related it back to a study of medieval sensibilities. This chapter then studied how Peter defined, and used disgust to convey his message of avoidance. This understanding is critical, since it emphasises elements of disgust that may have been misrepresented. Peter conveys Judaism as something to avoid, and relates it to the foul or the sick. This sickness or aversion acts to replace the positive connotations placed upon the Jews by Augustine. The next chapter will focus on his target audience, and how his treatment of Judaism reflected a potentially more serious threat to Cluny. Therefore, and in order to fight against this disgusting force, Peter had to craft himself as an authority figure over the disgusting.

AUDIENCE AND IDENTITY: EXAMINING THE IMPLICATIONS OF  
DISGUST AND HOW PETER USES DISGUST AS A MEANS TO DEFINE AND  
SUPPORT CLUNIAC IDENTITY

As discussed in chapter two, Peter's use of rhetoric and invective in comparison to other contemporary anti-Judaic polemics suggest that the *Adversus Iudaeos* had a different purpose than other contemporary polemics. The current chapter will argue that the difference served to stress Peter's authority over Christian orthodoxy to a Christian audience. To do so, I argue that Peter used established patterns to create and re-enforce his own authority. This argument understandably clashes with the idea that the *Adversus Iudaeos* was for a Jewish audience.<sup>133</sup> However I will also argue that there is a disconnect between the intended audience and the fictive audience.

When Peter calls the Jews in in the prologue of the *Adversus Iudaeos*, he implies that he is delivering a monologue or sermon. This conflicts with who is actually consuming his text: learned Christian monks. To argue this point, I will examine Peter's conscious use of style, and relate it to both his other works, and how Peter defines Judaism in his writings. The final section of this thesis will discuss the message that Peter wanted to convey to his readership. When Peter declares that Judaism is something to avoid, he is implicitly arguing that a Jew-like position (such as the Cistercian viewpoint) is the true problem. Disgust reinforces the message and simplifies the narrative, which then allows Peter to cast himself as both authoritative and pure. This chapter will first

---

<sup>133</sup> Which stems from Peter's opening line, which calls Jews forward using the words of Quodvultdeus. Peter the Venerable, *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, trans. Irven M. Resnick (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2013), 49.

explore how Peter cast himself as an authority figure, followed by an examination of what his authority allows him to claim in regards to the corrupting effects of Judaism in Christendom.

#### 4.1 Peter's Use of Disgust and the Creation of an Authority Figure

Peter's rhetorical style does more than simply order his polemic. When Peter crafts his rhetorical arguments against the Jews, he is arguing both that he knows the Old Testament better, and that he has authority over the Jews. This authority allows Peter the ability to claim that he is representing the pure or the good. Peter's rhetorical style shows him as participating in a framework of Christian authority, which developed in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Stock attributes this sense of authority to the rebirth of literacy which took hold and slowly restructured existing behavioral patterns which were previously based on orality.<sup>134</sup> This restructuring gave a new role to the written word, as texts became reference points for society. Text did not render orality obsolete, but it did redefine the framework of coexistence. Since laws and codes were being codified and written down, people were becoming empowered authors, with the ability to create and refer to their own laws and beliefs. This act served to empower and redefine humanity's earthly duty. Before, humanity was a passive receptacle for scripture and the wisdom of Church Fathers. Now humanity could both understand and renegotiate and alter the everyday world through the two pronged act of meditating on scripture and *ratio*.<sup>135</sup> This theme of renegotiating authorship is highlighted in the work of Szpiech, who argues that humanity adopted almost God-like qualities of creation during the twelfth century. In this

---

<sup>134</sup> Brian Stock, *The Implications Of Literacy* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1983), 3-4.

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid.*, 325.

sense the medieval author now had the ability to create new arguments and belief patterns that base themselves in scriptural proof.<sup>136</sup> This act of creation raised the status of the author, so that he became an authority figure on the subject on which he was writing through the use of holy texts. Therefore a good authoritative piece will pair rationality and logic alongside authoritative proof.

Iogna-Prat describes three distinct characteristics which Peter actively employs throughout his text to create his polemical authority.<sup>137</sup> These characteristics serve to stress Peter's use of established twelfth-century patterns of authority as Stock has described. The first is combative language which serves to confront the opponent.<sup>138</sup> The second characteristic is that of what seems to be an armory of scriptural evidence to support one's point.<sup>139</sup> The final characteristic is the use of classical rhetoric. Peter uses both rhetoric and scripture to structure the *Adversus Iudaeos* and Peter's use of invective (which is given place and space through the use of rhetoric) serves to further assert his authority over his fictive opponent.

This mastery and authority over scripture allows Peter the ability to educate and engage with his fellow monks. This ability would complement Jaeger's argument that rhetoric was believed to have an educating or correcting force on society.<sup>140</sup> Peter takes this authority, which is based on rhetoric, logic and scripture, and applies it to the

---

<sup>136</sup> Ryan Szpiech, *Conversion And Narrative* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 8.

<sup>137</sup> Dominique Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion Cluny and Christendom face Heresy, Judaism and Islam*, trans. Graham Edwards (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002), 31-2.

<sup>138</sup> Peter rarely misses the chance to hurl invectives or challenge the Jews. For example, Peter, at the start of chapter five, debates whether they are more akin to cows or asses. He decides on asses because they are quite stubborn in nature. Peter the Venerable, *Against the Jews*, 211.

<sup>139</sup> Peter extensively cites both the Old and New Testament in his work against the Jews. For an index on his use of scripture, see Irven Resnick, introduction to *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, by Peter the Venerable (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2013), 296-300.

<sup>140</sup> Stephen Jaeger, *The Envy Of Angels* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994), 133.

formation of Christian identity, which then counters the materialistic nature that Judaism represents. However, in order to participate in this established pattern of authority, Peter had to engage with his targeted audience. This issue of audience is often troublesome, as Peter divorces his targeted audience from the Jews he is addressing.

## 4.2 Peter's Fictive Audience and its Relation to Christendom

The most crucial (and often misleading) element of Peter's polemic is its intended audience. The very first line of his polemic is "Approach you - O Jews - you I say, who even to this day deny the Son of God. How long, wretches, will you fail to believe the truth?"<sup>141</sup> Those phrases give an initial impression that his work is meant for a Jewish audience. I oppose this surface reading of the text however, by suggesting that this Jewish audience is a fictive audience because of the way Peter structures his work, and because of the context in which Peter's original manuscripts were found. I argue that the intended audience for his work would have been learned Benedictine monks, who would have likely read the polemic.

When Peter argues a point, he uses scripture to justify his stance, and when he does so, he quotes directly from either Jewish or Judeo-Christian holy texts. In many of these cases, he then goes on to break down each and every word found in his quote, in order to prove that the Jewish framework of understanding scripture is flawed. One example of this is found in chapter two when Peter quotes Isaiah 9.6 and Psalm 34.4:

"The name" of the child "will be called wonderful, counsellor, God" But attend to what follows as well: "Mighty." Now it is clear to everyone that the one who is

---

<sup>141</sup> Peter the Venerable, *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, 49. *Adversus Iudaeos* prol., (p.1): *Vos ego, uos, inquam, ego conuenio, o Iudei, qui usque in hodiernum negatis Filium Dei. Quo usque, miseri, ueritati non creditis?*

God is also “mighty,” that he is both the source of might and the Lord of hosts. But what else? “Father of the world to come”<sup>142</sup>

After this lengthy quotation, Peter begins by dissecting the various elements of the quotation: “Who is speaking? The prophet. When is he speaking? Surely in this life and surely in this world.”<sup>143</sup> When Peter writes in this way, he forces his audience to recall the various quotations and references. That act of reference would be incredibly hard to do when the material is delivered orally and alongside many other references and quotations. Text makes the act of recollection easier, and allows for his audience to better interact with the complexity of his prose and writing style. This style of writing suggests that Peter wanted to engage an audience through reading.

Another piece of evidence that suggests that Peter intended his audience to read his work stems from his overall style. Friedman states that Peter is often quite repetitive and monotonous. This monotony is coupled with Peter’s overall ability to craft incredibly complex prose.<sup>144</sup> The complex Latinity suggests that only learned peoples could read, follow, and be affected by this polemic. Peter’s Latinity thus acts as a barrier for a broader audience. Peter’s Latinity coupled with the complexity of his arguments, strongly suggests that Peter wanted his targeted audience to consume the text through reading.

To argue that Peter’s intended audience for the *Adversus Iudaeos* was Christian monks, one must examine Peter’s argument against a fictive Jewish crowd. Friedman argues that the arguments that Peter uses against the Jews would not be persuasive to a

---

<sup>142</sup> Ibid., 81. *Adversus Iudaeos*, chp. 2, (p. 25): *Isaias magnus homo, magnus propheta, plenus Deo, amicus Dei, notus vobis, notus mundo, hoc dicit: Vocabitur nomen parvuli, admirabilis, consiliarius, Deus. Sed attendite et sequentia: Fortis. Jam hoc omnibus clarum est, quia qui Deus est, et fortis, et auctor fortitudinis, et Dominus virtutum est.*

<sup>143</sup> Ibid., *Adversus Iudaeos*, chp. 2, (p.25): *Sed quid post? Pater futuri saeculi. Quis loquitur? Propheta. Ubi loquitur? Utique in hac vita, utique in hoc saeculo. Quid est ergo quod dicit.*

<sup>144</sup> Yvonne Friedman, introduction to *Adversus Iudeorum Inveteratam Duritiem*, by Peter the Venerable (Turnhout: Continuatio Mediaevalis, 1985), xxiv.

Jewish audience.<sup>145</sup> Peter does not add any new content to the Judeo-Christian debate. Rather, he is simply consolidating the works of many other anti-Judaic polemicists, such as Petrus Alfonsi.<sup>146</sup> This fact would imply that Peter is not sermonising to the Jews at all. Couple this lack of novelty with the density of Peter's Latinity, and overall distribution, and what we have is a narrow representation of who would A) have access to the *Adversus Iudaeos*, and B) be able to interact with such complex Latinity. These elements strongly suggest that Peter's readership were Christian monks.

The second indicator that this text was solely for a Christian monastic readership is in the way the text was treated after Peter finished it and how he felt the Jews might receive it. Both Resnick and Bruce have identified that Peter wanted the *Adversus Sectam Saracenorum* translated. Peter emphasised this point both in his prologue against the Saracens, and later on through his letters.<sup>147</sup> There is no indication that Peter wanted the *Adversus Iudaeos* translated into Hebrew. This lack of indication would reflect Peter's worldview.

Peter believed that the Muslims showed promise because they were rational peoples.<sup>148</sup> Peter believed that love, compassion, and reason were the tools that Christian preachers could use to show Muslims their error. Peter displayed much less confidence in converting the Jews, and he often expressed doubts that they could convert, due to their irrationality.<sup>149</sup> This claim of irrationality underlies the notion that Peter is not addressing

---

<sup>145</sup> Ibid., ix.

<sup>146</sup> Ibid.,

<sup>147</sup> Irvn Resnick, introduction to *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, by Peter the Venerable (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2013), 33.

<sup>148</sup> John Tolan, "Peter the Venerable on the Diabolical Heresy of the Saracens," in *The Devil, Heresy and Witchcraft in the Middle Ages*, ed. Alberto Ferreiro (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 6.

<sup>149</sup> Best example of this claim is in Peter the Venerable, *Against the Jews*, 57-8.

the Jews at all, since Peter evidently believed that his use of reason would fall on deaf ears.

The next section will explore the implications of an intended monastic audience. By treating Judaism as an unbound force, Peter is able to make the argument that certain Christians are Jew-like in their framework of thinking. This ability to bond contrasting identities together allows Peter to create and advocate for his own version of Christianity through the use of alterity.

### **4.3 Jews as Both a Framework of Thinking and an Identity**

As suggested above, Peter separates Jews from Judaism. Peter represents the Jews as peoples who obtained their money by immoral or illegal means. Judaism, for Peter, meant a refusal to believe that Christ was the prophesized Messiah. Underlying this supposed denial, however, is the accusation that ascribing to the Jewish faith meant focusing on the material realm, rather than the eternal.<sup>150</sup> Furthermore, Judaism is critiqued for following the Old Laws too strictly, instead of using reason to understand that the laws and prophecies of the Old Testament lead to the belief in Christ. In this instance, Peter divorces Judaism from the Jews, and creates a framework for thinking that can be adopted by Christian thinkers. One can see this in Peter's letters, where Peter calls the Cistercians Jew-like.

The principle letter that this chapter will focus on is letter twenty eight, which was written by Peter in 1126.<sup>151</sup> Constable argues that this text was written just after Bernard

---

<sup>150</sup> Ibid., 83-85.

<sup>151</sup> Although there is some controversy with this date. See: Giles Constable, "From Hugh I to Hugh V," in *The Abbey of Cluny*, ed. Giles Constable (Berlin: Lit, 2010), 273.

of Clairvaux's *Apologia ad Guillelmum Sancti Theoderici Abbatem*, Bernard's scathing critique of the Cluniac order.<sup>152</sup> The Cistercians openly criticized the Cluniacs for practicing a life of gluttony and luxury.<sup>153</sup> Peter then seemed justified to defend his order soon after his election, and felt it necessary to deconstruct the error of the Cistercians. Near the end of the letter, Peter alludes to the notion that the Cistercians are receiving counsel from the Pharisees.<sup>154</sup> This imagery leads Peter into a discussion of the Jew-like nature of the Cistercians and their relation to the Rule of Benedict. Cistercians are represented as Jew-like because they follow the *Rule* blindly, without thought for present circumstances. This faithfulness to the letter but not the spirit of the *Rule* is shown by Peter as irrational, since the Cistercians, like the Jews, are too focused on the law itself.<sup>155</sup> This impedes both the Jews and the Cistercians from receiving divine revelation.<sup>156</sup> Cluniacs, in contrast, claim to base their monastic framework on both reason and the *Rule* in order for abbatial discretion and compassion to shine through. This basis allows the Cluniacs to avoid the pitfalls of being bound irrationally to the letter of the law. Peter in this way advocates that the interpretation in law should be based in reason. Cistercians, in their foolishness, show a lack of proper sense and understanding because they fail to use reason in their interpretation of the *Rule*. By justifying Cluniac monasticism, Peter is both

---

<sup>152</sup> For a more comprehensive look at letter 28 see: Gillian Knight, *The Correspondence Between Peter the Venerable and Bernard of Clairvaux* (New York: Routledge, 2002), 25-51.

<sup>153</sup> *Ibid.*, 41.

<sup>154</sup> "If you consider it blasphemy and pride to say this, then you are saying that they [Paul and members of a referenced Christian Synod] could alter the original statutes in accordance with wise counsel, or perhaps you hesitate to say what alone remains. But if you keep silent, you show yourselves to be using the counsel of the Pharisees who, not wanting to admit the truth nor able to indict it, chose silence after having been asked by the Lord about John's baptism –whether it was of heaven or of men" Letter 28 translated by Marc Saurette p. 28

<sup>155</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>156</sup> Marc Saurette, "Rhetorics of Reform: Abbot Peter the Venerable and the Twelfth Century Rewriting of the Cluniac Monastic Project" (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 2005), 95.

correcting fellow Christians and defending his order. This letter therefore is an example of how he defined Cluniac monasticism through the use of a Jewish force.

It is important to note that Peter is not calling the Cistercians Jews. Cistercians are not members of the Jewish faith, and Peter made no such argument. Rather, Judaism is seen as an identity that can be grafted onto a Christian host. In this instance, Cistercians are accused of interpreting the *Rule* in a Jew-like manner, and participating in what it means to be a Jew.<sup>157</sup> Peter is pointing this element out to the Cistercians in an effort to establish contrast with his supposedly more rational adherence to the *Rule*. Judaism, as represented by Peter, is a malleable identity that can be divorced from a body and with the ability to lead Christians astray. It is important to note that Peter believed that a Jewish way of thinking was leading Christians astray from what Peter believes is the ideal form of Christendom. This argument would probably have been scary for Peter, since even Cluniacs could be accused of being Jew-like if they read the Old Testament literally. The *Adversus Iudaeos* therefore promotes an avoidance of a Jewish way of thinking, and Peter advocates for this avoidance through the use of disgust and through reason. By categorising the Cistercians as Jew-like in letter twenty-eight, Peter is extending the element of avoidance to the Cistercian order. That message is then communicated to his audience of learned monks, both within Cluny and abroad. Peter, through the engagement with the Jew, is making the claim that the Cistercian approach to the *Rule* is an object to avoid. The *Adversus Iudaeos* therefore is a text that helps Peter defend Cluniac ideals while at the same time correct others, lest they be seduced by a more literal interpretation

---

<sup>157</sup> Gillian Knight, *The Correspondence between Peter the Venerable and Bernard of Clairvaux*, 49.

of scripture and the *Rule*. The next section will explore the intended recipient of this message, and how disgust confirms and simplifies the arguments that Peter has made.

#### 4.4 Peter's Target Audience and what Disgust Communicates

This section will examine the association between Judaism and disgust, and what that communicates to his Christian readership. For starters, disgust makes the argument simpler. The *Adversus Iudaeos* is an incredibly dense and complex piece of Latin text, and Friedman bemoans the fact that Peter is often quite repetitive.<sup>158</sup> Disgust simplifies the narrative. It is difficult at times to understand the theological basis of this text, yet it is relatively simple to understand the comparison between Jews and vomit. What disgust does is make clear who was victorious between Peter and the Jews. Even if one did not understand the theological points of contention, it is very clear and simple to understand that the polemic depicts Judaism as synonymous with disgust, and therefore worthy of aversion.

This Jewish identity is also construed as a problem for Cluny, as Judaism is imagined as more of an abstract enemy that can infect the minds of a Christian host. By associating Judaism with disgust, Peter is giving Judaism an aspect of avoidance, offensiveness and foulness. This connection is contrasted with Peter's version of Christian orthodoxy, which is represented as more rational, spiritual and pure. Iogna-Prat argues that Peter likened the Church to a body, which needed solidarity when the head suffered.<sup>159</sup> By implying that Judaism can infect, Cluny in this instance is imagined as a corporeal body, capable of suffering from disease, due to the fact that the monks that

---

<sup>158</sup> Yvonne Friedman, introduction to *Adversus Iudeorum Inveteratam Duritiem*, xxiv.

<sup>159</sup> Dominique Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion*, 318.

compose this body are subject to its influence (like the Cistercians). The emphasis is therefore solidarity. Monks who subscribe to a Jewish way of thinking are seen as destabilising, since they have the ability to pollute the pure. Peter is fulfilling his role as a defender and unifier by clarifying the true way of interpreting scripture, and contrasting it with the disgusting. This emphasis further relates the theme of avoidance to Judaism, just as Peter's word choice would suggest.

The use of disgust also makes clear that a Jewish interpretation has no more use in society. As discussed in chapter two, Christian thinkers once thought that Jews at least had some utility as the possessors of ancient knowledge. This is where the image of them as 'useless vomit' is especially apt, because it identifies both a lack of usefulness and a signal to avoid. Jews are not meant to have any purpose, and so any sense of their inherent utility they may have possessed should be replaced by a feeling of disgust in on-lookers. Peter then is emphasizing his own way of interpreting the Bible, which relies on reason in conjunction with scripture.

When Peter associates Judaism with the disgusting, he is creating a worldview for his readership. Humanity, as Peter suggests, is not based on merely being a human, but rather is based on a framework of thinking. In the *Adversus Iudaeos*, Peter associates the ability to think rationally with humanity. It is rational to understand that Isaiah refers to Jesus, for example. When the fictive Jew fails this test of rationality, he is described as cattle, chewing on the letter.<sup>160</sup> The ability to reason places Cluny above those who would interpret scripture literally. Disgust reinforces this worldview and clarifies what it means to be human, and how to participate in the ideal.

---

<sup>160</sup> Peter the Venerable, *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, 64.

This ideal, however, is framed as being under attack. When Peter uses emotional rhetoric, he clarifies a clear dichotomy between what is good (or pure) and what is bad (or inhuman/corrupting). Christendom is imagined as under attack from the corroding effects of Jew-like thought. As both Miller and Nussbaum argue, disgust implies an element of danger. The ideal Christendom that Peter imagines is faced with corruptors, both from the outside and the inside (Cistercians).<sup>161</sup> In this way, Cluny and Christendom are under attack from a polluting force. Therefore it is in the best interest of those who support Peter's vision, to unite against the supposedly disgusting enemies. Peter however subtly advocates a specific type of unity; one which is focused solely on his Cluniac worldview.

Peter crafts himself as a twelfth-century authority figure. Peter then expands upon this representation of authority, by casting himself as the arbiter of the pure. When Peter associates Jew-like thought with the impure he implicitly advocates that his own interpretation is better. And since Peter uses a myriad of Old Testament quotations, he suggests that he understands the Old Testament better. Peter casts himself then as both the defender and the protector of the pure, since his mastery and arguments trump anything his fictive or real opponent could muster. In this way he also adopts a fatherly corrector image. By sermonising to these 'lost believers' he is educating his readership that his points are superior and his view is that of an authority.

This authority changes the perceived dynamic between himself and his opponent as well. Peter casts himself as the good fighting against the impure. For those who would accept the arguments presented, Peter casts himself as a force of good. This force is

---

<sup>161</sup> See Peter's treatment of a Cluniac heretic: Scott Bruce, *Cluny and the Muslims of la Grande-Freinet* (Ithaca: Cornell University press, 2015), 76.

contrasted with the literal or material forces of evil, which present a danger to the whole of Christendom. By casting the issues of interpretation in this way Peter is unifying Cluny under him. By casting his opponents in such a negative light, Peter is implicitly stating that the best way to salvation is through his way of thinking. And if one recalls, Peter inherited an intensely divided Cluny upon his arrival, as many Cluniac monks sided with Pontius. By casting himself as the good, Peter is gathering adherents to him. By demonstrating the proper framework of thought through alterity, Peter is furthering his goal of an ideal Christendom, as one that is united against Jew-like thought.

This chapter has argued that Peter was not trying to convert the Jews through his sermons as the prologue implies. Instead, Peter designed the *Adversus Iudaeos* to engage with a Christian audience. This chapter has also established that Peter wanted to separate Judaism from Jews themselves, in order to properly define what it meant to participate in Judaism. To do so, however, Peter had to establish himself as an authority figure, both over the Jews and in the eyes of his fellow Christians. He does so using both rhetoric and scripture alongside reason, in order to elevate his own authority as a learned writer in Christendom. This authority allows Peter to mould and reconstruct what Judaism meant, in relation to Christianity. By removing any positive connotations from the Jews, Peter establishes a new framework of thinking that relates Judaism to avoidance and disgust.



## CLOSING THOUGHTS: A POLEMIC RE-EXAMINED

The subject of this thesis is the *Adversus Iudaeos*, one of three twelfth-century polemics written by Peter the Venerable. Some scholars have attributed its creation to the depletion of Cluny's treasury at around this time. Still others call it a foundational piece of writing that represents the evolving narrative of inter-religious dialogue. Yet none of these descriptions adequately represent the complexity that resides in this polemic. Rather than simply discuss the *Adversus Iudaeos* within a framework of how other polemics of the time have been studied, I have tried to show how Peter's subtle innovations in regards to both style and use of emotion can give one a radically different outlook on the nature and purpose of this text. Irven Resnick calls this polemic the most vitriolic of all Peter's works.<sup>162</sup> This view leads one to ask the obvious question: Why? Jews were not a military threat during this time, and authors such as Constant Mews have shown that Jews were a relatively tolerated minority in medieval Europe for centuries.<sup>163</sup> And while Jews did represent a lapse in Christendom, contemporary Christian writers were quick to point out that Jews were politically weak and inferior to their Christian counterparts.<sup>164</sup> So why did Peter save his most passionate vitriol for the people that threatened Christianity the least?

This thesis explores that question of why. I argue that Peter had a much larger problem with what Judaism represents. For Peter, Judaism represented a framework of thinking which was identified as a blind focus on law without the ability to apply reason

---

<sup>162</sup> Irven Resnick, introduction to *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, by Peter the Venerable (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2013), 11.

<sup>163</sup> Constant Mews, "Abelard and Heloise on Jews and Hebraica Veritas," in *Confrontation and Coexistence* ed. Pinhas Artzi (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1984), 85.

<sup>164</sup> Irven Resnick, introduction to *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*, 11.

and revelation. Peter contrasts this devotion with a more rational interpretation that focused on abbatial discretion and compassion alongside scripture. This viewpoint was designed to convince a Benedictine audience that his monastic order was superior to its detractors. The fact that Peter focused specifically on the supposed Jew-like nature of the Cistercians in letter twenty-eight leads me to suggest that Peter was attacking the Cistercian interpretation of the *Rule*. Peter then contrasts this interpretation with what he advocates: a more rational or human way of interpreting scripture and the *Rule*.

When Peter attacks the pillars of Jewish identity, he breaks away from the traditional model of polemic, and uses invectives that would remove all positive connotations and humanity that Christian doctrine would ascribe to it. This means altering the 'Doctrine of the Jewish Witness' so as to remove Judaism as the keeper or the interpreter of the sacred. This positivity is replaced by the disgusting, as Peter uses a scale of invective to reduce the status of his supposed audience. This use of invective starts by questioning Jewish sanity or rationality, and gradually escalates to wholesale comparisons to feces, vomit, or disease. Peter's word choice is especially crucial, since it ultimately advocates for an avoidance of Judaism as a framework of understanding.

Underlying all of these messages of avoidance is Peter's desire to represent himself as this master of scripture and this authority of the pure. Peter supports his arguments with an array of biblical citations and references, often in a way that he argues supersedes Jewish knowledge. Peter creates this argument so as to remove the need for Judaism to serve as the intermediary between Old Testament knowledge and Christian scholars. Peter bases his power and ability to supersede the Jewish way of thinking on his mastery of the rational. Rationality is the basis of humanity for Peter, and the key difference

between a Jewish way of thinking and a Christian one. When he depicts the Jews' failing to reason, Peter makes it clear that Jewish humanity is lost. That emphasis is made through his use of invectives, as he compares Jews to both animals and filth. Peter contrasts this emphasis on dehumanization with reason. He does so through the use of scripture, the Church fathers, and logic. When the (fictive) Jews fails to convert or be moved, Peter is quick to use emotional rhetoric, and in so doing, casts himself as this arbiter of proper Christian thought and as the arbiter of the pure.

When scholars such as Miller attempt to define disgust, they often bring up the fact that it simplifies the narrative.<sup>165</sup> Disgust creates an artificial binary, that classifies things, people, or acts as either disgusting or pure. There seems to be a sense of absolutism, as these two elements are often irreplaceably bound to the other as polar opposites, with no room for crossover. By categorising Judaism as inherently disgusting and worthy of aversion, Peter makes the subtle argument that he is the pure. Peter is pure because he is able to both identify and reject the corroding force that Judaism represents. In doing so, Peter represents himself as the protector and defender of Christendom, who fights against the disgusting, and in so doing, binds himself to the pure. This binding to the pure is critical, since it simplifies an intensely complex theological argument. Readers can understand that Judaism is something to avoid through the use of imagery and comparisons. Through the use of disgust, Peter gives Judaism and, by extension, the Cistercians, an element of avoidance. And if the reader understands and agrees with the connections being made, Peter then subtly argues that the Cluniac religious view is superior, and that Cluny is the source of the pure.

---

<sup>165</sup> William Ian Miller, *The Anatomy of Disgust* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), 220.

In closing, the *Adversus Iudaeos* should not be relegated to represent the changing thoughts on the Jews in the twelfth century, nor serve to represent Peter's hatred of Jewish moneylenders of the time. Doing so would marginalise and simplify a polemic that is far more complex and nuanced than initially thought. Dominique Iogna-Prat has argued that medieval polemics are focused on two things: the act of cleansing the Church from within and to struggle against the enemies abroad.<sup>166</sup> With this in mind, I have argued that Peter focused far more on the cleansing of the Church than on the enemies abroad and he does so through the use of disgust. By defining a Jewish frame of thought and separating it from the Cluniac religious view, Peter is better able to advocate for the latter and condemn the former. Disgust simplifies the narrative and allows Peter the ability to renegotiate the most critical theological stance on the Jews of the time: "the Doctrine of the Jewish Witness".

This thesis shows the potential of the history of the emotions. With it, I was able to develop a new method of understanding the *Adversus Iudaeos* through the identification of subtle but key differences that separated it from other traditional polemics of the time. Emotions have an ability to connect and influence the minds of others. This shared humanity implies a sense of commonality and with that comes a better understanding of the past. I would not be surprised to see a surge of history related to emotion as the field grows as a means of analytical discourse.

---

<sup>166</sup> Dominique Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion*, 23.

## Appendix

TABLE 1

MEDIEVAL LATIN EMOTIONAL WORD LIST RELATED TO DISGUST AND  
APPROXIMATE ENGLISH EQUIVALENTS <sup>167</sup>

Distaedet	- It is wearisome – it is disgusting
Fastidio	– to feel disgust, shrink, flinch, loathe, dislike, despise
Fastidiosus	– full of disgust, squeamish, disdainful, scornful
Obtaedesco	– to disgust
Perosus	– detesting, hating greatly, weary of, disgusted with
Pertadesco	– to become disgusted
Pertaedet	– it wearies, disgusts, makes sick
Piget	– it irks, pains, chagrins, affects, grieves, disgusts
Putide	– disgustingly, disagreeably, affectively
Putidulus	– disgusting
Taedet	– it excites loathing, disgusting, offends

---

<sup>167</sup> For a list of definitions related to disgust – see the online Latin dictionary found here  
<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/search>

TABLE 2

MEDIEVAL LATIN EMOTIONAL WORD LIST RELATED TO OBJECTS OF  
DISGUST AND APPROXIMATE ENGLISH EQUIVALENTS

Caenum – dirt, filth, mud

Coinquino- to pollute, contaminate

Concaco – to defile with odor / cover with filth

Conlino – to besmear, defile, pollute

Contemero – to pollute, violate

Evomo – to spew – vomit forth

Faeculentus - excrement

Foeditas – foulness, filthiness, ugliness

Impurus – unclean, filthy, foul

Insanitas- unsoundness, disease

Maculo – to spot, stain, defile, pollute

Merda – dung, odor, excrement

Morbidus – sickly, diseased

Paedor – nastiness, filth

Polluo – to soil, defile, foul, pollute

Sordes – dirt, filth, uncleanliness, squalor

Spurce – impurely, foully

Stercus- dung, excrement

Turpis – ugly, unsightly, repulsive, foul, filthy

Vomo – to puke, spew, throw up, vomit

TABLE 3

NUMBER OF TIMES PETER USES THE ROOT WORD OF DISGUST IN HIS  
WRITINGS

**Fastidio/ Fastidiosus** – 18 (Most used in Letters (7), 3 uses in *Adversus Iudaeos*)

Perosus 1 (Letters)

Pertadesco/ Pertaedet – 4 (2 in Letters, 1 in *Adversus Iudaeos*)

**Piget** – 7 (4 in Letters, 1 in *Adversus Iudaeos*)

Putide/Putidulus – 2 (1 in *Contra Petrobrusianos*, 1 in *Dei Miraculus*)

**Taedet** – 20 (11 in Letters, 4 in *Adversus Iudaeos*)

TABLE 4

NUMBER OF TIMES PETER USES THE LATIN EMOTIONAL WORD LIST  
RELATED TO THE OBJECTS OF DISGUST

Coinquino-	1 ( <i>Noni Sermons</i> )
Concaco	– 6 (5 in Letters)
Evomo	– 6 (1 in <i>Adversus Iudaeos</i> )
Faeculentus	– 1 ( <i>Contra Petrobrusianos</i> )
<b>Foeditas</b>	– 27 (16 in Letters, 5 in <i>Adversus Iudaeos</i> )
Impurus	– 3 ( 1 in <i>Adversus Iudaeos</i> )
<b>Insanitas</b>	- 52 (20 in <i>Adversus Iudaeos</i> )
Maculo	– 8 (3 in Letters)
Morbidus	– 1 (in Letters)
<b>Polluo</b>	– 13 ( 9 in <i>Adversus Iudaeos</i> )
<b>Sordes</b>	– 35 (10 in <i>Adversus Iudaeos</i> )
Spurce	– 3 (1 superlative version in <i>Adversus Iudaeos</i> )
Stercus-	1 (only found in <i>Adversus Petrobrusianos</i> )
<b>Turpis</b>	– 20 (8 in Letters, 5 in <i>Adversus Iudaeos</i> )
Vomo	– 6 (4 in Letters)

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources

Alfonsi, Petrus. *Dialogue Against the Jews*. Translated by Irven Resnick. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2006.

Alfonsi, Petrus. *Der Dialog des Petrus Alfonsi: seine Überlieferung im Druck und in den Handschriften Textedition*. Edited by Klaus-Peter Mieth. Inaug. Diss. Freien Universitat Berlin, 1982.

Peter the Venerable. *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*. Translated by Irven Resnick. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2013.

Peter the Venerable. *Adversus Iudaeorum Inueteratam Duritiem*. Edited by Yvonne Friedman. Turnhout: Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 58, 1985.

Peter the Venerable. "Letters of Peter the Venerable." In *The Letters of Peter the Venerable*, edited by Giles Constable. Vol 1. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Peter the Venerable. "Letter 28." Unpublished manuscript, translated by Marc Saurette, September 9<sup>th</sup>, 2015, Microsoft Word File.

## Secondary Sources

Berger, David. *Persecution, Polemic, and Dialogue*. Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2010.

Blumenkranz, Bernhard. *Juifs et Chretiens Dans Le Monde Occidental, 430-1096*. Paris: Mouton, 1960.

Breisach, Ernst. Introduction to *Classical Rhetoric and Medieval Historiography*. edited by Ernst Breisach, 1-4. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1985.

Bruce, Scott. *Cluny and the Muslims of la Grande-Freinet*. Ithaca: Cornell University press, 2015.

Chazam, Robert. "Twelfth Century Perceptions of the Jews: A Case Study of Bernard of Clairvaux and Peter the Venerable." In *From Witness to Witchcraft*, edited by Jeremy Cohen, 187-201. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996.

Constable, Giles. "From Hugh I to Hugh V." In *The Abbey of Cluny*, edited by Giles Constable, 265-280. Berlin: Lit, 2010.

Eisenberg, Saadia. "Reading Medieval Religious Disputation: The 1240 "Debate" Between Rabbi Yehiel of Paris and Friar Nicholas Donin." Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 2008.

- Fredricksen, Paula. *Augustine and the Jews*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Friedman, Yvonne. "An Anatomy of Anti-Semitism: Peter the Venerable's Letter to Louis VII, King of France (1146)." In *Bar-Ilan Studies in History*, edited by Pinhas Artzi, 87-102. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1984.
- Friedman, Yvonne. Introduction to *Adversus Iudeorum Inveteratam Duritiem*, by Peter the Venerable, I – LXX. Turnhout: Continuatio Mediaevalis, 1985.
- Funkenstein, Amos. *Perceptions of Jewish History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Iogna-Prat, Dominique. *Order and Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom face heresy, Judaism and Islam*. Translated by Graham Robert Edwards. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002.
- Jaeger, C. Stephen. *The Envy Of Angels*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994.
- Kennedy, George. *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Knight, Gillian. *The Correspondence Between Peter the Venerable and Bernard of Clairvaux*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Knowles, David. "The Reforming Decrees of Peter the Venerable." In *Petrus Venerabilis, 1156-1956, Studies and Texts Commemorating the 8<sup>th</sup> Centenary of*

*his Death*, edited by Giles Constable and James Kritzeck, 1-20. Romae: Herder, 1956.

Larrington, Carolyne. "Diet, Defecation, and the Devil: Disgust and the Pagan Past." In *Medieval Obscenities*, edited by Nicola McDonald, 138-155. New York: York University Press, 2006.

Leclerq, Jean. *Pierre le Vénérable*. Paris: Editions de Fontenelle, 1946.

Limor, Ora. "Christian Sacred Space and the Jew." In *From Witness to Witchcraft*, edited by Jeremy Cohen, 56-77. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996.

Lotter, Frederich. "The Position of Jews in Early Cistercian Exegesis and Preaching ." In *From Witness to Witchcraft*, edited by Jeremy Cohen, 162- 187. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996.

Martin, Janet. Introduction to *Peter the Venerable: Selected Letters*, edited by Janet Martin, 1-11. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1974.

Mack, Peter. "Argument and Emotion in *Troilus and Criseyde*." In *Medieval Rhetoric: A Casebook*, edited by Scott Troyan, 109-126. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Mews, Constant. "Abelard and Heloise on Jews and Hebraica Veritas." In *Confrontation and Coexistence*, edited by Pinhas Artzi, 83-107. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1984.

Miller, William Ian. *The Anatomy of Disgust*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Murphy, James. "Rhetoric." In *Medieval Latin*, edited by Frank Mantello, Anthony Carl, and A. G Rigg, 629-638. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1996.

Nussbaum, Martha. *Hiding from Humanity: Disgust, Shame, and the Law*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.

Nussbaum, Martha. "Secret Sewers of Vice: Disgust, Bodies and the Law." In *The Passions of Law*, edited by Susan Bandes, 19-62. New York: New York University Press, 1999.

Resnick, Irven. Introduction to *Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews* by Peter the Venerable, 3-46. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2013.

Resnick, Irven. Introduction to *Dialogue Against the Jews*, by Petrus Alfonsi, 3-39. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2006.

Rosenwein, Barbara. *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006.

Saurette, Marc. "Rhetorics of Reform: Abbot Peter the Venerable and the Twelfth Century Rewriting of the Cluniac Monastic Project." Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 2005.

Saurette, Marc. "Peter the Venerable and Secular Friendship." In *Friendship in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age*, edited by Albrecht Classen and Marilyn Sandidge, 273-299. New York: De Gruyter, 2010.

Stock, Brian. *The Implications of Literacy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Szpiech, Ryan. *Conversion and Narrative*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.

Szpiech, Ryan. *Medieval Exegesis and Religious Difference*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2015.

Tolan, John. "Peter the Venerable on the Diabolical Heresy of the Saracens," In *The Devil, Heresy and Witchcraft in the Middle Ages*, ed. Alberto Ferreiro, 345-367. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Torrell, Jean-Pierre. "Les Juifs dans l'œuvre de Pierre le Vénérable," *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale* 120 (1987): 331-346.

Torrell, Jean-Pierre, and Bouthillier, Denise. *Pierre le Vénérable et sa Vision du Monde: Sa Vie, son Oeuvre, l'Homme et le Demon*. Leuven: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, 1986.