

Theological confrontation with Christianity's success

The success of the Christians in defeating the Muslims in the Holy Land, conquering it and establishing a Christian colony there, particularly in the Holy City of Jerusalem, was a harsh blow to the Jews from a theological viewpoint. The theological difficulty, which emerged during the course of the twelfth century, became a central issue, one which also affected the status of voluntary converts to Christianity. The Jewish sources are ominously silent concerning the conquest of the Holy Land by Christians and the establishment of a Christian city in Jerusalem. From the viewpoint of twelfth-century Jewry, there was no point in publicizing this fact, which reinforced the powerful Christian theological claim that their victories and worldly success were proof that God had abandoned the Jewish people and now supported the Christian side. In reading Jewish sources from the twelfth century, one is hard put to find even an echo of the historical events which occurred in the Land of Israel. The chronicles describing the First Crusade relate to events in Europe alone, leaving the reader with the impression that the Crusaders moved eastward, where they were stopped and slaughtered by their Christian brethren. There is no reference to the fact that in July 1099 Jerusalem was conquered decisively by the Christians. Anyone reading the Jewish chronicles of the Second Crusade gains the impression they speak of European matters and of movements within that continent. Only after Saladin defeated the Christians at the Battle of the Horns of Hattin (Karnei-Hittin) in 1187 does the Jewish reader discover that there were Christians in Palestine and that they were defeated by the Muslims, who slaughtered them and stole their sacred objects.¹

Nevertheless, one may find an echo of the Jewish theological frustration in light of the political situation and the Christian victories. In only one source, that of R. Yitzhak ben Saadya, does the author of the *piyyut* depict

this problem in a heartfelt manner, without any attempt at concealment. The *piyyut*, *Eikh ukhal lavo eilekha* ('How can I come before You'), has survived in the collection of *Selihot* recited by Ashkenazic Jews during the Ten Days of Penitence between Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur.² In this *piyyut*, as in most liturgical poems of this genre, the Jewish believer bewails the situation of Exile, of the Jews being miserable and downtrodden, dwelling among the Gentiles, yet longing for closeness to God. In addition, the author emphasizes the theological tension between his Judaism and the success of the surrounding Christianity, particularly that related to the conquest of the Land of Israel by the Christians. In my opinion, this *piyyut* was written in Europe during the course of the twelfth century, as the Christians are described there as a proud nation, its people considering themselves wise men, dwelling in security, joy, and comfort, and mocking the Jews. Here, for the first time, there is also an allusion to the Christian conquest of the Holy Land.

The Christians are referred to in this *piyyut* as *ovdei zulatekha* ('those who serve [a divinity] other than You'—i.e., those generally referred to as idolaters). This is a striking expression, which immediately guides the reader towards the central-most place in the prayer: 'O Lord, there is none like You, and there is no God other than You' [זולתך] (a quotation from 1 Chronicles 17:20). This verse is associated with a midrash which draws a connection between the word 'other than You' and the compulsion to worship idols.³ The midrash links this verse in turn to Isaiah 26:13, 'O Lord our God, we have been swallowed by masters other than You,' seeking a connection between these two verses in which the word *zulatekha*, 'apart from You,' appears. The midrash's answer is: 'They demanded of us to serve their idolatry, like a husband who demands intercourse of his wife.' The Christians, says the *paytan*, not only prevent the Jews from observing their religion, but seek to remove them from it, and thereby separate them from their God.⁴

According to the author, the Christian theological claim is that at this point they are wearing 'My garment'—i.e., the glorious garment of the people of Israel—and are eating 'milk and honey' (an expression mentioned twenty-six times in the Bible in connection with the Land of Israel), being chosen by God. Our author describes a situation in which the Jews are surrounded by both Muslims and Christians, and he explicitly mentions the Christian claim that the verse, 'The greater shall serve the younger' (Genesis 25:23) is part of the punishment of the Jews. The Christians refer to 'a man who has never prophesied' as a prophet, but in his name they make a great and mighty army, proud of its military ability; they have

kings and dominions and are victorious everywhere. Their situation proves the Christians' claim that the Jews are weak, dispersed, without rule or 'government,' subject to the hands of Gentiles who do not understand their language. Our poetic author knows that their truth is derived not only from the successful place of the Christians in the world, but also from the fact that the circumstances of Judaism and Jews are similar to those described in the prophecies of wrath in the Torah. At the climax of the poem, the author describes the unbelievable situation ('Who would believe?') according to which 'those who hate purity'—i.e., the Christians—dwell in the Land of Israel, are wealthy and secure, and occupy the Temple site ('dwell in My Sanctuary').

The *piyyut* is composed of eleven stanzas, each one of which consists of three lines describing the success of the Christians, while the fourth emphasizes the miserable situation of the Jews. The Christians are powerful, victorious, wise, knowledgeable, enjoy rule and government, are wealthy, and dwell (he uses the verb *shokhen*, associated with the Temple!) in the palace of the Jew (i.e., Jerusalem). On the other hand, while the Jew has not abandoned his God, neither is he close to God ('I have not been called to go to the king'). He is like a docile lamb, ignorant and without knowledge, within the Exile, childless and bereft, shamed, impoverished, and beaten. The author concludes with a prayer for the future coming of the House of the Lord.⁵

Even if we assume that this literary example is not complete, it is impossible to ignore that, from the middle of the twelfth century on, Jewish leadership anticipated a concrete danger of Jewish conversion to Christianity arising, not from the violent struggle of the Christians against Judaism but rather from their ability to persuade and to convince. The success of Christianity led to the phenomenon of Jews who converted to Christianity of their own free will, of a type whom the Jews could no longer label as 'forced converts.' During the course of the twelfth century we find evidence of such converts to Christianity in the Jewish sources.

One such example appears in an inquiry addressed to Rabbi Ya'akov ben Meir, Rabbenu Tam (ca. 1100–71, Ramerupt, northern France), asking whether the *get* (divorce writ) of a convert should bear his Jewish name only, or his new Christian name as well. This was obviously a family in which the husband alone had decided to convert, while his wife remained Jewish. Rabbenu Tam's response draws attention to the fact that conversion to Christianity had become a part of Jewish life. He writes that 'more than twenty writs of divorce (*gittin*) of converts were made in Paris and France.' In order to provide the questioner with an example related to his conclusion

regarding the names of the converts, R. Tam notes, as if in passing, the names of two apostates hailing from different towns: 'Did you ever hear of a convert named Asher of Cologne or Avran of Sens?' His answer implies that these were converts from prominent families, that he knew of cases from Germany as well, and that the general public related to these converts to Christianity by labeling them with derogatory names or nicknames in order to avoid calling them by their new Christian names. And, although twenty divorce writs for converts is a very substantial number, this tells us nothing about the totality of converts, but only of those who agreed to give a *get* to their wives who had remained within the fold of Judaism. Indeed, there were also converts who refused to grant their wives a *get*, and still other cases in which the entire family converted. In any event, in small communities such as those discussed here, twenty bills of divorce is an extremely significant number, attesting to an extensive, although not mass, phenomenon.⁶

Such conversion to Christianity was a new phenomenon. Jews rushed to convert to Christianity, were convinced of its truth, and were also interested in convincing their former brethren (i.e., the Jews) of the truth of Christianity. Fortunately, we have the testimony of a Jew who converted to Christianity during this specific time period. Yehuda-Herman was a Jew born in the city of Cologne in 1107, about one decade after the destruction of its Jewish community during the First Crusade; he was baptized as a Christian in Cologne in 1128, and became a monk in the Kapenberg monastery. In 1148, twenty years after his conversion, he wrote his autobiography. This work has been extensively studied, both because of its rarity as the confession of a Jew who converted and explained his motives, and because it is among the earliest examples of the autobiographical genre. Our interest in it in the context of the present study is not related to either of these two aspects but rather to the question of the attitude of the Jewish group towards the apostate and the reasons he cites for his conversion. In 1988, Avraham Saltman raised the possibility that this work was an educational fiction—that is, a work written by monks in order to convince the reader of the truth of Christianity. Most scholars do not accept this theory, and I likewise tend to believe that the contents of this work are authentic in substance, although one cannot completely ignore the points raised by Saltman regarding the educational aim of the work.⁷

For our purposes, there are a number of important points emphasized by Yehuda-Herman in his story. One is that his basic sense of repugnance towards his brethren, his family, and his Jewish relatives derived from the Jews' love of profit and their lust for money and property. Secondly,

it is clear from his story that from the moment his relatives identified his tendency towards Christianity, they kept their eyes on him to prevent him drawing closer. However, it would seem that the youth's anger and his own personal fears affected his mature writing so that those sections seem particularly vivid, but it does seem reasonable to assume that those in his immediate Jewish environment kept an eye on him from the moment they began to suspect his religious deviation.

According to his account, at age thirteen he had a dream filled with awesome grandeur and extremely significant, to which he attributes the beginning of his transition to Christianity. He saw a king approaching him and giving him an impressive white horse, an elaborate belt, a bag of silk, and heavy gold coins. The king preferred him above all the members of his own nobility, rode in his company, and even ate with him from the same plate. This dream made a deep impression upon him, but when he told it to one of his relatives, who was 'a man of authority among the Jews,' the latter interpreted it as signs of material success—a beautiful woman who would be his wife, great wealth, and worldly honor. In the story, Herman emphasizes that the interpretation of the dream by the Jew was consistent with the Jewish characteristic (Romans 8:5) of interpreting everything in terms of the pursuit of wealth. As a Christian, he was convinced that the correct interpretation of the dream was the appearance of Divine grace, which was given him by the 'Christian' God. In order to prove this, he tells of his trip at age twenty to Mainz for purposes of trade, and his encounter there with the prince-bishop of Münster, Egbert. He was so impressed by the bishop's personality that he gave him a loan without taking any collateral. When this became known to the Jews, they cursed and reviled him, as he ought to have taken a collateral twice the size of the loan; the Jews forced him to return to the bishop in order to get either the money or the pledge, as required. The mature author states here that 'the Jews are all completely enslaved to business.' The Christians whom he meets along his path are utterly different. The bishop's helper, a man named Rikmar, foregoes the gifts he has received and gives them to him. Moreover, Yehuda-Herman, the classical Christianizer, emphasizes that he was also impressed by the miracles that enabled him to decide on his path, but that the Christian bishop was interested that a Jew would convert to Christianity because he was convinced of the truth of Christianity, out of faith and not due to the influence of a miracle.

The second point is emphasized in his description of the contrast between the pressured, frightening, and vulgar Jewish atmosphere and the calm, innocent and accepting atmosphere among the Christians. The Jews

are afraid to let him be free, and hire an elderly man to accompany him wherever he goes on his trip to the bishop, to keep an eye on him, and to report back to his family about his actions. And indeed, that is what the person did. When Herman returned to Cologne and the bishop of course paid his debt, the suspicions of the ‘carnal’ Jews were disproven. His escort, who had accused him of becoming friendly with Christians and listening to them, is promptly punished by God with a vengeance, becoming ill and suffering a terribly painful death. The Jews continue to follow him, and connect him with their own destiny by forcing him to marry a young girl whom he had betrothed. When they see that he refrains from coming to the synagogue, they attempt to kill him, sending letters denigrating him to Mainz, where he is to flee in the future. In his book, the apostate Yehuda-Herman not only confirms that there were apostate Jews who converted to Christianity of their own free will, but describes in a striking way the atmosphere of tension and suspicion that existed in the Jewish community regarding this phenomenon.

The tendency towards fascination with Christianity likewise emerges from a Jewish source from the end of the twelfth century in England, which speaks of the suicide of a ‘venerable and very wealthy Talmud scholar who studied in the yeshiva, R. Yom Tov,’ who killed himself on the eve of Shavuot. We are told by this source that this Yom Tov was harassed by a demon who showed him the form of ‘warp and woof’—i.e., the cross—and tried to persuade him to engage in idolatry. The source adds that Yom Tov’s father, upon hearing of this, did not leave his room, did not interrupt his studies, and did not shed a single tear. The father’s behavior may have been because of the son’s suicide, which is prohibited according to halakhah or, what seems more likely, as an expression of the problematic nature of this son, who was evidently ‘fascinated’ by Christianity and drew close to it, a phenomenon described by the author in terms of a demon attacking the young son.⁸

Many scholars have noted that the Jews of the Middle Ages lived among Christians and were familiar with the Christian religion, and that it fascinated and tempted them. The struggle against the attraction of Christianity, with which the Jews had to contend, was the outcome of fear and the desire to integrate into society and succeed economically, as well as theological persuasion. Several scholars have dealt with this issue and invoked various proofs in support of their views. Here I wish to deal with an interesting source which, I believe, can illustrate this phenomenon very well. I refer to a commentary by Rabbi Abraham ben R. Azriel (thirteenth century) on a *piyyut* by R. Solomon ben Judah ha-Bavli, which

appears in R. Abraham's book, *Arugat ha-Bosem*. Rabbi Solomon ha-Bavli (mid-tenth century) evidently lived in northern Italy, although his family was of Oriental origin. When R. Abraham saw this *piyyut* it was already accompanied by commentary, but he added another level of interpretation. In other words, we have here at least three layers: the first, the *piyyut* of R. Solomon ha-Bavli; the second, the commentary ascribed to R. Joseph Kara that preceded that of R. Abraham; and the third, Rabbi Abraham's thirteenth-century interpretation.

The *piyyut*, entitled *Ahashvah la-Da'at Amal* ('I shall consider [think about] knowing labor'), is of the *zulat* type which was recited by the leader and congregation on Shabbat Bereshit, the Sabbath on which the cycle of reading the Torah was renewed. The *piyyut* alludes to the human tendency to absorb the wonders of one's surroundings.

The first commentator phrased his interpretation of the word 'to absorb' in an amazing way: 'Even though my mind absorbs the magic of the Christian surroundings, and it penetrates my being as a flame and tempts me to follow it, my closeness to God comforts me and prevents me from succumbing to it.' This interpretation was obviously written before the thirteenth century. Rabbi Abraham's response was that there is nothing surprising about the words of the previous commentator because, in the end, he emphasizes that his closeness to God triumphs over any temptation or false magic. He cites Rashi's commentary on a verse in Psalm 73, stating that God confronts His people with difficult and terrible situations in order to reward them with the life of the World to Come. Moreover, he stresses that jealousy and temptation come from observing the serenity in which the Christians live. This interpretation again underscores just how tempting Christianity was and the extent to which the Jews had to contend with it and its temptations. Only the believer's closeness to God can save him from this temptation.

As Jordan notes in an important article, an interesting characteristic of these converts to Christianity is their age. We are dealing here with the conversion of educated young people from good families.⁹ One cannot ignore the fact that, from the middle of the twelfth century on, the Jewish leadership anticipated a concrete danger of Jewish conversion that would stem not from the violent struggle of Christianity against Judaism, but rather from its ability to fascinate and to persuade.

Against this tendency, there developed among the Jews in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries a polemical literature intended for internal purposes, a special section of which is devoted to the matter of apostates. It was clear to the authors of this polemical literature that at that time

there were apostate Jews among the Christians, and that it was they who taught the Christians the arguments of the Jews. The polemical books fulfill a three-fold function: to strengthen Jews against Christian arguments, to serve as propaganda against converts to Christianity, and to persuade apostates to return to Judaism.¹⁰

The author of *Sefer Yosef ha Mekane*, R. Joseph ben Nathan Official, who lived in twelfth-century France, describes the character of the ‘theological’ convert as perceived by the Jews. He wrote this book in reaction to the Christians (monks, priests, bishops, a pope, members of certain orders, and disreputable characters) and apostates who attempted to convince Jews to convert to Christianity. ‘The transgressors, members of our nation, have abandoned the source of living waters [their faith], to pursue vacuity, to boast that they are the prophets of truth, to exalt the name of Jesus, to pay heed to falsehoods.’ To R. Joseph it was clear that these apostates had been indoctrinated by Christianity. They were ‘orthodox in their worship of idols’ (*avodah zarah*), believing in the Christian ‘truth’ with all their heart, and hoping to convince the Jews of the truth of the ‘dead one’ (i.e., Jesus).

Among other things, these converts attempted to persuade the Jews of the doctrine of the Trinity and the truth of the ‘New Testament,’ and to convince them that the Virgin Mary was the mother of Jesus, that Jesus was the Messiah, that he had come, that God had turned away from the people of Israel, that they were no longer the chosen people, and even that the Christians were physically beautiful while the Jews were offensive. They argued about Rashi’s commentaries, about the problem of evil in the world, about Mary’s having corrected the wrong done by Eve, about the forbidden foods and, of course, they claimed enthusiastically that the Hebrew Bible, particularly the Song of Songs, contained hints of Jesus’ coming, that the Torah has been abrogated by the coming of Jesus, and that God was no longer interested in the repentance of the Jews.¹¹

Sefer Nizzahon Vetus, or the ‘Old Book of Polemic,’ is an anthology of attacks on Christian belief and its principles or, as its subtitle has it, ‘A critique of the Gospels and Christianity.’ The book is organized according to the order of chapters of the Hebrew Bible and includes most of the books of the Bible as well as extensive reference to the New Testament. It was written at the end of the thirteenth century, and based upon earlier collections which were written in Germany and in northern France.¹² But the role of the apostate is not the main focus of *Nizzahon Vetus* as it is in *Sefer Yosef ha Mekane*. Rather, the description of the convert serves here as an antithesis to the Jew who remains faithful to his God: “And I will purge out from among you the rebels and transgressors” (Ezekiel 20:38)—these

are the apostates who accept their defiling baptism, rebelling against God and denying him.' The apostate is described as an 'evil Jew' whose aim is to eat any food, to drink any wine, to whore and 'to relinquish the yoke of heaven, no longer to have any fear, to free himself from all commandments and to become contaminated with sins, and lapse, woe unto him, into the life of the moment; we should therefore, not be surprised by his evil deeds.' The convert is even accused, like the Christians and 'evil ones,' of preventing the end of the Exile and its sufferings.¹³

Nizzahon Vetus gives sharp expression to the aggression and feelings of disgust towards the convert to Christianity. The aggressiveness and extremism in the book relate to the apostates who have converted to Christianity and are now playing an active part in the polemic itself, where they represent Christian ideas and what they present as proofs for the correctness of Christianity and its theological superiority to Judaism.

The author cites those verses and subjects which are specifically brought by the apostate. For example, they attempt to prove the Christian truth by invoking the verse 'until Shiloh comes and to him' (Genesis 49:10), in which Shiloh represents Jesus.¹⁴ Similarly, the very use in the Torah of the word *Elohim*, in the plural, is taken up to confirm the Christian claim that God is both father and son.¹⁵ The author suggests to his Jewish readers a linguistic answer to this claim that puts to ridicule the Christians' distorted understanding, as it is well known that out of respect one habitually addresses kings and nobility using the plural form; all the more so God.

The author likewise cites the claim, or 'proof,' of the apostates that the phrase used by God, 'Let us make man' (Genesis 1:26) proves the doctrine of God as both father and son. Here he presents the decisive response given by Jews against those who convert to Christianity, an answer made up of two components: the one explaining the context and the other ridiculing the Christian approach which the converts had taken upon themselves. On the first level, the author explains that God's words, 'Let us make' are addressed to the spirit that God breathes into the soil/dust which comes from the earth.¹⁶ On the second level, he composes a mocking and satirical story containing an ironic dialogue between the 'Father'—i.e., God—and His 'son,' Jesus:

Indeed, the matter is as you say. The father told the son 'My son, help me, and let you and I make a man.' However, the son rebelled and did not wish to help his father, and so the father made man alone without the son's help, as it is written 'and God created man,' with a singular rather than a plural verb. Consequently, the father became angry with his son and said, 'If the

time should come when you need my assistance, I shall not help you just as you have not helped me.' So when the day came for the son to be stoned and hanged, he cried out in a bitter voice 'My Lord, my Lord, why have you forsaken me? Why are you so far from saving me ... ?' and he begged for his help [Matt. 27:46]. Then the father told him, 'When I asked you to help me make man, you rebelled against me and did not come to the aid of the Lord, and so my own power availed me and I made him without you. Now you too help yourself, for I shall not come to your aid.'¹⁷

Beyond the level of theological debate with those who had been convinced by Christianity, there clearly emerges here the anger against converts to Christianity who made use of knowledge they had acquired when they were Jews, from Jewish sources and especially from the Talmud, in order to attack the arguments of the Jews in a fallacious manner, thereby proving their mistaken approach. The anger and sense of disgust relate to this double betrayal. For example, in Genesis 47:31 it is told that the dying Jacob bowed down upon his bed. The apostate, referring to the word 'bed,' *mitah*, which is written without the letter *yod*, and thus may be read as identical to *mateh*, 'staff,' inferred that the dying Jacob bowed down to the cross resting at the head of his bed. He exploits his knowledge of the Talmud regarding the issue of how words are to be interpreted—i.e., whether the text may be read without regard to the traditional vocalization, thereby proving, as it were, that the Torah itself alludes to the existence of the cross to which Jacob bowed:¹⁸

The apostates say that 'If there is a mother [i.e., authoritative basis] to the tradition[al reading],' then one should consider the fact that in the verse 'Then Israel bowed at the head of the bed' [Gen. 47:31], the Hebrew word for bed (*mittah*) is written without a *yod* and can therefore be read *matteh*, which means staff. Consequently, it is probable that it was customary to place a cross at the head of dying men, and it was to the cross that Jacob bowed.¹⁹

The convert likewise makes use of his knowledge of the manner in which one ought to write a Torah scroll, according to which there are certain letters that are written in a larger form than others—e.g., in Deuteronomy 32:6, in the phrase *Ha la-Shem tigmelu zot*, in which the letter *Heh* (which has a numerical value of five) is written larger than the other letters. According to the apostate, this is intended as an allusion to the five wounds of Jesus, and to his death.

Why is the *heh* of the word *Ha Ladonai* ('Is it to the Lord?') in the phrase,

'Is it to the Lord that you requite this?' [Deut. 32:6] written large? It must refer to the five (*heh*) wounds that you inflicted upon the hanged one.²⁰

The author notes that the apostates make use of a typical midrashic method in order to attach verses to one another, to create a message that supports Christianity:

A certain apostate said: It is written 'For it is your life and longevity' [Deut 30:20]; thus the Torah is called life. It is also written, 'And your life shall be hung before you' [Deut. 28:26]—this refers to the fact that the hanged one is life.²¹

Some primary sources also deal with the fact that former apostates lived in the same communities as members of the Jewish group. The severe attitude towards the apostates and the hostility towards the act of conversion may be seen in the language and images by which they are described in these sources. The use of harsh imagery in internal Jewish texts to attack explicitly Christian symbols, such as Jesus, churches, etc., is a specifically Jewish response.²² The discussion below will focus on this imagery in connection with the ceremony of conversion, baptism, and especially the instrument of conversion—water. More than anything else, the ceremony of baptism characterizes the creation of the new Christian, whether as an infant entering the world of Christian belief or an adult being baptized as a Christian.²³ In the Jewish descriptions of the First Crusade written in the first half of the twelfth century in Germany and northern France, and in Jewish apologetics written in the thirteenth century, such as *Sefer Yosef ha Mekane* and *Sefer Nizzahon Vetus*, the baptismal water, the ultimate Christian symbol, is always described as dirty, foul smelling, disgusting, and evil. More than anything else, these epithets express what the authors sought to impart to their readers about the process of conversion to Christianity.²⁴

Although the Jews looked upon this, as well as other Christian ceremonies, with great skepticism, they had to deal with several complex theological issues in connection with it. The Christians in the time of Justin Martyr find support for the ceremony of baptism in the Bible, where immersion is regarded as a means of absolution from sins, and in which two miracles happen to the people of Israel in connection with water: the parting of the Red Sea and the crossing into the Land of Israel via the River Jordan. Both *Sefer Yosef ha Mekane* and *Nizzahon Vetus* deal with the Christian perception of the Israelites' crossing of the Red Sea as the baptism of the Jews. The basis for this notion is found in the Augustinian image that views the Christians as persecuted by sin until they are baptized and cleansed,

just as the Egyptians pursued the Israelites until they became baptized as they crossed the Red Sea. As noted by the author of *Nizzahon Vetus*: ‘Here the heretics say that all Israel was baptized in the sea in accordance with their impure practice.’ Furthermore, the Christians note that it was not Moses who brought the Israelites into the Land of Israel, but Joshua who led them across the River Jordan. The Christians use this biblical episode to persuade the Jews of the power of baptism under the leadership of Joshua/Jesus. This is even more significant as the main element of Moses’ legacy, circumcision, was eliminated from that of Joshua/Jesus, whose main symbol is baptism.²⁵

The Jewish interpretations, which attempted to refute this Christian proof, rejected the notion that the crossing of the Red Sea and Jordan were acts of baptism. *Sefer Yosef ha Mekane* caustically notes that those saved in the Red Sea had walked on dry land, whereas those who got wet (he uses the term ‘became defiled in the water!’), died. He even takes advantage of the Christian image claiming that the rescue of the Israelites in the Red Sea was proof that the Jewish people would be saved from their present situation as well: ‘We will live among you and not become sullied with water’—an obvious allusion to Jews who had converted to Christianity and ‘become sullied’ by baptism. The Jewish apologist also asserts that Jesus and John the Baptist were circumcised, and that any Christian who claims that baptism has replaced circumcision according to Jesus ignores what is stated in the New Testament itself, in Matthew 5:17—i.e., that Jesus had not come to detract from the Torah. To reinforce his views against the Christian ceremony of baptism, the polemicist cites the image of David who prays: ‘Save me, O God, for the waters are come in even unto the soul’ (Psalms 69:2). In this psalm, King David himself prays against the Christians in order to help the Jews who were being forced by them to become baptized.²⁶

The Jewish sources go on to reject the Christian notion that all biblical references to purification by water are an allusion to baptism, as interpreted by Jesus. First, they are careful to reject this idea on a theological basis, pointing out that it does not even make any sense. Second, they use a contemptuous tone towards this explicitly Christian symbol, transforming it from an embodiment of grace, pity, and new life to a representation of larceny, murder, and impurity. In one example, based on the similarity between the Hebrew words for ‘wine’ and ‘drunkard’ (סבא/סובא), a comparison is drawn between Isaiah 1:21–22, which mentions ‘wine mixed with water,’ and Deuteronomy 21:20, which speaks of the son who is sentenced to death for being a ‘glutton and drunkard.’ The baptismal waters

are looked upon with the same contempt as the son, i.e., the ‘wine mixed with water.’ ‘Here, behold how loathsome *shemad* (forced conversion) is to the Lord, as He has made it more contemptible than murder and thievery.’ Thus, a person who accepts the baptismal waters is tantamount to having assumed the status of murderer, glutton, and drunkard.²⁷

The excesses of the drunken and gluttonous son are described in the exegeses of the twelfth and thirteenth century as lusts leading to the appetite for murder. The baptismal water, the sublime Christian symbol which comes to purify and to renew, is given an extremely negative interpretation among the Jews and is referred to in contemptuous terms of cheapness, ugliness, filth, and contamination; ‘the water of stench,’ ‘the stain of their baptism,’ ‘the well of Gehinnom,’ ‘the raging waters,’ and ‘immersion in the abominable water.’ In one passage, alluding to Jeremiah’s words upon the water, the author of *Nizzahon Vetus* compares the baptismal water to waters that are ‘stagnant, stinking’—i.e., waters that cannot serve in Judaism for any matter of purity. The symbol of water is perceived in such a negative fashion by a twelfth-century French commentator, R. Yitzhak of Troyes, who claims that the reason the phrase ‘it was good’ is not said on the second day of creation, in contrast to all the other days, is because this day deals entirely with water.²⁸

In the polemical literature, the apostate articulates an aggressive position to his brethren, who have remained Jewish even on the simplest levels, indicating in a deep way his own treachery. Rabbi Nathan, in his book *Sefer Yosef ha Mekane*, is forced to refute the claim of the apostate that the Jews are uglier than the Christians. On the superficial level, the author of this work hints that this Jew converted because he was jealous of the beauty of the Christians. On the deeper level, we have here a complex psychological perception that suggests feelings of true inferiority in this area, for the author of the responsum accepts the statement of the apostate, which he interprets in various ways.²⁹

Why did such an extreme attitude take hold in relation to the convert to Christianity? Were these merely theological conclusions in light of the growing phenomenon of conversion to Christianity?

Towards the end of the twelfth century the attitude towards apostates changed, corresponding to the changing legal position of the Church, particularly as there began to appear a new type of apostate—one who caused harm to the Jewish community from which he came. At the beginning of the twelfth century Emperor Henry IV allowed those Jews who had been forced to be baptized to return to Judaism. This was perceived in an extremely negative light in the eyes of the Church, and in

the middle of the twelfth century Pope Alexander III explicitly forbade it. From 1201 on, a new and different attitude emerged in relation to those who converted to Christianity in the wake of Pope Innocent III's activity regarding this question.³⁰ Innocent effectively defined an approach that prevented one who had been baptized from returning to his previous situation, and even improved the status of the convert to Christianity by stating that it was desirable that he be in a better position than before (i.e., as a Jew), allowing the apostate to keep the property he had acquired as a Jew. From that point on, the Jewish convert to Christianity did not necessarily lose his property, and was not impoverished and dependent upon the compassion of others. From the end of the twelfth century, and particularly during the thirteenth, the French and English kings were more influenced by this approach than they were by the need to protect the Jews living in their territory, and there developed an increasingly strict attitude towards the return of apostate Jews, even those converted by force, to the Jewish world. In 1267, the papal bull *Torbato Corde* brought this tendency to its height. However, one should note that in England this tendency had already led, in the 1230s, to the first royal organization that was 'concerned' as to what happened to these Jews after their conversion to Christianity. From the time of Henry III, and throughout the reign of Edward I, there was an established policy to house Jews who converted, and to support them economically at the expense of the kingdom—albeit the money for this purpose was taken directly from the former Jews, and used to finance them once they were Christians. This new activity of the English crown was certainly known to the Jewish leadership in northern France (most of whom were related to the families of English Jewry), and almost certainly to the Jews of Germany.³¹

From the mid-twelfth century on a new kind of apostate appears, one who causes direct harm to the Jewish community to which he had belonged. We first learn of this phenomenon in a story related in *Mahzor Vitry*. The Capatian king (evidently Louis VII) called upon R. Moshe ben Yehiel ben Matityah of Paris, asking him whether it was true that when Jews bury their dead they perform magical acts and curse the Christians in a ceremony that consisted of throwing dirt and grass. The king derived this information from the words of Jewish apostates. R. Moshe explained the Jewish custom as an innocent belief pertaining to the Resurrection of the Dead, a belief based upon the verse in Psalms: 'May there be abundance of grain in the land; on the tops of mountains may it wave; may it be like Lebanon; and may men blossom from the cities like the grass of the field' (Psalms 72:16), and that under no circumstance was it intended to harm Christians. In his reply,

R. Moshe made use of a verse from Psalms, a book particularly close to the hearts of Christians, and of a verse whose interpretation could be accepted even by the strictest Christian. By this he exposed the apostate's scheme to mislead the king and to harm the Jews, his loyal subjects. According to the Jewish source, the king praised the Jewish custom and was shocked by the act of the apostate, to the extent that he cursed him severely: 'More power to you, and well do you do. This is a great and good belief, for you are a holy people to your God. Cursed be those who slander you, for they do not know the goodness of your faith, for this is all of man's [duty].'³² The author's view is clear. He distinguishes a new type of apostate, who seeks to harm his former group, emphasizing this by placing words of curse and imprecation in the mouth of the Christian king. The curse emphasizes (according to the Jewish prayer, the *Amidah*) the emergence of slanderers, whose existence makes the curse necessary.

The problem of harmful apostates was exacerbated during the thirteenth century with the appearance of Nicholas Donin de la Rochelle. Donin was a Jewish apostate who had converted to Christianity, apparently after having been a student in the yeshiva of R. Yehiel of Paris. His central idea was to deny the Jews the Talmud and thereby accelerate their conversion to Christianity. To this end, he wrote a letter in 1236 to Pope Gregory IX with a list of thirty-five accusations against the Talmud, claiming that the purpose of the Talmud was twofold: heresy that changes the understanding of the 'Old Testament,' and concealing the Christian truth from the Jews. On Saturday, 3 March 1239, at the instruction of the pope, all of the books of the Jews in Paris were confiscated in order to examine whether they were indeed heretical. A trial was conducted for the Talmud and three of the senior Jewish leaders in Paris, headed by R. Yehiel of Paris, who was doubtless the most important and strongest figure in the Jewish community there, were called upon to defend it. When the Jewish spokesmen failed to do so, it was declared a heretical book, and sentenced to being burned.³³

We have an extant source from the thirteenth century describing the 'debate' between the Christian theologians who attacked the Talmud, and R. Yehiel, who defended it.³⁴ This work is attributed to R. Yehiel, but it is not clear whether it was written by him, his son, one of his students, or, as seems most likely, by R. Yosef ha Mekane. It is clear that it was written after the severe crisis described above in which the Jews lost the basis for their religious life and for their self-definition with the burning of the Talmud, which created a need to write a book that would strengthen the Jews so as to withstand the Christians. The beginning of *Sefer ha-Vikuah* is devoted to a denunciation and rejection of this apostate. Nicholas Donin

is cursed and condemned, and it is emphasized that he is classified as an evildoer—‘the name of the wicked shall rot’; it is wished that he not have any offspring; his descendants are also accursed. He is referred to there as ‘Haman,’ ‘a foolish person,’ ‘one who breaks the boundaries,’ ‘a serpent,’ ‘a sinner,’ ‘she-ass,’ ‘enemy,’ ‘may his shame be increased, that he brought our dispute to the king and to his council.’ In other words, as they understood matters, an apostate had appeared whose purpose was to deprive Jews of the Talmud, to denounce the Jews before the Christians in such a manner as to deny them the right to dwell in the place and the ability to conduct their lives, and to judge them according to the Talmud. The abundance of terms of opprobrium indicates they no longer saw him as a ‘brother.’

Another convert to Christianity who greatly worsened the situation of the Jews in France was Pablo Christiani, a Jew from Montpellier who was born with the name Saul in 1210. He received a regular Jewish education, was familiar with Talmud and midrashim, was married to a Jewish woman, and was a father of children. He converted to Christianity at the beginning of the 1230s and joined the Dominican order (Order of Preaching Friars); he left his wife, took his children, and converted them as well.³⁵ Friar Pablo’s main activity with the Dominican order was in Spain, in connection with the public polemic conducted against R. Moses Nahmanides (Ramban) in Barcelona in 1263 which, both in terms of geographical area and in terms of the problematic involved in the attitude towards apostates, was not similar to that which prevailed in France and Germany.³⁶ In the wake of the discoveries of Professor Shatzmiller, it has become clear that Friar Pablo made his way to Paris in 1269 where, under the aegis of King Louis IX, he debated with and preached to the Jews regarding the Christian truth.³⁷ In response to this activity, the Jews wrote a book of polemics for internal purposes, to ensure that Pablo Christiani’s arguments would be familiar to the Jews, so that they might effectively confront them and defend themselves against them. This book was similar to that written after the crisis caused by Donin twenty-five years earlier. The author describes Pablo’s manner of activity with great anger, and particularly the nature of his arguments, which are reminiscent of those Nahmanides had to deal with in Barcelona in 1263. He was particularly angry because Pablo was so familiar with the Jewish way of life; he was expert, not only in the *aggadah* and the Talmud, but even describes the bodily gestures used by Jews during prayer.³⁸

But this Hebrew book reveals something else beyond the theological debate. From the Jewish point of view, Pablo represented numerous and threatening dangers. The Jews compare him to Donin: like him he is an apostate, and he also protested against the Jews in the days of Rabbi Yehiel

of Paris. Just as in the ancient period there were scribes whose function was to write so that people would know how to answer an *apikorus* (according to *b. Sanhedrin* 38b), so too they write against Pablo, who is referred to on only one occasion as a *meshumad*, and more generally as *min* or *kofer* ('heretic').³⁹

The Jews emphasize that the aim of this apostate was the destruction of the Jews and not their conversion. According to them, this apostate, a Dominican monk, argued that the Jews as a whole are responsible for the murder of Jesus, a claim whose purpose is the destruction of the Jews, 'and one who is knowledgeable should be very reluctant to speak about the murder of Jesus, because this one [i.e., Pablo] revealed that it is his intention to destroy all the Jews.'⁴⁰ Moreover, according to them Pablo emphasizes that the Jews have no right to defend their religion because they are *bougres* of fire: that is to say, literally, heretics, who are subject to death by fire. Pablo speaks decisively against those Christians who are tolerant of the Jews, for as heretics they need to be burned. In other words, this is not at all a religious debate, but preaching intended to destroy them. The Hebrew text contains more than a hint of the great danger in the connection between the apostate and the king, who listens to him and states that the 'heresy' of the Jews is worse than 'idolatry.'⁴¹ The author notes that Pablo received an order from the king so that, whenever he wishes to debate the Jews, all the Jews, 'great and small,' must appear at the command of the king to listen to him. The example given is the description of the gathering of all the Jews of Paris in the Dominican courtyard at Rue San Jacques in Paris,⁴² while opposite a large Christian crowd Pablo began to describe Jesus' murder by the Jews by stabbing and hanging.

In the middle of the thirteenth century, the Jews experienced the emergence of a new type of convert to Christianity, one in the vanguard of the Christian theological struggle against Judaism, who reveals 'secrets' and knowledge from the Jewish world of the past in support of Christianity in order to destroy Judaism from its foundations.

Notes

- 1 S. Goldin, *The Ways of Jewish Martyrdom*, Turnhout 2008, pp. 190–192.
- 2 I. Davidson, *Thesaurus of Medieval Jewish Poetry* [Hebrew], 4 vols. New York 1970, Vol. 1, p. 129, No. 2, 745; A. Grossman, 'Saladin's Victory and the Aliya of the Jews of Europe to the Land of Israel,' *Studies in the History of Eretz Israel, Presented to Yehuda Ben Porat*, eds. Y. Ben-Arieh and E. Reiner, Jerusalem 2003, pp. 361, 381.

- 3 *Midrasch Tehillim (Midrash on Psalms)*, ed. S. Buber, Wilna 1892 [repr. Jerusalem 1966], Psalm 28, s.v. [2].
- 4 Davidson, *Thesaurus*, Vol. 1, p. 129, No. 2, 745.
- 5 Davidson, *Thesaurus*, Vol. 1, p. 129, No. 2, 745.
- 6 Ya'akov ben Meir, *Sefer ha-Yashar* (Responsa), ed. S. Rosenthal, Berlin 1918, Nos. 25–26, pp. 42–45, and No. 93, p. 74; Ya'akov ben Meir, *Sefer ha-Yashar* (News), ed. S. Schlesinger, Jerusalem 1959, pp. 448–449; Tosafot *Gittin* 34b s.v. *veho* (אָוהוּ); J. Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, Oxford 1961, pp. 67–68; E. E. Urbach, *The Tosaphists: Their History, Writings and Methods*, Jerusalem 1980, p. 121; A. Grossman, *The Early Sages of France* [Hebrew], Jerusalem 1995, p. 503; Judah b. Samuel he-Hasid, *Sefer Hasidim*, ed. J. Wistinetzki, Frankfurt am Main 1924, p. 74, No. 193.
- 7 B. Blumenkranz, 'Jüdische und Christliche Konvertiten im jüdisch-christlichen Religionsgespräch des Mittelalters,' in: *Judentum im Mittelalter: Beiträge zum christlich-jüdischen Gespräch*, ed. P. Wilpert, Berlin 1966, pp. 264–283; J. Cohen, 'The Mentality of the Medieval Jewish Apostate: Peter Alfonsi, Hermann of Cologne and Pablo Christiani,' in: *Jewish Apostasy in the Modern World*, ed. T. M. Endelman, New York 1987, pp. 20–47; A. Saltman, 'Hermann's *Opusculum de conversione sua*: Truth or Fiction?' *Revue des études juives* 147 (1988), pp. 31–56; A. Kleinberg, 'Hermanus Judaeos *Opusculum*: In Defence of its Authenticity,' *Revue des études juives* 151 (1992), pp. 337–353; J. C. Schmitt, 'La memoire de Premontre: a propos de l'autobiographie du Premontre Herman le Juif,' in: *La vie des moines et chanoines reguliers au Moyen Age et temps modernes*, ed. M. Derwich, Wroclaw 1995, pp. 439–452; A. Haverkamp, 'Baptised Jews in German Lands during the Twelfth Century,' in: *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, eds. M. Signer and J. Van Engen, Notre Dame, Ind., pp. 279–283; Cohen, 'Between Martyrdom and Apostasy: Doubt and Self-Definition in the Twelfth-Century Ashkenaz,' *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 29 (1999), pp. 431–471.
- 8 Urbach, *The Tosaphists*, pp. 498–499; E. Kupfer, 'A Contribution to the Chronicles of the Family of R. Moses Ben Yom-Tov "the Noble" of London,' [Hebrew] *Tarbiz* 40 (1971), pp. 385–387; H. H. Ben-Sasson, *Continuity and Variety* [Hebrew], Tel Aviv 1984, pp. 61–62; E. Horowitz, 'Medieval Jews Face the Cross,' in: *Facing the Cross*, eds. Y. T. Assis, J. Cohen, A. Kedar et al., Jerusalem 2000, pp. 118–140, at pp. 120–121.
- 9 W. C. Jordan, 'Adolescence and Conversion in the Middle Ages: A Research Agenda,' in: *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, eds. M. A. Signer and J. Van Engen, Indiana 2001, pp. 77–93 (esp. pp. 87–93).
- 10 Grossman, *The Early Sages of France*, pp. 27, and 145ff., notes 138–140. An example not from this region—the Introduction to Yosef Kimhi's *Sefer ha-Berit*, 1105–1170—specifically states that his students asked him to gather proofs from the Torah against the claims of the Christians, to whom he refers as 'schismatics and heretics.'

- 11 Yosef b. Natan Official, *Sefer Yosef ha Mekane*, ed. J. Rosenthal, Jerusalem 1970, pp. 32, 34 (No. 6); 36 (10), 82 (86), 117 (128), 45 (23), 91 (98), 68 (62), 77 (82), 75 (78), 95 (104).
- 12 D. Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate in the High Middle Ages: A Critical Edition of the Nizzahon Vetus*, introduction, translation, and commentary D. Berger, Philadelphia 1979, pp. 32–37.
- 13 Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate*, pp. 94–95 (No. 78), 206–207 (211), 226–228 (242).
- 14 Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate*, pp. 60–62, 248–252.
- 15 Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate*, pp. 42 and 235, 347–349: ‘The apostates may say: Why is the world “God” written in the plural form *Elohim* when it should have been written in the form *Eloah*? Surely it is because there are two, father and son.’
- 16 Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate*, pp. 42–43 (No. 5).
- 17 Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate*, p. 43.
- 18 In *b. Kiddushin* 18b; *Sanhedrin* 4a–b; *Makkot* 7b.
- 19 Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate*, pp. 59 (No. 26) and 248.
- 20 Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate*, pp. 78 (No. 54) and 275.
- 21 Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate*, p. 58 and see his note on p. 265 (No. 14) for the Christological interpretation of this verse.
- 22 A. S. Abulafia, ‘Invectives against Christianity in the Hebrew Chronicles of the First Crusade,’ in: *Crusade and Settlement*, ed. P. W. Edbury, Cardiff 1985, pp. 66–72; Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate*, pp. 3–40.
- 23 P. Cramer, *Baptism and Change in the Early Middle Ages, 200–1150*, Cambridge 1993.
- 24 A. Habermann, ed., *Sefer Gezerot Ashkenaz ve-Zarfat*, Jerusalem 1945, pp. 25, 36, 38, 39, 42, 87, 97; Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate*, pp. 65, 172–175, 325–326; A. S. Abulafia, *Christians and Jews in the Twelfth-Century Renaissance*, London 1995, pp. 70, 154, Nos. 23–24.
- 25 Yosef b. Natan Official, *Sefer Yosef ha Mekane*, p. 47 s.v. 27. See also *Sefer Nizzahon (Yashan) Vetus*, in Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate*, p. 65 s.v. 35 and note p. 254, the list of Christian theologians who wrote about it: Isidore, Bede [pseud.], Raban Maur and p. 226; Abulafia, *Christians and Jews*, pp. 105, 124–125, 164, note 62.
- 26 Yosef b. Natan Official, *Sefer Yosef ha Mekane*, p. 47; *Sefer Nizzahon (Yashan) Vetus*, in Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate*, pp. 172–173, 312–313.
- 27 Yosef b. Natan Official, *Sefer Yosef ha Mekane*, pp. 73–74. The old French word he uses to define this is ‘*ta glotonie*’ (gluttony). See *Sefer Nizzahon (Yashan) Vetus*, in Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate*. Against Christian baptism see paragraphs 51, 63, 157, 160–161 (pp. 77, 171ff., 175–177, 314). See for example *ibid.*, 196, pp. 201, 325–326: ‘Gregory interpreted that we should placate our Creator for saving us from the impure water that was sanctified falsely through the god who can be represented by an image.’

- 28 Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate*, p. 85 (No. 64); Grossman, *The Early Sages of France*, p. 504.
- 29 There is a parallel to this story also in *Nizzahon Vetus*, albeit there, in a more logical way, the question is raised by a Christian rather than by a Jewish convert to Christianity. Yosef b. Natan Official, *Sefer Yosef ha Mekane*, p. 95; *Sefer Nizzahon (Yashan) Vetus*, in Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate*, p. 195.
- 30 Haverkamp, 'Baptized Jews in German Lands,' pp. 264–267, notes 66–68.
- 31 S. Grayzel, 'Popes, Jews, and Inquisition: From "Sicut" to "Torbato corde,"' in: *Essays on the Occasion of the Seventieth Anniversary of the Dropsie University (1909–1979)*, eds. A. Katsch and L. Nemoy, Philadelphia 1977, pp. 151–188; R. C. Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity in Thirteenth-Century England,' *Speculum* 67 (1992), pp. 263–283.
- 32 *Mahzor Vitry*, ed. S. Horowitz, Nuremberg 1892, No. 280; Yosef b. Natan Official, *Sefer Yosef ha Mekane*, p. 61 s.v. 49; Urbach, *The Tosaphists*, pp. 46, 140.
- 33 S. Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century*, rev. edition, New York 1966, pp. 29–33, 240, 250, 275, 341–345; J. M. Rosenthal, 'The Talmud on Trial: The Disputation at Paris in the Year 1240,' *Jewish Quarterly Review* 47 (1956–57), pp. 58–76 and 145–169; C. Merchavia, *The Church Versus Talmudic and Midrashic Literature 500–1248* [Hebrew], Jerusalem 1970, pp. 227–360; J. Shatzmiller, 'Did Nicholas Donin Promulgate the Blood Libel?' [Hebrew] *Mehkarim* 4 (1978), pp. 173–182; C. Merchavia 'Did Nicholas Donin Instigate the Blood Libel?' [Hebrew] *Tarbiz* 49 (1980), pp. 11–121; W. C. Jordan, *The French Monarchy and the Jews: From Philip Augustus to the Last Capetians*, Philadelphia 1989, pp. 137–141.
- 34 Yehiel ben Joseph, *Vikuah* [Dispute], ed. R. Margulies, Lvov 1928; I. Loeb, 'La controverse de 1240 sur le Talmud,' *Revue des études juives* 1 (1880), pp. 247–261, 2 (1881), pp. 248–270, 3 (1883), pp. 39–57; Y. Baer, 'The Disputation of R. Yehiel of Paris and of Nahmanides,' [Hebrew] *Tarbiz* 2 (1931) pp. 172–187; R. Chazan, 'The Condemnation of the Talmud Reconsidered (1239–1248),' *PAAJR (Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research)* 55 (1988), pp. 11–30.
- 35 Cohen, 'The Mentality of the Medieval Jewish Apostate,' pp. 35–40; J. Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews*, Ithaca 1982, pp. 108–128.
- 36 Y. Baer, *A History of the Jews in Christian Spain*, 2 vols. Philadelphia 1961, 1966, Vol. 1, pp. 152–159; R. Chazan, *Medieval Jewry in Northern France*, Baltimore 1973, pp. 149–153; J. Cohen, *Friars and Jews*, pp. 108–128; R. Chazan, 'From Friar Paul to Friar Raymond: The Development of Innovative Missionizing Argumentation,' *Harvard Theological Review* 73 (1983), pp. 289–306.
- 37 J. Shatzmiller, *La deuxième controverse de Paris: un chapitre dans la polemique entre Chretiens et Juifs au Moyen Age* (Collection de la REJ, 15), Paris 1994; R. Chazan, *The Jews of Medieval Western Christendom 1000–1500*, Cambridge 2006, pp. 251–252.

- 38 Shatzmiller, *La deuxième controverse de Paris*, p. 50 and note 103.
- 39 Shatzmiller, *La deuxième controverse de Paris*, pp. 36, 37.
- 40 Shatzmiller, *La deuxième controverse de Paris*, p. 60.
- 41 Shatzmiller, *La deuxième controverse de Paris*, p. 22 and note 26; J. Shatzmiller, 'The Albigensian Heresy as Reflected in the Eyes of Contemporary Jewry,' in: *Culture and Society in Medieval Jewry*, eds. M. Ben-Sasson, R. Bonfil, and J. Haker, Jerusalem 1989, pp. 333–352; J. Cohen, 'The Second Disputation of Paris and Its Place in Thirteenth Century Jewish Christian Polemic,' [Hebrew] *Tarbiz* 68 (1999), pp. 557–579.
- 42 In Shatzmiller's translation: 'dans l'enclos de l'institution de la maison des Jacobins,' *La deuxième controverse de Paris*, p. 56.