# The Judensau: Remembering a Grotesque Anti-Jewish Image

01.09.2024 | Maurice Ryan

**Judensau translates as, Jewish sow. Its German medieval origins are complex; its history long (extending well into the twentieth century, and well beyond German borders). It was created to be grotesque, offensive to Jews and Jewish religion, and, bizarrely, to elevate Christians and Christianity. The Judensau image is beyond disgusting. The long-form story of the Judensau affords credit to no one. Disturbingly, images of the Judensau continue to disgrace the Christian landscape in churches and cathedrals in Europe, proving resistant to determined efforts to remove them. This article seeks to bring to awareness this regrettable part of the Christian heritage. The Judensau raises the issue of how we see and remember in relations between Christians and Jews.**

## What is the *Judensau*?

*Judensau* is German for “Jewish sow”—a female pig. The first visual depictions of the *Judensau* appeared in Germany in the thirteenth century. Over the following six centuries, the anti-Jewish imagery intensified as the obscene nature of the images amplified. Common representations included depictions of Jews lying underneath the sow suckling on her teats.[1] Other identifiable Jews are depicted holding up the sow’s tail while one or other person stares at her anus or ingests her excrement.[2] In some representations, the devil is present watching on, portrayed with stereotypical Jewish features.[3] A sixteenth-century representation showed a demon, identified as Jewish by the round *rouelle* on his clothing,[4] incongruously playing the bagpipes while riding a vomiting pig.[5] In typical examples of the *Judensau*, the devil assists in the process by holding up the pig’s tale to support the “Jew eating the excrement. The Devil also wears the *rouelle* indicating his close association with the Jews.”[6] Often, a Jewish male was shown mounted backwards on top of the sow, an accepted sign for determining whether the sow was on heat. It also exemplified the rider as an object of humiliation and a symbol of evil.[7] Various depictions of the *Judensau* did not share a standard form, except for the usual rendering of, and association between, Jews and pigs; history and geography influenced individual representations. Children were often shown suckling at the teats of the sow. Sometimes, the animal was presented with a pig’s body and a human head.

## Origins of the *Judensau*

The literary origins of the *Judensau* are not firmly established. References in the homilies of John Chrysostom[8] (349-407) in 386 to Jews as gluttons and pigs are a significant and early influence. He claimed:

> The Jews live for their bellies, they gape for the things of this world, their condition is not better than that of pigs or goats because of their wanton ways and excessive gluttony. They know but one thing: to fill their bellies and be drunk, to get all cut and bruised, to be hurt and wounded while fighting for their favourite charioteers.[9]

Chrysostom’s character flensing of Jews was aimed at those considered as Christian backsliders

and hybrid worshippers—those who attended synagogue *and* church—as a warning against the potential corruption that would result from mixing in close quarters with Jews.[10] His identification of Jews as exhibiting obsessive carnality, gluttony, profanation, and wasteful consumption found expression in his correlation with pigs. Chrysostom invented, and/or nurtured, a style of anti-Jewish porcine rhetoric that would be adapted and expanded by medieval admirers. His sermons against the Jews "demonstrate a model of abasement and abjection that is not terribly far from the complex of scatological and sexual perversions united in the image of the *Judensau*."[11]

Chrysostom may have chosen a pig for the purposes of descriptive comparison, but he was not the originator of the use of grotesque imagery to characterize Jews. The New Testament is a prime source of anti-Jewish rhetoric, though Adele Reinhartz cautions "debate still rages over whether the New Testament itself is anti-Jewish or whether its statements about Jews and Jewishness have been distorted in an anti-Jewish direction by Christian interpreters over the past twenty centuries."[12] A key New Testament text that shaped the construction of many *Judensau* images is John 8:44: "You are from your father the devil, and you choose to do your father's desires. He was a murderer from the beginning and does not stand in the truth, because he has not truth in him."[13] A common feature of *Judensau* iconography was the lurking presence of Satan/devil/demon wearing recognizable emblems, such as the *rouelle*.[14] Reinhartz considers later generations of Christian interpreters amplified biblical authors' intentions and imaginations: "the New Testament provided subsequent Christian theologians and leaders with plenty of fodder for what later became a widespread, though not universal, anti-Jewish agenda that went far beyond what New Testament authors would have envisaged or (I conjecture) desired."[15]

The depiction of grotesque images of Jews in medieval art and literature requires appreciation of the cultural context in which these images arose. Istvan Czachesz has pointed to notions that emerged in early Christianity related to the inhabitants of hell and the underworld: people are sitting in hell in filth: "The idea that people sit in dirt in hell seems to be an archaic one…Sinners are dirty and they remain eternally in dirt in the underworld." The usual literary descriptions for the source of this dirt is "mud or filth, but there are also many references to bodily discharges: blood, sweat, pus, and excrement, the latter occurring especially frequently."[16] Modern interpreters have revised their understanding of the grotesque dimensions of art and culture in the Middle Ages: "scatology is no longer seen as something marginalized, but is rehabilitated as an important part of medieval art and culture."[17] Obscene images were a familiar component of medieval Christian architecture: "pornographic and scatological sculptures are common features in cloisters and churches from the Romanic period."[18] In art and literary culture, "the scatological transforms pride into humiliation" and was a standard feature of medieval theological contests and disputes.[19] Jeff Persels and Russell Ganim observe that "much Early Modern vernacular art and literature is disorderly, is unclean, is thus 'dangerous,' 'subversive,' and is in need of the neo-Classical bath it will receive in subsequent centuries."[2] Filth, foul smells and excrement operated in the Middle Ages to delineate the religious other and separate members of different religions from one another by creating disgust and revulsion. Impurity and filth created theological and emotional space between people of different religions.[21]

Another likely direct literary antecedent of the *Judensau* is the ninth century text, *De Universo* (also known as *De Rerum Naturis*), an encyclopedic dictionary compiled by Rabanus Maurus (c. 780-856).[22] Rabanus explicitly compared the putatively unclean and sinful nature of the pig with Jews in Book 7. Rabanus "identified the Jew and the pig because of the pig's negative natural attributes: that is, its lust, wantonness, and gluttony. These are the qualities that the Jew and the pig share."[23] Rabanus' 22 volume library was mostly literary and included a limited selection of simple miniature illustrations.

The literary collections of Rabanus and others were the foundation for illustrated bestiaries.[24] Medieval bestiaries were a source of association between Jews and pigs.[25] Bestiaries "largely focused on each animal's religious meaning. The key theme was how to be a good Christian."[26]

Debra Higgs Strickland observes how the medieval bestiaries solidified "the Christian belief that certain undesirable animals are appropriate symbols of Jews because they all share irrational, bestial natures."[27] She maintains that "such poisonous attitudes doubtless informed popular anti-Jewish animal motifs such as the *Judensau*, whose conception and iconographical origins may well lie in the bestiaries."[28]

An influence on evolving medieval anti-Jewish propaganda was legal custom. The 13th century practice of the *Judeneid*, or Jewish oath, correlates with the emergence of the *Judensau*. To establish proof and corroboration in lawsuits in German courts, Jews were required to take an oath standing barefoot on skin taken from a sow, establishing the connection between Jews and unclean animals. This requirement "served as a medium for anti-Jewish derisions: the Jew shall stand on a sow's hide, stipulates the *Schwabenspiegel*,[29] and illustrations in manuscripts not only translated the written word into visual stimuli but emphasised the connotation with one of the major anti-Jewish images of the Middle Ages, the *Judensau*."[30]

This compilation of influences ensured the *Judensau* image persisted in Germany and beyond into and beyond the Renaissance.[31] The efficacy of pig iconography was propelled by the ubiquity of pigs in European communities, especially Germany.[32] Pigs were unruly co-habitants with humans. Pigs became "a formative influence on definitions of social order…They were both a flexible species and a demanding one that trotted and jumped and swam right through the boundaries that humans had set for them."[33] Alison Stewart claims that medieval "dogs and pigs indicated human qualities, albeit undesirable ones, that overlapped with these animals…Pigs and dogs can be seen as emblematic of evaluation and change at a time of 'moral panic'."[34]

## *Judensau* in Public Spaces

Images of the *Judensau* proliferated for around 600 years. Most images were created and displayed in Germany, though neighboring countries produced allied versions.[35] It may be that *Judensau* images found in France, Switzerland, Poland and Sweden were confined to those areas "under heavy German influence, if not actually populated by Germans."[36] In any case, "by the fifteenth century and on through the sixteenth, the *Judensau* motif was ubiquitous in word and image throughout German lands."[37]

Media for presenting these images varied; their presence was pervasive. Images were "hammered into metal gates, sculptured into choir stalls, corbels, and church gargoyles, carved into wood, and appeared on the handles of walking sticks, in game cards, in faience, and on hundreds of prints and posters."[38] The printing press was a powerful tool for disseminating and popularizing the *Judensau*. Original versions may have been sculpted in stone, but the printing press enabled viral duplication and distribution across European communities. After Johannes Gutenberg invented the printing press with movable type around 1450, job printings of ephemeral materials and broadsides (individual single-sheet prints) became common: "among these job printings were anti-Jewish publications, which appeared in increasing numbers from the 1470s onward."[39] Many printed images were displayed in public squares, on street corners and drinking halls. A famous *Judensau* adorned the tower (until demolished in 1801) above the bridge which formed the major entrance to the city of Frankfurt.[40] The depiction "portended the Jewish threat to Christian existence by depicting the ritually murdered corpse of Simon of Trent hovering above the porcine scene."[41] The image was "affixed there not by some bigoted individual but by 'the city government'. The city was still paying for its upkeep when Goethe was a child, and remembered being traumatized by it."[42]

As a young Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832) fretted over the existence of this grisly image as a "public monument," the general population became accustomed to the presence of these grotesque representations. Ideas communicated in these depictions of Jews could seep into

the consciousness of ordinary citizens as they went about their daily lives: the *Judensau* "legitimized the fears and deadly superstitions and helped perpetuate them from generation to generation."[43] Precisely when the *Judensau* image ceased to be disseminated is disputed by scholars. In his monumental study, Isaiah Shachar argued the centuries-long usage of the *Judensau* image ended abruptly at the dawn of the Victorian era, in deference to a spirit of greater genteel sensibilities.[44] Maya Balakirski-Katz argues that while this may have been the case in Germany, "a burgeoning antisemitism and the more general fascination with medieval history and art seem to have occasioned the revitalization of the motif" among French intellectuals into the twentieth century.[45]

## *Judensau* in Church Spaces

*Judensau* images were not only displayed in public spaces. The first representations appeared in 13th century stone sculptures within German churches and cathedrals. Images were carved into wood and stone and displayed on choir stalls, internal walls, and external walls of churches. Artworks in medieval churches acted as the literature for the illiterate, so, according to Pope Gregory the Great "paintings are placed in the churches to enable the illiterate to read on the walls what they cannot read in the books."[46]

One significant representation of the *Judensau* is a sculpture on the exterior south-west wall of the church of Wittenburg, near Dessau in Germany. The stone sculpture, now badly weathered, dates to the 14th century. It shows four Jewish men and a sow. The Wittenburg church is famous as the place where Martin Luther (1483-1546) proclaimed his 95 theses which, according to legend—if not reliable history—he nailed to the door of the church in 1517, thus sparking the Protestant Reformation. In 1543, Luther provided an interpretation of the *Judensau* sculpture adorning his local church in typically spiteful and crude fashion:

> Here on our church in Wittenberg a sow is sculpted in stone. Young pigs and Jews lie suckling under her. Behind the sow a rabbi is bent over the sow, lifting up her right leg, holding her tail high and looking intensely under her tail and into her Talmud, as though he were reading something acute or extraordinary, which is certainly where they get their *Shemhamphoras*.[47]

The Wittenberg *Judensau* has proven to be an enduring contentious presence up to the current day. In his treatise, Luther for the first time associated the Jewish Talmud with a pig's anus. He deliberately corrupted the term for the ineffable name of God. These acerbic tropes were later cast in stone. Around 200 years after he made his initial declaration, "Luther's boorish comparison of the Talmud to a pig's rectum was literally carved into stone in Wittenberg, when the word "*Rabini*" (rabbi) and the title of Luther's treatise, *Von Schem Mephoras (On the Ineffable Name of God)*, were inscribed above the *Judensau*."[48] Luther's intention was "to teach his followers to hate his adversaries."[49] On 11 November 2015, the synod of the Evangelical Church in Germany released the statement, *Martin Luther and the Jews: A Necessary Reminder on the Occasion of the Reformation Anniversary*. The second part of that document noted: "For centuries, people had recourse to Luther's advice…They appealed to Luther's late writings in order to justify hatred and persecution of Jews, in particular with the emergence of racist anti-Semitism at the time of National Socialism…In the 19th and 20th century Luther was a source for both theological and ecclesial anti-Judaism, and political anti-Semitism."[50]

## Modern *Judensau* Representations

Images of the *Judensau* persisted: "the *Judensau* lived on—especially in books, pamphlets, posters, playing cards, and ornaments—into the nineteenth century."[51] The dawn of the twentieth

century denoted a “highwater mark” in antisemitic sentiment throughout Europe.[52] The assertion of “Nazi racial ideology breathed new life into medieval representations of the Jew.”[53] During the Nazi era “*Saujud* was a common German invective,”[54] and “the word *Judensau* was scrawled on the windows of Jewish businesses.”[55] After the war, awareness of the *Judensau* largely evaporated in public consciousness.

The *Judensau* has not disappeared completely. By 2022, there were “48 so-called *Judensäue* in Western Europe and there are still 30 in Germany. They can be found on churches’ facades (the most prominent instances include Roman Catholic as well as Protestant churches), at different heights, as well as in their interior, and some in areas closed to the public.”[56] Campaigns to remove them from public display have proven ineffective. In 1988, on the fiftieth anniversary of *Kristallnacht*, a debate emerged about the fate of the Wittenberg *Judensau*. The decision was taken to let the sculpture remain in place with the addition of a plaque which, among other messages, reminds visitors that six million Jews died “under the sign of the cross.”[57]

Attention to the modern presence of the *Judensau* image has galvanized opposition on both sides of the issue. In German communities “there have been tumultuous demonstrations against such images, accompanied by vitriolic charges of murderous anti-Semitism, on the one hand, and of anti-intellectual, antihistorical image burning, on the other.”[58] Efforts to remove the Wittenberg *Judensau* completely from the site were re-kindled in the lead up to the 500th anniversary in 2017 of Martin Luther’s actions at Wittenberg. They were unsuccessful.[59] Similar attempts to remove the *Judensau* at Regensburg Catholic Cathedral met a similar response: the placement of an “information board” at the site declaring that “The Free State as the owner of the cathedral and the Diocese of Regensburg as the user distance themselves from the anti-Jewish depiction from the late Middle Ages.”[60] The *Judensau* sculpture was not removed and remains on the south-side wall of the cathedral, facing the former Jewish ghetto.

## Remembering the *Judensau*

The *Judensau* image is multifariously offensive: it infantalizes those suckling at the sow’s teat; it violates and profanes laws of *kashrut* which forbid the eating of pork; it associates Jews with animality; it profanes the holy scriptures and the name of God by locating them on the sow’s belly and/or anus; it associates all Jews with Satan and demons; it characterizes all Jews as greedy and lascivious; it implies and/or depicts bestiality. The intention is to humiliate, deride and wound: Birgit Wiedl describes the purpose as dehumanizing Jews by showing them “as a different, and lesser form of being, as offspring of a beast…Thus, the *Judensau* stresses the ‘alien quality’ of the Jews…firmly establishing the distinct notion that Jews simply were ‘another category of beings’, a nonhuman life form.”[61] For medieval artists, “animal images were useful instruments to illustrate the Jews’ intellectual and moral shortcomings. Animal imagery was easily transferred to medieval art and iconography; perhaps best known is the *Judensau* (?Jew‘s Sow) motif.”[62] The use of porcine imagery also allowed an easy transference to children’s play: “The road to the Holocaust was paved by anti-Semitic puppets, showing, for example, Jews transforming to pigs, inculcating into German children an image of the racist insult *Judensau*.”[63]

A precise evaluation of the influence of the *Judensau* on medieval Europeans is difficult to verify. Voigtlander and Voth have detected evidence that the presence of the *Judensau* in a medieval German community fomented violence directed towards Jews in that community. They analysed data on the incidence of pre-bubonic plague pogroms in Germany. They found a “highly consistent and significant pattern of differences” between German places that contained *Judensau* sculptures: “there are no *Judensau* sculptures in localities without a pogrom in 1349.”[64] Caroline Walker Bynum describes the power that existed in the iconographic representation, which extended beyond their impact on personal attitudes:

> The *Judensau* was not merely anti-Semitic propaganda, the conveyer and inducer of attitudes. It effected as well as suggested action. In the early modern period it was placed on the doorways and porches of churches, the gates of cities, and the gables of inns to announce that Jews were unwelcome; it was even thought to ward off their presence in a talismanic way and insure that they would not return from exile.[65]

Bynum thinks of the *Judensau*, not merely as an artwork, but as a talisman or amulet, protecting Christians from the potential influence of Jews and warding off their presence in churches and houses. For her, it is more than a vulgar image; it is a record of hate: "they are horrible objects—evidence for and record of scapegoating, fear of the other, inflicted pain, opportunism, warped devotion, and deep belief."[66]

Scholars debate the extent of the relationship between medieval anti-Jewish antagonisms and the atrocities of the twentieth century. John Phelan provides a balanced assessment of the impact of ancient animosities on modern consciousness:

> Tragically, a straight line can be drawn from Chrysostom and Augustine through Martin Luther and his virulent *On the Jews and Their Lies* to European anti-Semitism and the murder of six million. This is not to discount the rise of secular and anti-religious anti-Semitism, particularly in the late nineteenth century. But it is to insist that this secular anti-Semitism grew in European soil already well plowed and sown with anti-Jewish seed planted and nurtured by Christians.[67]

## Conclusion

The story of the *Judensau* is an illustration of what Mary Boys calls the "troubling tellings" of the Christian tradition—historical narratives that derive from times when church people were not at their best. She says that, for Christians, "experiencing shame at the church's disparagement of the Jews is at least a prelude to a conversion to history. We need to stay with this shame long enough for it to serve as a catalyst for change."[68] In her view, the troubling tellings "invite not only personal grief but also consideration of what it would mean for the church to repent."[69] John Pawlikowski adds that "there is little question that the greatest challenge posed to Christians in dialogue with Judaism is coming to grips with the history of antisemitism….The church will need to commit itself to a complete and honest evaluation of its record in this regard."[70]

A number of scholars and religious leaders has spoken about this process of repentance in terms of the practice of *teshuvah*,[71] a concept from Jewish tradition.[72] Michael Signer has distinguished *teshuvah* and apology: "an apology would be a once and done-with moment. By shifting the term to *Teshuvah*—a Hebrew term—rather than simply using penitence, the Catholic Church is calling for a process. It will be long and it will require many, many years."[73] Significantly for the story of the *Judensau* and representations of the image in current Christian contexts, Signer advises that "*Teshuvah* does not imply forgetting, but the ritualisation of memory so that the deed will not be performed again as it was in the past."[74] Barbara Meyer maintains that "for a widespread popular memory to be changed, multiple processes of examining and retelling the story are necessary."[75]

Caroline Bynum cautions in relation to the *Judensau*, merely explaining, and distancing from, the existence of false history or erasing remaining images is insufficient: "whatever the ultimate goal of tourist pamphlets, artists' protest actions, historical or art historical conferences, or exorcizing liturgies, those involved must recognize that neither erasure nor contextualizing will remove the infamy of such things from memory."[76] Historical correction is not enough. The *Judensau*

challenges Jews and Christians about how we see and remember. These images connect us to our destructive European past. They require response, repentance, return.

[1] Debra Higgs Strickland, “The Jews, Leviticus, and the Unclean in Medieval English Bestiaries,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Antisemitism*, ed. Steven Katz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022), 227, explains “hatted Jews in the place of piglets are shown being suckled by a sow, recalling in a mocking and derisory way the Roman imperial iconography of Romulus and Remus suckled by the she-wolf….The *Judensau* images also implied that contemporary Jews harbored a secret desire to violate the swine ban.”
[2] See an example at: www.tabletmag.com/tags/judensau
[3] See an example at: en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Judensau_Frankfurt.jpg
[4] Armand Lunel, “The Jews of the South of France,” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 89 (2018): 32 explains the origins: “the wearing of the *rouelle*, the badge of shame sewn onto the chest, which had been imposed on the Jews in 1215 by the Lateran Council and gave them the same status as lepers and prostitutes, was reaffirmed in 1227 by the Council of Narbonne and in 1236 by the Council of Béziers.”
[5] For a representation of this image see Henry Abramson, “A Ready Hatred: Depictions of the Jewish Woman in Medieval Antisemitic Art and Caricature,” *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 62 (1996): 5.
[6] Abramson, “A Ready Hatred,” 16-17.
[7] Ruth Mellinkoff, “Riding Backwards: Theme of Humiliation and Symbol of Evil,” *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 4 (1973): 172: “From the fifteenth through the eighteenth century, Jews were depicted in degrading ways mounted backwards on animals, and often they were portrayed holding up the tail of the mount…The label of evil was affixed and its object correspondingly defamed.” Charles Tracy, “The Former Nave and Choir Oak Furnishings, and the West End and South Porch Doors at the Chapel of St Nicholas, King’s Lynn,” in *King’s Lynn and the Fens: Medieval Art and, Architecture and Archaeology*, ed. John McNeill (London: Routledge, 2008), 32 explains how “an unfortunate object of popular derision and hate was seated backwards on his or her mount and…had nothing to hang on with other than the animal’s tale.”
[8] John Chrysostom was born in Antioch and became archbishop of Constantinople and a prolific Christian author. “Chrysostom” was a sobriquet meaning “golden mouthed,” recognizing his talents as a preacher.
[9] John Chrysostom, *Against the Jews. Homily* 1, 4, 1. Available at: www.tertullian.org/fathers/chrysostom_adversus_judaeos_01_homily1.htm Chrysostom violently elevated his attack: “Although such beasts are unfit for work, they are fit for killing. And this is what happened to the Jews: while they were making themselves unfit for work, they grew fit for slaughter.” 2, 6.
[10] Blake Leyerle, “Refuse, Filth, and Excrement in the Homilies of John Chrysostom,” *Journal of Late Antiquity* 2 (2009): 337: Chrysostom “mobilizes disgust in order to deter his congregation from pursuing or admiring elite behaviors.” Wendy Mayer, “Preaching Hatred? John Chrysostom, Neuroscience, and the Jews,” in *Revisioning John Chrysostom: New Approaches, New Perspectives*, eds. Chris de Wet and Wendy Mayer (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 58-136, argues the effect of Chrysostom’s anti-Jewish rants on the behavior and attitudes of his contemporary Christian audience was negligible, even counterproductive. His greater influence was on later generations who found his sermons to be a valuable resource for their own anti-Jewish ideas and activities.
[11] Samantha Zacher, “Jews and Judaizing as Pathologies in the Anglo-Saxon Imagination: Toward a Theory of Early Somatic Anti-Judaism,” in *The Anonymous Old English Homily: Sources, Composition, and Variation*, eds. Winfried Rudolf and Susan Irvine (Leiden: Brill, 2021), 286.
[12] Adele Reinhartz, “New Testament Origins of Christian Anti-Judaism” in *Cambridge Companion to Antisemitism*, 42.
[13] Two texts likely influenced by John 8:44 are Revelation 2:9: “I know your affliction and your poverty, even though you are rich. I know the slander on the part of those who say that they are Jews and are not, but are a synagogue of Satan”. See also Revelation 3:9.
[14] Lionel Steiman, *Paths to Genocide: Antisemitism in Western History* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1998), 27: “In the course of the thirteenth century the satanic image of the Jew was consolidated in the culture of Europe. Fantastic tales of ritual murder, cannibalism, host desecration and similar such outrages became common property. The primary agents of their dissemination, and therefore of antisemitism, were clerics of the new mendicant orders.”
[15] Reinhartz, “New Testament Origins,” 55.
[16] Istvan Czachesz, *The Grotesque Body in Early Christian Discourse: Hell, Scatology, and Metamorphosis* (London: Routledge, 2012), 16.
[17] Anja Grebe, “Inside Out: Scatology in Medieval Art,” in *Scenes of the Obscene: The Non-Representable in Art and Visual Culture, Middle Ages to Today*, eds. Kassandra Nakas and Jessica Ullrich (Weimar: VDG, 2014), 16.
[18] Grebe, “Inside Out,” 21.
[19] Jeff Persels and Russell Ganim, “Scatology, the Last Taboo,” in *Fecal Matters in Early Modern Literature and Art: Studies in Scatology*, eds. Jeff Persels and Russell Ganim (London: Routledge, 2004), xviii.
[20] Persels and Ganim, “Scatology,” xvi.
[21] Alexandra Cuffel, *Gendering Disgust in Medieval Religious Polemic* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007).
[22] Rabanus was a Benedictine monk who became Archbishop of Mainz in East Francia. He was one of the foremost and influential scholars of his era.
[23] Irven Resnick, “Dietary Laws in Medieval Christian-Jewish Polemics: A Survey,” *Studies in Christian-Jewish Relations* 6 (2011): 6.
[24] Xenia Muratova, “Animal Symbolism and Its Interpretations in the Pictorial Programmes of the Illuminated Bestiaries,” *IKON: Journal of Iconographic Studies* 2 (2009): 229-242.
[25] Sarah Phillips, “The Pig in Medieval Iconography,” in *Pigs and Humans*: *10,000 Years of Interaction,* eds. Umberto Albarella, Keith Dobney, Anton Ervynck, and Peter Rowley-Conwy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 374. She reviewed visual representations of the pig in medieval bestiaries “which were used as practical and active texts from which to teach moral instruction by monks.” These instructions made associations between Jews and filth, shame, lust, fantasy, consumption, inspiration, and human identity. Elizabeth Morrison, “The Medieval Bestiary: Text and Illumination,” in *Book of Beasts: The Bestiary in the Medieval World*, ed. Elizabeth Morrison (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2019), 4: “Bestiaries were one of the most popular illuminated book types in Northern Europe from around 1180 to 1300. They portrayed not only imaginary creatures, such as the unicorn, the siren, and the griffin, but also exotic beasts, such as the tiger, the elephant, and the ape, as well as animals common in Europe, including the horse, the dog, and the beaver.”
[26] Andrew Watson, “Art and Propaganda: Historical Depictions of Jewish People,” *Chevarim*, Februa (2022): 7.
[27] Strickland, “The Jews,” 227.
[28] Strickland, “The Jews,” 227-228.
[29] “Mirror of the Swabians.” A legal code written by a Franciscan friar in Augsburg c. 1275. Scholars dispute how prescriptive and widespread this practice was in German courts. A comprehensive survey of opinions is supplied by Andreas Lehnertz, “The Erfurt *Judeneid* between Pragmatism and Ritual: Some Aspects of Christian and Jewish Oath-Taking in Medieval Germany,” in *Ritual Objects in Ritual Contexts*, eds. Claudia Bergemann and Maria Sturzebecher (Erfurt: Bussert & Stadeler, 2020), 12-31.
[30] Birgit Wiedl, “Anti-Jewish Legislation in the Middle Ages” in *Confronting Antisemitism through the Ages: A Historical Perspective. Volume 3*, eds. Armin Lange, Kerstin Mayerhofer, Dina Porat, and Lawrence Schiffman (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021), 204.
[31] Simona Cohen, “Animal Imagery in Renaissance Art,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 67 (2014): 175 explains how Renaissance artists “perpetuated the symbolic contexts of ancient and medieval animal symbolism that was disguised under the veil of genre, religious or mythological narrative, and scientific naturalism.”
[32] Alison Stewart, “Man’s Best Friend?: Dogs and Pigs in Early Modern Germany,” *Faculty Publications and Creative Activity, School of Art, Art History and Design*, 23 (2014): 21: “pigs and dogs ran loose in early modern Europe….Both pigs and dogs were common occurrences in such streets where they found much to eat, thus they were familiar to early modern man and woman.” Jamie Kreiner, *Legions of Pigs in the Early Medieval West* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2020), 34: “pigs were nearly everywhere in the early medieval west.”
[33] Kreiner, *Legions of Pigs*, 43.

[34] Stewart, “Man’s Best Friend,” 34.
[35] Nico Voigtlander and Hans-Joachim Voth, “Persecution Perpetuated: The Medieval Origins of Anti-Semitic Violence in Nazi Germany,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 127 (2012): 1341: “Churches from Cologne to Brandenburg displayed (and many still display) a *Judensau*...The same type of sculpture can also be found in Poland, Sweden, Switzerland, France, and the Low Countries.” Developments in the French Middle Ages have been chronicled by Claudine Fabre-Vassas, *Jews, Christians, and the Pig* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997). A Swedish example is described in Anders Andren, “The *Judensau* in Uppsala” in *Myth, Magic, and Memory in Early Scandinavian Narrative Culture*, eds. Jürg Glauser and Pernille Hermann (Turnhout: Brepols, 2021), 351-370.
[36] Daniel Leeson, “*Judensau* 2010,” *Journal for the Study of Antisemitism* 2 (2010): 393.
[37] Jay Geller, *Bestiarum Judaicum: Unnatural Histories of the Jews* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2017), 35.
[38] Maya Balakirski-Katz, “Émile Zola, the Cochonnerie of Naturalist Literature, and the *Judensau*,” *Jewish Social Studies* 13 (2006): 119-120.
[39] Christine Magin and Falk Eisermann, “Two Anti-Jewish Broadsides from the Late Fifteenth Century,” *Studies in the History of Art* 75 (2009): 192.
[40] A print of the Frankfurt *Judensau* housed in the British Museum collection is available at: www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/P_1876-0510-518 The curator’s notes explain the print “was until 1801 on the Old Bridge Tower in Frankfurt am Main. The subject refers to the alleged ritual murder of Simon of Trent in 1475, here wrongly given as 1476. The saint was one of the most celebrated child martyrs alleged to have been killed by Jews. The story is an example of Blood Libel which was a widespread anti-Semitic myth within medieval Christian Europe.”
[41] Geller, *Bestiarum Judaicum*, 36. Simon of Trent was a two-year old Christian boy whose body was allegedly found in a sewer underneath a Jewish family’s house in Trent, Italy at Easter 1475. This fabrication spread widely throughout Europe from the turn of the sixteenth century setting in motion a propaganda campaign, aided by the printing press, that became one of the most damaging “blood libels” against Jews in Early Modern Europe. See, Emily Pothast, “Magic, Money, Ink, and Blood,” in *Religious Dimensions of Conspiracy Theories: Comparing and Connecting Old and New Trends*, eds. Francesco Piraino, Marco Pasi, and Egil Asprem (London: Routledge, 2023), 31-56; Emanuele D’Antonio, “Jewish Intellectuals and the ‘Martyrdom’ of Simon of Trent in Habsburg Restoration Italy: Anti-Semitism, Relics and Historical Criticism,” in *Public Uses of Human Remains and Relics in History*, eds. Silvia Cavicchioli and Luigi Provero (New York: Routledge, 2020), 80-96.
[42] Amos Elon, *The Pity of It All: A Portrait of Jews in Germany* 1743-1933 (London: Penguin, 2002), 14
[43] Elon, *The Pity of It All*, 14.
[44] Isaiah Shachar, *The Judensau: A Medieval Anti-Jewish Motif and Its History* (London: Warburg, 1974), 63. See also, John Davis*, The Victorians and Germany* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2007).
[45] Balakirski-Katz, “Émile Zola,”, 120.
[46] Robert Michael, *A History of Catholic Antisemitism: The Dark Side of the Church* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 40. Abramson, “A Ready Hatred,” 8: “Iconographic materials, intended to convey the subtleties of Catholic dogma to the illiterate, employed a complex array of symbols to simultaneously educate, entertain, and inspire the viewer.”
[47] Quoted in Michael Wolffson, *Eternal Guilt?: Forty Years of German-Jewish-Israeli Relations* (New York: University of Columbia Press, 1993), 194.
[48] Debra Kaplan, “Martin Luther and the Reformation” in *Cambridge Companion to Antisemitism*, 273.
[49] Andreas Loewe and Katherine Firth, *Martin Luther and the Arts: Music, Images and Drama to Promote the Reformation* (Leiden: Brill, 2022), 9. They claim his “strong condemnation of Jews and Jewish culture was used by later German administrations to justify anti-Semitism.” Balakirski-Katz, “Émile Zola,” 122: “To Luther’s readers, the Jewish literary tradition became the original source of all religious and political perversion.” See also Isaac Kalimi, “The Position of Martin Luther toward Jews and Judaism: Historical, Social and Theological Avenues*,” Journal of Religion*, 103 (2023): 456: “Hatred of the Jews was not new to sixteenth-century Germany. However, it never reached such a climax as in Luther’s case.”
[50] Quoted in Ursula Rudnik, “Early Modern Hate Speech: Martin Luther’s Anti-Semitism Responses and Reactions,” *Cross Currents* 67 (2017): 429.
[51] Jeremy Cohen, *Christkillers: The Jews and the Passion from the Bible to the Big Screen* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 208.
[52] William Brustein and Ryan King, “Anti-Semitism in Europe before the Holocaust,” *International Political Science Review*, 25 (2020): 35-53.
[53] David Livingstone Smith, *Making Monsters: The Uncanny Power of Dehumanization* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2021), 198.
[54] Robert Michael and Karin Doerr, *Nazi Deutsch/Nazi German: An English Lexicon of the Language of the Third Reich* (London: Greenwood Press, 2002), 226. See also: “*Judenschwein*. Jew-pig. Derogatory term often used by the SS when addressing Jews.” See also, James Wald “Antisemitism in Germany” in The Routledge History of Antisemitism, eds. Mark Weitzman, Robert Williams and James Wald (London: Routledge, 2023), 126-142.
[55] Smith, *Making Monsters*, 197. Smith explains how “the *Judensau* was often featured in Nazi propaganda. In one cartoon published in the gutter-press Nazi newspaper *Der Sturmer* in 1934, prominent Jewish intellectuals Albert Einstein, Magnus Hirschfeld, Alfred Kerr, Thomas Mann, and Erich Maria Remarque are portrayed sucking milk from a sow, with the caption “Although the pig is dead, its piglets are yet to be eliminated.”
[56] Sarah-Lea Effert and Charlotte Püttmann, “Negotiating Sculptures Through In_Visibilities: The Case of Anti-Semitic Reliefs in German Churches,” *On_Culture: The Open Journal for the Study of Culture* 13 (2022): 3. Heidi Keller, “The Chosen Creatures: How Animal Juxtapositions in Antisemitic Propaganda Contributed to Institutionalized Otherness” (Thesis, University of Gothenburg, 2023), 16 says that examples of *Judensau* sculptures presently exist in “Heiligenstadt, Kelheim, Cologne, Regensburg, Wittenberg, Nordhausen, Erfurt, Freising, Heilsbronn, Frankfurt and Zerbst in Germany; Wiener Neustadt in Austria; Basel in Switzerland; Metz and Colmar in France; Gniezno in Poland; Bratislava in Slovakia, and in Uppsala in Sweden.”
[57] Billie Lopez and Peter Hirsch, *Traveler’s Guide to Jewish Germany* (New York: Pelican, 1998), 260.
[58] Caroline Walker Bynum, “The Presence of Objects: Medieval Anti-Judaism in Modern Germany,” *Common Knowledge* 10 (2004): 12.
[59] Carol Schaeffer, “Hatred in Plain Sight,” *Smithsonian Magazine*, October (2020). Available from: www.smithsonianmag.com/history/germany-nazism-medieval-anti-semitism-plain-sight-180975780/
[60] “Germany: New Information Board for the Abusive Depiction of *Judensau* at Regensburg Cathedral,” MENA Report, January (2023). Available at: www.proquest.com/docview/2769512395
[61] Birgit Wiedl, “Laughing at the Beast: The Judensau: Anti-Jewish Propaganda and Humor from the Middle Ages to the Early Modern Period,” in *Laughter in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times: Epistemology of a Fundamental Human Behavior, Its Meaning, and Consequences*, ed. Albrecht Classen (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), 346.
[62] Resnick, “Dietary Laws,” 4.
[63] Matthew Isaac Cohen, “Introduction: Attitudes toward the Other,” in *Representing Alterity through Puppetry and Performing Objects*, eds. John Bell, Matthew Isaac Cohen, and Jungmin Song (2023), 1. Available at: digitalcommons.lib.uconn.edu/ballinst_alterity/18
[64] Voigtlander and Voth, “Persecution Perpetuated,” 1377.
[65] Caroline Walker Bynum, *Dissimilar Similitudes: Devotional Objects in Late Medieval Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), 162.
[66] Bynum, *Dissimilar Similitudes*, 180.
[67] John Phelan, “The Land of Israel and the Problem of Supersessionism” in *A Land Full of God: Christian Perspectives on the Holy Land*, ed. Mae Elise Cannon (Eugene: Cascade Books, 2017), 77.
[68] Mary Boys*, Redeeming Our Sacred Story: The Death of Jesus and Relations between Jews and Christians* (Mahwah: Paulist Press, 2013), 245.
[69] Boys, *Redeeming*, 245.
[70] John Pawlikowski, “Historical Memory and Christian-Jewish Relations” in *Christ Jesus and the Jewish People Today: New Explorations of Theological Interrelationships*, eds. Philip Cunningham, Joseph Sievers, Mary Boys, Hans Herman Henrix and Jesper Svartvik (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 24.
[71] Pontifical Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, *We Remember: A Reflection in the Shoah*. (1998): “The Catholic Church desires to express her deep sorrow for the failures of her sons and daughters in every age. This is an act of repentance (*teshuva*), since, as members of the Church, we are linked to the sins as well as the merits of her children.” Katharina von Kellenbach “Repenting for Antisemitism: ‘To Elevate Evil into a State of Goodness’,” *Studies in Christian-Jewish Relations* 16 (2021): 19: “Repentance is about a future which is not condemned to repeat, over and over again, the same old patterns. Repentance means that when synagogues are attacked, non-Jews show up in the streets to show solidarity. Repentance means standing with the victims this time.” Louis Newman, *Repentance: The Meaning and Practice of Teshuvah* (Woodstock: Jewish Lights Publishing, 2010). Henry Abramson, *Maimonides on Teshuvah: The Ways of Repentance*, (2017). Available at: touroscholar.touro.edu/lcas_books/1
[72] Anthony Gittins, “‘They Set Out at Once and Returned (Luke 24:33)’,” *Australasian Catholic Record* 92 (2015): 354: “*Teshuvah* is the word for repentance and conversion. Its root is *shub*, which means ‘to return home’, and it implies an act of conscious awareness and willingness to make a commitment to the future.”

[73] Michael Signer, “On Christian *Teshuvah*: The Open Heart of the Jewish People,” in *Jewish-Christian Relations: A Textbook for Australian Students*, ed. Maurice Ryan (Melbourne: David Lovell Publishing, 2004), 153.
[74] Signer, “On Christian Teshuvah,” 156
[75] Barbara Meyer, *Jesus the Jew in Christian Memory: Theological and Philosophical Explorations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 33.
[76] Bynum, *Dissimilar Similitudes*, 181.

**Dr Maurice Ryan** holds a Ph.D. from Boston College. He works as an author, publisher and lecturer in Brisbane, Australia. He edited, *Jewish-Christian Relations: A Textbook for Australian Students*, which included contributions from Rabbi Michael Signer and Cardinal Edward Cassidy. He works with teachers and university students in the areas of biblical education, Jewish-Christian relations, and Church history and has published books and articles on these topics.