

JEWISH POLEMICS AGAINST CHRISTIANITY AND THE CHRISTIANS IN NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN FRANCE FROM 1100 TO 1300

Hanne Trautner-Kromann

Copenhagen

Jewish polemics against Christianity in the Middle Ages show a striking change in contents and in the linguistic form of the texts after the First Crusade.¹ While the texts up to about 1100 are reports on religious discussions between Jews and Christians, often held in a friendly tone, the texts after 1100 contain aggressive or bitter attacks on the Christians. An example of how this was put into words appears in a Jewish text from the 1250s. In seven points the author gives voice to his protest against the introduction by the French king of a number of harsh edicts against the Jews. The following renders one of these points:²

האחד, שחקק חוק על בני עמנו לבלתי יוכל יהודי לצאת מחתח מושל אחד לעבור חתח מושל אחר. ועתה ראו כמה קשה גזירה זו, כי בחוק זה מכרנו להשמיד להרוג ולאבד ביד שרי הארץ יום יום. שאם יראה יהודי אחד אשר חתח מושל אחד כי הוא אויב לו ורוצה לשלול כל אשר לו, כמו שהמלך ויועציו רואים שעושים שרי הארץ תמיד. וגם לפעמים שחושבין שיש לו יותר הרבה ממה שיש לו, ונוגשים הגוף ביסורין קשים ורעים, עד שיפדה את עצמו אם ימצא די ספקו על הפדיון, או ימות עם ביסורין ברעה גדולה. מי גרם מיתחו? הלא המלך בגזירתו

וגם אם יראה יהודי אחד שאינו יכול לחיות עם ביתו ובניו במקום אחד וסבור להרויח יותר באדנות מושל אחר, או בשכר למודו עם היהודים אשר הם, או בענין אחר, לא יכול לשנות מושבו וימות עם ברעב הוא וביתו ועפו. ואם יברח על נפשו יתפוש אותו המושל אשר יצא מתחזיו ויעמיד אותו בבבלי ברזל וימות עם ביסורין.

First: He has enacted an edict relating to members of our people under which a Jew cannot leave one ruler to transfer to another ruler. But now see how harsh this decree is, for by this edict he has handed us over to the lords of the country for daily destruction, killing and annihilation. For if a Jew under one ruler sees that this ruler is his foe and wishes to rob him of everything he

possesses, as the king and his counsellors see the lords always do — and sometimes they also think that he owns much more than he actually does — then they will torture the body with harsh and wicked afflictions until he redeems himself, if he can raise the sum for the ransom, or else he will die there of his afflictions in great pain. Who caused his death? Surely the king by his decree!

And likewise, if a Jew sees that he cannot live with his house and his children in a certain place and thinks he can make more money under another ruler, either by tutoring the Jews who are there or in other ways, he cannot change residence and he will die there of hunger, himself and his house and his children. And if he flees for his life the ruler from whom he fled will seize him and put him in irons, and he will die there of (his) afflictions.³

Another Jewish text, also from the thirteenth century, says:⁴

הסידם מנן אותה האומרים שאנו מרצחים את ביהם ולועסים הדם. אלא עלילות דברים אהם משמין עלינו להתיר את דמינו כאשר ויבא דוד במזמור מיד שהייתם עתידים לחרף אתנו ולהתיר את דמינו ולהרז אתנו על יראת שדי התחלל עלינו אתה הוא מלכי אלהים צוה ישועת יעקב (תהי מידתו).

The heretics anger us by charging that we murder their children and consume the blood.

The fact is that you are concocting allegations against us in order to permit our murder; this is in accordance with David's prophecy in Psalm 44 that you would abuse us, permit our murder, and kill us because of our fear of God, and he prayed for us saying, "You are my king, O God; command the deliverance of Jacob" [Ps. 44:5].

The causes for this change in the polemic texts must be sought in the changed conditions

for the Jews in Europe after 1100.⁵ In the eleventh century the number of Christian polemic writings against Judaism increased substantially only to culminate in the twelfth century.⁶ The Christians interpreted the Hebrew Bible christologically — i.e. texts and events were understood as referring to Jesus, Christianity and the Christians.⁷ Furthermore they accused the Talmud of containing derogatory remarks about Jesus, Mary and the Christians.⁸ In addition to this religious pressure the Jews were subjected to physical pressures: forcible baptism, forced participation in religious disputations with official Christian participants and obligatory attending of conversionist sermons.⁹ Gradually the Church suppressed all social and economic contact with the Jews, including Jewish money-lending at interest.¹⁰ The Jews were literally stigmatized as Jews — as heretics and seducers of good Christians to heresy.¹¹ The Church demonized the Jews and hereby prepared the way for accusations of ritual murder and desecration of the Host.

The secular authorities, i.e. king and nobility, also tightened their control over the Jews after 1100, partly as a consequence of their diminishing usefulness for society and its economic life, partly through inspiration by the Church. The physical and legal security of the Jews was impaired and their occupational and professional opportunities were curtailed. At the same time they were exploited by the rulers as useful objects of taxation who by way of lending money to the Christians at a high rate of interest could provide considerable revenues for king and nobility, without the Christian population realizing that not only the Jews but also the population itself was exploited.¹²

The Christian population's concepts of the Jews were thus marked by the religious and secular pressures on them. The image of the Jews as the murderer of Christ and an insulter of Jesus, Mary and the rituals of the Church took root in the laity and in the lower clergy.¹³ From here there was a short step to actual molestation, forcible baptism and accusations of ritual murder and desecration of the Host.

This change of attitude to the Jews was prevailing all over Europe, but local conditions would hamper or hasten this development.¹⁴ In France the conditions deteriorated more rapidly in the northern part of the country which belonged directly under the French king,¹⁵ while things developed more slowly in Southern France which only little by little came under the sov-

eighty of the crown.¹⁶ The individual ruler in an area, whether a count or a bishop, could also influence the conditions for the Jews negatively or positively, but the overall picture is one of steady deterioration of these conditions.

The various forms of attack and molestation of the Jews are reflected in the Jewish literature of the period, often in polemical or aggressive form and in many different types of text.¹⁷ At the same time these ecclesiastic, secular and popular pressures must have hampered the expression of the Jewish attitudes.¹⁸ This indirect censorship may have been moderated by the fact that the literary vehicle of the Jews was the Hebrew language, which few Christians were able to read. But in the thirteenth century Hebrew writings were becoming more accessible to the Christians: chairs of Hebrew were established and Jewish converts placed themselves at the service of the Christian Church in its fight against the Jews.¹⁹ The result was that the Jews had to express themselves with greater care since harsh words could have serious consequences for the Jewish population.

Below, this development with steadily increasing pressure on the Jews and a reaction to this from the Jewish side will be illustrated through some Jewish polemic texts from France dating from the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries. For this purpose three Hebrew source texts from Northern France have been selected together with three source texts from Southern France, each of which will elucidate three central subjects or themes so that it will be possible to discern differences and resemblances in the development in the two areas.²⁰ A short presentation of each of the authors and themes is followed by the source texts themselves, in Hebrew as well as in translation.

Source texts from Northern France

- 1a *Rabbenu Tam* (Rabbi Jacob ben Meir) was a grandchild of the famous exegete Rashi and belonged to the Tosafists. He lived from 1100–1171 and worked as an exegete and a rabbi in Ramerupt and Troyes. His commentaries are found in the Tosafot to the Babylonian Talmud.
- 1b *Rabbi Joseph Bekhor Shor* (1140?–1200?) of Orleans was a pupil of Rabbenu Tam and worked as an exegete, a Tosafist and a poet. He wrote a commentary on the Pentateuch and the Psalms, in which he rejects the

christological interpretations which he knew from Christian Latin writings. He is noted for his attacks on Christianity.²¹

- 2 *Rabbi Joseph ben Nathan Official* worked around 1240–1260 as administrator to the bishop of Sens, a position he took over from his father. The family hailed from Narbonne. His work "Sefer Yosef ha-Mekanne" (The Book of Yosef the Zealot) is a collection of polemical Bible commentaries, often in the form of dialogues, and contains a critique of the New Testament.²²
- 3 "*Nizzahon Vetus*" (Old Book of Polemic) is a collection of polemical Bible commentaries and arguments against Christianity, known by Jews from Northern France and from Germany. The work has been collected and expanded by an anonymous author in the late thirteenth century.²³

Source texts from Southern France

- 4 *Rabbi Joseph Kimḥi* (c. 1105–c. 1170) was a fugitive from the persecutions in Almohad Spain (1148) and settled in Narbonne. He worked as a translator, writer and exegete. Besides other books he wrote "Sefer ha-Berit" (The Book of the Covenant), a manual of religious disputations in dialogue form. It also contains interpretations of the Bible.²⁴
- 5 *Rabbi David Kimḥi – Radak* – (1160?–1235?) was the son of Joseph Kimḥi and worked as a Bible exegete and grammarian in Narbonne. In his commentaries to the Scriptures there is a good deal of polemical material, and he especially attacked the christological and allegorizing interpretations of the Bible by the Christians.²⁵
- 6 *Rabbi Meir ben Simeon of Narbonne* (about the middle of the thirteenth century) worked as a Talmudist and was head of the Jewish community in Narbonne. His work "Milḥemet Mitzvah" (Obligatory War) is a sort of diary from the years 1240–1270 (?) containing among other things polemics against Christianity, reports of disputations and comments on current affairs.²⁶

These six source texts are meant to illustrate the following three subjects or themes:

- A Criticism of the Christians
- B Moneylending at interest
- C Bible exegesis

These three subjects have been chosen in order to show that the Jews did not tacitly put up with the Christian pressures but protested actively, for example by criticism on a moral, economic and religious basis.

The first subject shows that the Jews — which may not be generally known — dared to contest the morals and way of life of the Christian majority and even criticize the Christians sharply.

The second subject has been chosen because the Jews have generally been accused of being usurers and money extortioners since the twelfth century.

The third subject has been selected because ever since the early Middle Ages Bible exegesis has given rise to many discussions between Jews and Christians.

A Criticism of the Christians

The first text is by Rabbi Joseph Bekhor Shor. He rebukes the Christians for suppressing the Jews, and in his comment on the Bible verse: "They have roused Me to jealousy with a no-god; They have provoked Me with their vanities; And I will rouse them to jealousy with a no-people; I will provoke them with a vile nation" (Deut. 32,21) he says the following:²⁷

הם קנאוני בלא אל. במי שאינו לא אל ולא כלום. ואני אעשה להם
מידה כנגד מידי שאקניאם בלא עם. בעם שאינו עם אלא בהמוה.
ורבותי פני כגון כשדים. דכתי בהו זה העם לא היה. בגוי בבל
אכעיסם. כגון בני ברכניא ובני מרטניא שהולכים ערומים בשוק שאין
משוקץ ומתועב לפני הקי כמי שהולך ערום בשוק. והם מצירים לישי.
וכגון אלו הנוצריים:

They have roused Me to jealousy with a no-god — with somebody who is neither God nor anything at all. But I will make them a punishment fitting the crime (measure for measure): *And I will rouse them to jealousy with a no-people* — with a people which is not a people but beasts. And our masters explained: as for example the "Kasdim", for it is written about them: "— this is the people that was not..." (Isa. 23,13); *I will provoke them with a vile nation* — as for example the barbarians and Mauretians who walk naked in the marketplace, for there is nothing so abhorred and abominable for the Holy One as somebody who walks naked in the marketplace; and they oppress Israel, and the Christians are like them.

Bekhor Shor also criticizes the Christian laws because they cannot prevent the Christians from committing misdeeds. In his comment on the

Bible verse: "Ye shall therefore keep My statutes, and Mine ordinances, which if a man do, he shall live by them" (Lev. 18,5) Bekhor Shor says:²⁸

5. אשר יעשה אתם האדם חיי כולם — שלא יד שניו
 תקצרות שאדם מה אלא יחיה עמו; אבל תוקף הטיה שנתלים חסמים וטנבים
 ורצוחים ואדם כל נשי תבדירה. מקצרות יודע, שבאים בעלי הבית
 הודנים אולם. וכן בעל האשה לא יחולל כיום נקט. וכן הקרובים הודנים את
 הדעת התיב: ושעה רשעים הקצרות.

which if a man do, he shall live by them — his years shall not be reduced, for he shall not die except his own death (a natural death), but the ordinances of the people who plunder and rob and steal and murder and commit adultery with their neighbour's wife, they (the ordinances) reduce their days, for the rich lords shall come and kill them, and likewise the husband of the (unfaithful) wife, "and he will not spare in the day of vengeance" (Prov. 6,34), and also the relatives (of the murdered man) shall kill the murderer, for it is written: "But the years of the wicked shall be shortened" (Prov. 10,27).

The second text is by Rabbi Joseph Official. He criticizes the Christians by giving an account of a dialogue between a friar and Rabbi Joseph's father, Rabbi Nathan. The starting point is the first of the quotations from the Bible which Joseph Bekhor Shor commented on, and the story goes:²⁹

האיננו. יהם קנאוני בלא אל, כעסוני וגוי (דברים לב כא). אח
 גרין ישינו נמוכח עם היר נתן. אחר לו: לפי רשעתכם וגריונותכם אתם
 משועבדים לנו, לפי שאנו חשובים מכם. השיבו: כך מדתו של הקביה
 שהוא נפרע מדה במדה, הכעסנוהו בגרוע ממנו וכן עשה לנו, שנאמר:
 יהם קנאוני בלא אל כעסוני בהבלהם, ואני אקניאם בלא עם, בגוי
 נבל אכעיסתי (שט). ואם היה גוי נבל יותר מכם היה משעבד אותנו
 וחת ידו.

Brother Gerin — May his name and memory be blotted out! — debated with Rabbi Nathan. He (Gerin) said to him: "According to your wickedness and inferiority you have been subjected to us, because we are more important than you". He answered him: "Thus it is the way of the Holy One, blessed be He, that He punishes measure for measure; we provoked Him with something inferior to Him, and He did the same to us, for it is written: "They have roused Me to jealousy with a no-god; They have provoked Me with their vanities; And I will rouse them to jealousy with a no-people; I will provoke them with a vile nation"; and if there existed a nation more vile than you, He would have subjected us under their hand.

The third text is Nizzahon Vetus, which has numerous passages with accusations against

priests, friars and nuns, but also generally against the Christians.³⁰ In a criticism of the Christian confession it is said that the Christian reasons for this, namely: "He that covereth his transgressions shall not prosper; but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall obtain mercy" (Prov. 28,13) are not correct. The quotation relates only to somebody who tries to conceal his sins from God. Below it is written:³¹

הדין אמת העולם שהם מכסים פשעיהם מן המקום. שהנאף והזמה
 והרצוחה יד בידתם. וכל המצוות שבזה הקב"ה מכסים הם בידתם ורשעים פירושם
 בפנים אחרים להתלף המצוות כגון כלה חויר חלב דם וכל איסורין שבמצוה. ויתור
 על כן. לפי שכן מליא דימה ולפי תורתן לא ניתן להם רשות לקחת אשה. ולכן הסכימו
 יחד שיבואו האנשים ויגדו להם מסעם ורשעיהם להם עתה כדי להביד תשם המצוה
 חתה בעליהן. ומבקשין מהן לאמור אעשה [מן גמ] אני. והנשים לא יכלו לבסוד ליהן אחרי
 שהנאף פירסמן. הדין שכן הוא. אחרי שאנם אומרים שהאיסור שהוא חתה אלהיהם
 יס לו כח לאסור ולהחיר. למה לא נתן כח לכומרות/שבתאבתן אליהן הנשים להתחרות.
 והיה דבר נאה ומקובל יותר שיתודו הנשים לנשים והנשים אל האנשים ולא יבואו
 לדי דימה תנאף.

Indeed, this refers to the nations of the world, who conceal their sins from God, for adultery, fornication, and murder are found among them. In fact, all the commandments that God ordained are hidden among them, for they concoct different interpretations so that they can change such commandments as circumcision, the prohibition of swine, suet, and blood, indeed, all the prohibitions in the Torah. Not only that, it was because of the fact that they wallow in fornication and yet their Torah forbade them from marrying that they agreed to require men to come and tell their sin and publicize their adultery so that they might know which women are having extramarital affairs. They then tell those women that they would like to do the same, and the women cannot deny anything because the adulterer has already identified them. This is certainly the explanation, because otherwise why doesn't the pope, who is regarded as the vicar of their god and who has the power to forbid and permit, give nuns the authority to hear the confession of women? It would clearly be more proper and acceptable for women to confess to women and men to men so that they would not be seduced into fornication and adultery.

The fourth text is from Southern France and written by Joseph Kimḥi. He criticizes the Christians for their immoral way of life, whereas the Jews are scrupulous about the ten commandments (Ex. 20). Rabbi Joseph Kimḥi says:³²

"לא תרצח לא
 תנאף" [שם שם. יג], אין בהם רוצחים ומנאפים; עושק וגול
 אין ביהודים משורסם כמו בנצורים שמלסטמים הבריות
 בדרכים וחולין אותם ומנקרין עיניהם למקצתם. ולא תוכל

You shall not murder. You shall not commit adultery (v. 13). Similarly, there are no murderers or adulterers among them. Oppression and theft are not as widespread among Jews as among Christians who rob people on the highways and hang them and sometimes gouge out their eyes.

The clergy, too, is criticized:³³

ומה שאמרת כי יש בהם אנשים קדשים שייפרדו בחייהם מזה העולם — הוא אחד מאלף או מרבבה והשאר כולם נטמאים בדרכי העולם. ואפילו כמרים שלכם והגמונים שלא יישאו נשים, בידוע שהם מנאפים.

Now with respect to your statement that there are many holy people among them (the gentiles) who separate themselves from this world in their lifetime, [it must be said] that they are one in a thousand or ten thousand, while the rest are contaminated by the ways of the world. It is well known that your priests and bishops who do not marry are fornicators.

The fifth text is by David Kimḥi, Radak. He accuses the Christians of idolatry, suppression of the Jews, lying and deceit and ridicule. In a comment on Isaiah 2,18: "And the idols shall utterly pass away" he writes:³⁴

19. והוא לילימים. ואף על פי שהאלילים כבר פסקו מקצת האמות היום עוד יש בקצה המזרח עובדי אלילים. ועוד הנצרים יחשבו גם הם עובדי אלילים. שהם משתחיים ועובדים לנצלם ישו הנוצרי ואו בימות המשחה כל האלילים יכרתו עד נמירא

And even though the worship of idols already has ceased to exist with some of the nations today there still are some idol-worshippers in the East; and besides, the Christians, too, are reckoned as idolworshippers. For they prostrate themselves and worship the image of Jesus of Nazareth; but in the days of the Messiah all idols will be totally destroyed.

In his comment on Psalm 22,17: "For dogs have surrounded me, a pack of evildoers encircle me, Piercing my hands and my feet" Radak compares Israel to the surrounded one:³⁵

כן אנחנו בגלות בתוך העגלה לא נוכל לצאת ממנה שלא נהיה ביד התורפים. כי אם נצא משרות הישמעאלים נבא ברשות הערלים, והנה אנחנו אוספים ידינו ורגלינו ועומדים יראים ופחדים בפניהם, כי אין לנו רשות לברוח ברגלינו ולהלחם בידינו, והנה כאילו ידינו ורגלינו בנחשתים.

Thus we in Galut (the Diaspora) are within a circle; we cannot get out of it so as not to fall into the hands of the robbers, for if we leave the territory of the Ismaelites we

enter the territory of the uncircumcised (the Christians); and behold, we hold back our hands and feet and stand before them in dread and fear, for it is not in our power to flee on our feet and fight with our hands; for it is as if our hands and feet are in chains.

In his comment on Psalm 120,2: "O LORD, deliver my soul (from lying lips)..." Radak goes on:³⁶

יהיה הצילה בפשי, מהגוים שאנחנו בתוכם, שהם אנשי שקר ומרמה.

... from the gentiles in whose midst we live, for they are men of lie and deceit.

Psalm 123,4: "Our soul is full sated with the scorning of those that are at ease, and with the contempt of the proud oppressors", he comments thus:³⁷

שבצעו הלעג. שאנחנו לשאננים. ושבצעו הבח שאנחנו לנאיונים. השאננים הם הגוים שהם שוקטים ושאננים. ואנחנו צניים וכואבים בנייה. ולעגו לנו.

... we are surfeited with being insulted by the carefree, and we are surfeited of being derided by the arrogant. And the carefree are the nations who live in peace and without worries, while we are poor and suffer among them, and they scorn us.

The sixth text is by Rabbi Meir of Narbonne. He accuses the Christians of interpreting the Jewish Torah and their own teaching figuratively (mashal). Likewise also the command of "love of one's neighbour" and the Christian command of "turning the other cheek" besides similar laws.³⁸

וכל זה הם מפרשים בדרך משל להנאתם, ואוספים המעשרות והביכורים ושאר יציאות בפי קרוביהם יותר מן הראוי, והיה להם לתתם בכל שנה לעניים ולהשיא בנות הצנועים העניים כדי שלא יצאו להפקר ולזנות. ורבים מהם חוטאים ונוחזין מתנות רבות לנשים שאינן הגונות להחטיאם, גם לבעליהן ושאר קרוביהם, להעלים עיניהם מהם, לפי מה ששמענו שאומרים מקצת מבני עמם. והיה די להם שיתפקו באותם הנכסים די מזונות ומלבושיהם, והמוחר יהיה בכל שנה ושנה לגמילות חסדים. והם לובשים בגדים יקרים מאד ורוכבים על סוסים ופרדים יקרים ונכבדים ואוכלים מחמדי הבשר והדגים והפירות (הגנובים) /הערבים/ ושוחים היינות המרוקחים, ומתקיים המקרא במקצתם שכתוב פן תאכל ושבעת וגוי, ורם לבבך ושכחת את יי אלהיך, וכל זה היה ראוי לגדוליהם להקן הענין ולדון לישועת הנפשות.

And all this they interpret figuratively to their own advantage, and they collect tithes and first fruits (bikkurim) and other dues for the benefit of their relatives, more than reasonable, for they ought to give it every year to the poor and see to it that the chaste and

poor girls were married so that they did not end up in licentiousness and prostitution. But many of them sin and give many present to women who are not worthy in order to make them sin, and also to their husbands and to the rest of their relatives so that they close their eyes to them, according to what we have heard some of their own people say. And it would be enough for them that they were content with the possessions sufficient for their food and clothing, and the rest should go to charity every single year. But they dress in very costly clothes and ride fine and expensive horses and mules and eat the most exquisite of meat, fish and dried (sweet) fruit and drink spiced wine; and the Scripture is fulfilled as regards some of them (those people) for it is written (Deut. 8,12): "lest when thou hast eaten and art satisfied... a.s.o. then thy heart be lifted up, and thou forget the Lord thy God", and all this is would be appropriate for their nobles to rectify and to consider the salvation of their souls.

All six source texts bring accusations against the Christians.

Joseph Bekhor Shor is aggressive and speaks most slightly of the Christians as abominable beasts which suppress the Jews. Although the text type is an ordinary running Bible commentary Bekhor Shor goes further than the Bible text proper in order to criticize the morals of the Christians and their bad laws as opposed to the life-protecting Torah of the Jews.³⁹

Joseph Official puts forward his criticism via a dialogue between his father and a friar, probably in the first half of the thirteenth century. The friar's contemptuous words about the Jews are turned against himself and the Christians are scoffingly denounced as the most debased nation.

Nizzaḥon Vetus accuses the Christians of evading the commandments of the Holy Scripture deliberately as well as of murdering and sinning, and both laity and clergy are accused of committing adultery. At the same time *Nizzaḥon Vetus* scoffs at the Christian confession and even accuses the Pope himself of having introduced institutionalized fornication.

Joseph Kimḥi is descriptive in his criticism of murder, adultery, violence and robbery among the Christians, as opposed to the better moral conduct of the Jews, and he states as a fact that the clergy is immoral.

Radak maintains that the Christians are reckoned as idol-worshippers, that they threaten and insult the Jews, and that they are deceitful and mendacious. But he only accuses them of actions directly related to those Bible verses he is commenting on, and he does not implicate any

other possible criticizable conditions as Bekhor Shor did. On the contrary, he emphasizes the powerlessness, fear, poverty and sufferings of the Jews which are so overwhelming that they are "surfeited therewith". The text implies the comfort that the Jews will have to follow the will of God until He takes compassion on them and until the coming of the Messianic times.

Meir of Narbonne criticizes the Christians for not complying with the commandments of the Torah, and not even with their own torah (The New Testament) but for interpreting everything to their own advantage. Hereby they do not comply with the Jewish (and Christian) command of love of one's neighbour and of charity, but they live a life of sin, fornication and luxury. His criticism is set on a sober tone and concludes with an admonition.

B Moneylending at interest

The second theme to be illustrated by means of the six source texts is moneylending at interest.⁴⁰ According to Deuteronomy 23,20-21: "Thou shalt not lend upon interest to thy brother; interest of money, interest of victuals, interest of any thing that is lent upon interest. Unto a foreigner thou mayest lend upon interest; but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon interest...", it is prohibited to lend at interest to a brother, but permitted to lend at interest to a foreigner. Moreover, in some rabbinic circles there had been a tendency to advise against lending to foreigners at all in order not to learn from their (bad) methods. Rabbenu Tam enters into the problem — should Jews lend money to foreigners at all? and the text says:⁴¹

ומה שנהגו עתה להלוות לנכרים - אומר רבינו חם, [...] לפי שיש עלינו חס מלך ושרים, והכל היו כדי חיינו. ועוד, שאנו שרויין בין האומות, ואי אפשר לנו להשתקר בשום דבר אם לא נישא ונתן עמנו. הלכך, אין לאסור רביה - שמה ילמוד ממעשי - יותר משאר משה ומתן.

And as to the fact that we now usually lend to foreigners — Rabbenu Tam says: ...Since we are obliged to pay taxes to the king and the nobles and everything is in order to sustain ourselves — and furthermore that we live among the nations and it is impossible for us to earn anything at all if we do not trade with them — then it is no more prohibited to lend at interest — not even in order not to learn from their actions — not any more than to carry on trade in any other area.

In rabbinic circles agreement existed that the Christians were not brothers, even the Jews

themselves often named the Christians ESAU or EDOM, who in certain Bible passages is called brother.⁴²

Joseph Official writes:⁴³

הנא לא תשך לאחך נשך [דברים כג ה]. מוכיחים אותנו על הרבית, לפי שאמר דוד בנאמו ס"ו: 'כסף לא נתן בנשך' [תהלים טו ה], וכתוב: 'עושה אלה לא ימוץ' [סם]. הטובה: דוד המלך תלמידו של משה היה. ואין לו כח לחלוק על רבו ולהוסיף ולגרוע על דבריו, ומשה רבינו אמר: 'לגברי תשך ולאחך לא תשך' [דברים כג א], ואם יאמרו הממרים שהם אחינו, לפי שכתוב לא תתעב אדומי, כי אחך הוא [דברים כג ח], השיב ה'ר"ד משה מפרש: הלא עובדיה הסידי האחות, שאמר: 'זונכרים באו סערי...גם אתה כאחד מהם' [עובדיה יא], והוא היה מדבר אל אדום, שכתוב בתחלת הספר; 'שמעוה שמענו לאדום' [סם א].

אמנם אתם מליים

בריבית גדול, כור בבוריים ומאריכים זמן לקונה סחורתם בעבור פרעון ונוטלן שכר המתנת מעות .

They (the Christians) reproach us for taking interest, because David said in Psalm 15:5: "He that putteth not out his money on interest... He that doeth these things shall never be moved".

Answer: King David was Moses' pupil and he has no authority to disagree with his teacher and add to or detract from his words, and Moses our teacher said: *Unto a foreigner thou mayest lend upon interest; but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon interest.* And if the rebellious (Christians) would say that they are our brothers, because it is written (Deut. 23,8): "Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite, for he is thy brother" — then Rabbi Moses of Paris answered: "Indeed, Obadiah has already annulled this brotherhood for he said (Obad. 1,11): "And foreigners entered into his (Jacob's) gates... Even thou wast as one of them" — and he (Obadiah) talked about Edom, for it is written at the beginning of the book: "Thus saith the Lord GOD concerning Edom: ... "But you (Christians) yourselves lend money at high rates of interest, one measure for two measures, and you delay the delivery of the goods which the buyer has paid, so that you thereby get a profit on the money in the intervening time.

According to the Jewish conception, then, the Christians have long ago forfeited the right to be called brothers, namely when the Temple was destroyed. Moreover, Official accuses the Christians themselves of moneylending at high rates of interest and of evading the prohibition of interest in different ways.

In Nizzahon Vetus we find the same Bible quotations and arguments as Official used, but here the Christians not only "reproach" the Jews for lending at interest, they "curse" the Jews for it. As an answer to the argument of the Christians that they are the brothers of the Jews it says:⁴⁴

אמה וזה שהיו אחים מקדם תאסרה להרביה מהם עד

זמן שסמל את עצמו, ועתה נחשבו לזרים בראותם שחרב בית המקדש ולא באו לעזרה. שאמר ביום עמדן בגדו וז' עד כאחד מהם (עובדיה א'י"א), וכיש אשר הם בעצמם עמדו להתרביה שאמר וזכר ה' לברי אדום את יום ירושלים וז' (תהי קליזו). והם שמתשכן עמנו לברי ובר שאינם גמולים.

It is true that they were once brethren and it was forbidden to take interest from them; now, however, they have disqualified themselves and are considered strangers, for when the Temple was destroyed they did not come to help, as it is written, "In the day that you stood aside... even you were as one of them" [Obad. 1:11]. Indeed, they themselves actually helped destroy it, as it is written, "Remember, O Lord, the children of Edom in the day of Jerusalem..." [Ps. 137:7]. Moreover, they consider themselves foreigners, for they are not circumcised.

Joseph Kimḥi repudiates the accusation of the illicitness of lending at interest to Christians by quoting Deuteronomy 23, 21 and Psalm 15,5, but even if he does not directly discuss whether Christians are brothers or not, it appears implicitly that they are *not*. Kimḥi refutes the Christian accusation by declaring:⁴⁵

והנה היהודים נשמרים מאוד מהריבית ומנשך לאחיהם כמו שאסרה תורה. ועוד, כי נשמרים היטב מאבק ריבית. לא ימכרו ליהודי אחיהו לא חיסים, ולא יין, ולא שום משה לזמן קצוב כדי להרבות לו בדמים. והנה אתם, שתחדלו מן הריבית, תמכרו לאחיהם כל משה לזמן קצוב בכסף דמים. הלא תבושו שתאמרו לא תלוי בריבית. הנה זה ריבית גדול. ועוד, כי הרבה גויים מלווים בריבית ידוע, ליהודים ולגויים, מה שאין היהודים עושים לאחיהם [ה]יהודים.

The Jews are indeed scrupulous about usury and the taking of interest from their brethren as the Torah forbade. They are also very scrupulous about 'avaq ribbit (the dust of usury). A Jew will not lend his brother wheat, wine, or any commodity on a term basis in order to increase his profit, while you, who have disdained usury, sell all commodities to your brethren on a term basis at twice the price. You should be ashamed to say that you do not lend with usury for this is enormous usury. Furthermore, many gentiles clearly lend on interest to [both] Jews and gentiles, although Jews do not lend to their fellow Jews.

Radak concurs in the general opinion that it is permitted to lend at interest to Christians but not to the Jewish brothers, and he adds:⁴⁶

ולא נאמר כן בגולה ונגזרת המצוה. כי אפילו לגברי אסור לתתו או לגולה או לגזר ממנו. אבל הנשך שהוא לוקח ממנו ברצונו והדעתו מותר. כי ישראל

חייב לעשות חסד עם ישראל חברו. וההלוואה בלא נכד הוא חסד וטובה. יותר טובה במקומה מן המתנה. כי הרבה אנשים יבדו לקחת המתנה ולא יבדו לקחת ההלוואה. ולא מן ישראל עם הגוי. כי אינו חייב לעשות כבוד חסד ולהלות לו כבודו בנכד. כי ברוב הם שונאים ישראל. אבל בחזאי אם עשה גוי חסד וטובה עם ישראל חייב לעשות הישראל גם כן עמו חסד ולהשיב לו. והרחיבו לו בזה כדי שתפנה בו הטובה לבערים שאמרים כי יד לא תפריש בין ישראל לגוי. אלא כל רביה אסור.

But thus it is not said regarding robbery and theft and loss and deceit, for it is also prohibited to cheat or rob a foreigner or to steal from him; but the interest which he (the Jew) takes from him at his own request and with his consent is permitted. For Israel is obliged to be charitable to Israel his fellow (fellow Jew), and lending without interest is charity and kindness and is better than giving presents, for many people are ashamed of accepting a present; but they are not ashamed of accepting a loan. But this is not so as regards Israel with the gentile, for he (the Jew) is not obliged to be charitable to him and lend him money for nothing, because generally they hate Israel. But of course, if the gentile is charitable and kind to the Jew, the latter certainly is obliged to be charitable to him and to do good to him. And I have spoken at some length to you about this in order that you may find in it an answer to the Christians who say that David did not distinguish between Israel and foreigners and that any interest is prohibited.

Meir of Narbonne speaks at great length of lending at interest, because the ban of Louis IX of France on moneylending was extended to apply also to the Jews of Narbonne.⁴⁷ Rabbi Meir points out that for legal and moral reasons the Christians cannot right away free themselves from the obligations of interest and repayment. For centuries the Jews had special authorization, issued by the Pope and the Church authorities and the emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, to lend at interest; furthermore, they had been loyal and useful subjects and thereby France had special obligations towards the Jews. He repeats the same quotations, arguments and accusations against Christians as Radak, but in addition he advances the new idea that the prohibition of interest only applies to the poor, and that it is necessary for rich and poor, even for the king himself, to have the possibility to borrow money. He also considers that if the king prohibits the Jews from lending at interest, the Christians will just do it.⁴⁸

ואחרי אשר אין

העולם יכול לעמוד בלא הלוואות. טוב היה לו ליסועות נפשו שיסבול, שיעשו הלוואות בריבית היהודים. שאינם בני דתו ואין מוטל עליהם להכריחם להאמין באמתותו. ולא שיגרמו לעבוד על דתם הנצרים. שהם בני דתו. ההענות שהם עושים בנרמתו. הם חללים על נפשו. ועתה אחרי כל הדברים האלה. למה ישנה אנשי המלך חוקיו ודיניו ומנהגיו אשר התנהג הוא ואבותיו עמנו ועם אבותינו — — למה תהפוך את דיניך ודיני אבותיך להפקיע ממנו ולגולגו

לעשוך ולחמוס אותנו מבלי התראה. כי אם התרית בנו תחלה לבלתי לזה עוד כרביה. ואם אחרי כן עברנו על דבריך. הורשנו; אע"פ שאינן בשקול הדעה נכונים. שתאסור לנו את המותר לנו לפי אמונתנו. גם אין עליך מן הדין להמנע מלנגוש הלוואה או הערב לפרוע הקרן. — כי הלוואה מחוייב לפרוע ככה שבעתה או אמתתה.

And since the world cannot exist without loans then it would be better for the salvation of his (the king's) own soul that he would tolerate that the Jews lend at interest, for they are not members of his faith, and he is not enjoined to force them to adopt his faith; and that is not to say that he causes the Christians to transgress their faith, for they are members of his faith, and that the sins they commit are at his request, but they are dependent on him. But now after all these words, why will my lord the King change his rules and laws and customs according to which he and his ancestors have behaved in their relations to us and our ancestors? — — Why will you change your law and the laws of your ancestors in order to confiscate our money and rob us and oppress and destroy us without warning; only if you had warned us from the outset not any more to lend at interest and then afterwards we transgressed your commands would we be silent. Even though in our opinion it is not right that you should forbid us that which is allowed to us according to our religion, even then you have not the right not to force the borrower or the bailor to pay back the principal — — for the borrower is obliged to pay it back on the strength of his oath or his religion.

Thus rabbi Meir insists on his right. He thinks it is the duty of the Church both religiously and morally to defend the Jews against injustice, because the pope and the church authorities, not the king, are experts in canon law.⁴⁹

All 6 texts implicitly or explicitly claim that Jewish moneylending at interest to the Christians is legal and necessary. *Rabbenu Tam* equates commodity trade with monetary transaction (moneylending at interest) and his main problem is not to defend the taking of interest as such but from a purely legal point of view to explain why Jews may do business with Christians. His argument in favour of this is that since Jews live among Christians and have to pay taxes besides earning their living it is necessary to do business (implying: since engaging in agriculture, crafts etc are not possible to Jews any more).

Joseph Official rejects the Christian claim of being brothers, a claim which would make, if it were true, taking interest from Christians illegal, and furthermore he claims that the Christians themselves take (extortionate) interest and evade the prohibition in different ways.

Nizzahon Vetus is more emotional than Official in its rejection of the Christian claim of brotherhood and even claims that the Christians took an active part in the destruction of the Temple. Moreover, the Christians themselves have chosen to be foreigners by not being circumcised.

Joseph Kimhi points out the conscientiousness of the Jews not to take interest from brothers, in contradistinction to the double standard of morality and impudence of the Christians who evade the prohibition in various ways, and actually lend to both Christians and Jews, all of it at high "fees" or downright interest, in spite of the contempt for Jewish moneylending.

Radak meticulously discusses the problem of lending money at interest because he is aware of the accusations of the Christians. He emphasizes the fact that the prohibition applies only to Jews, because an interest-free loan is a deed of charity which is only obligatory if both parties (thus also the Christians) perform it. The prohibitions of deceit, theft and robbery, however, are absolute and not dependent on reciprocity, not even if the Christians hate the Jews, as *Radak* claims they usually do.

Meir of Narbonne defends the taking of interest by a number of arguments of a legal, common-law, moral and exegetic nature. Moreover, he points out the necessity of money-lending for society as such, and that it is better for Jews to take interest than for Christians, since (according to the Christian view) the Jews have forfeited the salvation of their souls anyhow. *Meir* pleads justice and fairness and protests against the king confiscating the money of the Jews and against his maltreatment and destruction of the Jews — without any notice.

C Bible exegesis

The third theme is Bible exegesis. In principle the Jews wrote commentaries on the Hebrew Bible in order to expound and elucidate the text for Jews. But in practice they could not avoid being influenced by their knowledge about the christological interpretations of the Christians. Therefore, in Jewish Bible commentaries there is a great deal of direct or indirect polemics against the christological interpretations and the Christians. This fact will be illustrated by the so-called Shiloh-quotation (Gen. 49,10):

לֹא יִסּוּד שֵׁבֶט מִיְהוּדָה וּמַחֲקֵק מִבֵּין
רְגְלָיו עַד כְּרִיבָא שִׁילֹה וְלוֹ יִקְהֵת עַמִּים:

The rod shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and his be the obedience of peoples.⁵⁰

One of the debated points is the word Shiloh — is it a town, a name for Messiah or something entirely different? In this exposition the point of departure is that Shiloh stands for Messiah. The question then remains whether the Christian or the Jewish Messiah is meant.

In a story about Rabbenu Tam we can read:⁵¹

שאל מין אחד לרבינו תם בנים לא אמן עם הדוד אינכם מאמינים בישוע
הבצירי הולא יעקב חננבא סליו שב כי יבא שיליה וְלוֹ ראשי הדיבה ישי. השיב
לו ויהי כי שילי לסיפיה וקריא סבראי חננבא על ישו שטרד לחסטה את העולם
"יבא שיליה וְלוֹ יקדחת עממים".

An apostate asked Rabbenu Tam: You sons without faithfulness! Why do you not believe in Jesus of Nazareth? Is it not that Jacob prophesied about him, as it is said: *Shiloh come and his* — the initial letters (constitute an acrostic=notarikon for) JESHU. Rabbenu Tam — May he rest in Paradise! — answered him: Go on to the end of the verse, for certainly it was prophesied about Jeshu that he was going to lead the world astray: *Shiloh come and his be the obedience of peoples* —(notarikon produces the sentence) JESHU WILL LEAD THEM ASTRAY.⁵²

Joseph Official rejects the christological interpretation for historical reasons and afterwards he quotes the story about Rabbenu Tam.⁵³

Nizzahon Vetus goes further than Rabbenu Tam and Official:⁵⁴

משומד אחד סיקר: עד כי יבא שילו וְלוֹ (בר משה) הרי רמז יש בראשי הדיבות.
השובחו בנדו: כאן רמז לא יש טוס רע כישו — לא יסור שבט יהודה ומחוקק מבין
רגליו עד כי יבא שילו וְלוֹ. ורמז יש יתעם — יבא שילו וְלוֹ יקדחת עממים.
לא יסור שבט יהודה: פירושו: לא יחדל גלות משבט יהודה עם טעונו של ישו שהיה
מחוקק במסמרות בין רגליו. עד כי יבא שילה. זה משהו. וְלוֹ יקדחת עממים. כדרכיב
הלכו טים רבים ואמרו לכו תעלה אל... בית אלהי יעקב (יש' ב"ט).

A certain apostate argued that the Hebrew verse, "Until Shiloh comes and to him..." (*ad ki Yavo Shiloh velo* [Gen. 49:10]) constitutes an acrostic for Jesus (*Yeshu*). The answer to this is in the very same verse, for the Hebrew verse, "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor the ruler's staff from between his feet, until Shiloh comes and to him..." is an acrostic of the Hebrew phrase, "There is no blemish as evil as Jesus." Furthermore, the phrase "Shiloh comes and the homage of peoples shall be his" yields the acrostic, "Jesus will lead them astray."

"The scepter (*shevet*) shall not depart from Judah

nor the ruler's staff (*meḥoqeq*) from between his feet." This means that exile will not cease from the tribe (*shevet*) of Judah nor the error of Jesus, who was fastened (*meḥuqqaq*) with nails between his feet, until Shiloh, i.e., the Messiah, comes, and the homage of the peoples will be his, as it is written, "And many people will go and say, Come ye and let us go up to the... house of the God of Jacob" [Isa. 2:3].

Joseph Kimḥi has his Jewish disputant demonstrate that the Shiloh-quotation relates to the Davidic dynasty and he concludes by the following words:⁵⁵

והרי דברך כזב ואמונתך

שקר וזה גלוי ומפורש.

Your words are false and your belief is untrue. This is clear and evident.

Radak's explanations are not polemical and his general attitude to christological interpretations is a rejection for contextual reasons.⁵⁶

Meir of Narbonne does not comment on the Shiloh-quotation, as far as I am aware.

The three source texts from Northern France are more or less ironical or mocking of the christological interpretation, while the two texts from Southern France only reject it for contextual reasons.

Rabbenu Tam falls in with the claim of the Christians that the Hebrew Bible does prophesy about Jesus, but he ironically inverts it negatively so that the prophecy runs as follows: "Jesus will lead them astray".

Joseph Official first rejects the Christian claim and then quotes the above story.

In *Nizzaḥon Vetus* the meaning of the notarikon is elaborated into: "There is no blemish as evil as Jesus — Jesus will lead them astray". But to this is added an explanation (with a mocking pun) to the effect that the exile of the Jews and the error of Christianity will not cease until the Messiah of the Jews comes, and then the peoples shall acknowledge him and understand that the God of the Jews is the true one.

Joseph Kimḥi gives a long historical explanation and concludes by rejecting the claims of the Christians as untrue and the Christian faith as false.

Radak explains the grammatically difficult words and interprets the meaning historically and from the context, just as his father did.

Conclusion

All six source texts substantially agree in their views on the three themes, but the ways in which their views are expressed are greatly divergent.⁵⁷ Although the source texts have come into existence within a rather short period and in a relatively small area the wording ranges from objective statement to a violently emotional and aggressive form. In order to find the causes for these differences it is necessary to relate the texts to their historical and geographical context, and include elements such as text types, cultural background, regional conventions of form and the use of Hebrew as code language.

There is a marked dividing line between the predominantly aggressive texts from Northern France and the more sober ones from Southern France.

In the texts from Northern France the emotional expressions increase, irony turns to mocking and scorn, the accusations get more serious and the language gets more coarse. This, supposedly, is a consequence of the historical development which caused greatly deteriorated conditions for the Jews, economically, socially and legally. Around 1300 the only openings for Jews were by and large moneylending and second-hand trade (unredeemed pledges) and socially the Jews were almost totally isolated from the Christians because of the religious agitation of the Church. The legal guarantees for the safety and rights of the Jews time after time proved worthless in the face of the arbitrary annulments or changes made by the rulers, and especially of the spontaneous or planned attacks on the Jewish communities by the masses, either in connection with the Crusades or with accusations of ritual murder or desecration of the Host.

In Southern France the negative development for the Jews was not nearly so fast. The source texts certainly reflect knowledge of the pressures which the Christians try to put on the Jews, but conditions are not yet menacing, neither economically and socially, nor securitywise. As late as in the middle of the thirteenth century Meir of Narbonne protests against planned amendments of acts in a sober tone, because he does not yet feel the position of the Jews qua Jews seriously threatened, in spite of the widespread massacres of Jews during the Albigensian war in 1209.⁵⁸

From the above it follows that on the one hand every single Jewish polemical passage should be analyzed as to form and content, in-

cluding the context and text type in which the passage occurs, on the other hand the passages should be related to each other including their — in the broadest sense — historical background. By this procedure of comparison every

single passage can contribute towards creating a more differentiated and comprehensive picture of the conditions of the Jewish minorities in Christian Europe.

NOTES

Hebrew source texts which already exist in an adequate English translation are reproduced in this article with a reference to the work in which they are found. Bible quotations are reproduced from the English translation in the Soncino Books of the Bible, London 1966, unless otherwise stated.

1. For a bibliography of Jewish polemics against Christianity, see ROSENTHAL. J. in: Aresheth. An annual of Hebrew booklore. Ed. by N. Ben-Menahem and Y. Raphael. Vol 2, 130–179, Jerusalem 1960; vol 3, 433–439, Jerusalem 1961; see also [Anonymous] 1972a; 1972b; BEN-SASSON 1972. For the relationship between Church and Synagogue up to 1200 see BLUMENKRANZ 1968.
2. See: SOURCE MATERIAL 6: 1. Ed. BLAU 1964, 16.
3. For further discussion and translation of the complaint, see CHAZAN 1974b; *Church* 1980, 218–220.
4. *Jewish-Christian* 1979, par. 244, and p. 229.
5. For a general picture of Jewish life, see BEN-SASSON 1976; ABRAHAMS 1981.
6. Cf. *Jewish-Christian* 1979, 16; BLUMENKRANZ 1964.
7. The Jews were regarded as witnesses for the Church, cf. BLUMENKRANZ 1949. For a comprehensive discussion of Jewish polemical literature, see LASKER 1977.
8. The disputation at Paris in 1240; see ROSENTHAL, J.M. 1956; *Judaism* 1982.
9. See BARON 1965a; BROWE 1942.
10. For the relations between the Church and the Jews, see SYNAN 1965; GRAYZEL 1966; *Church* 1980; MARCUS 1981.
11. For the relations between Christian heresy and Jewish polemics, see TALMAGE 1967a; BERGER 1975.
12. For the changes in the Jewish-Christian relationship, see PARKES 1976; LIEBESCHÜTZ 1959; 1965; cf. also BERGER 1972.
13. See TRACHTENBERG 1943; BARON 1967, chapt. 49, and HAY 1960.
14. For the history account of the middle ages, see SOUTHERN 1953.
15. For the history of Northern France and the Jews, see RABINOWITZ 1938; CHAZAN 1973.
16. For Provençal Jewry, see TWERSKY 1971.
17. For Jewish polemics as a reaction to Christian pressure, see URBACH 1935; TRAUTNER-KROMANN 1984.
18. For Christian censorship of Hebrew books, see POPPER 1899.
19. See BLUMENKRANZ 1966.
20. See the list of SOURCE MATERIAL.
21. For a discussion of this exegete and contemporary tosafists, see AWERBUCH 1980.
22. See J.M. ROSENTHAL's introduction to OFFICIAL 1970.
23. See BERGER's introduction to *Jewish-Christian* 1979 and BREUER's introduction to *Sefer* 1978.
24. See TALMAGE's introductions to KIMHI 1972; 1974.
25. See TALMAGE 1967b; 1975.
26. See GROSS 1881; STEIN 1959; 1969; see also CHAZAN 1974a; 1975.
27. Commentary 3 *ad loc* (p. 4).
28. Commentary 2 *ad loc* (p. 236).
29. OFFICIAL 1970, par. 51 (p. 62).
30. For the relation between the mendicant orders and the Jews, see COHEN, J. 1982.
31. *Jewish-Christian* 1979, par. 236 (lines 992–1001), transl. p. 223.
32. KIMHI 1974, 26; translation: KIMHI 1972, 32.
33. KIMHI 1974, 28; translation: KIMHI 1972, 35.
34. See SOURCE MATERIAL 5: 1. FINKELSTEIN, *ad loc* (p. 14); FINKELSTEIN lists verse 18 as verse 19.
35. See SOURCE MATERIAL 5; 2. DAROM 1967, *ad loc* (p. 56); transl of Ps. 22,17, cf. The Anchor Bible, Psalms I, New York 1966.
36. See SOURCE MATERIAL 5: 2. DAROM 1967, *ad loc* (p. 281).
37. See SOURCE MATERIAL 5: 2. DAROM 1967, *ad loc* (p. 284).
38. See SOURCE MATERIAL 6: 2. BLAU 1973, 316.
39. For an exposition of polemics in Bible commentaries, see ROSENTHAL, E.I.J. 1960.
40. For an exposition of the development of the Jewish law on interest, see STEIN 1955. For a discussion on medieval moneylending, see PARKES 1976, part three.
41. Tosafot to Baba Mezia 70b.
42. For the use of ESAU/EDOM as a symbol of the Christians, see COHEN, G.D. 1967.
43. OFFICIAL 1970, par. 49 (p. 61–62).
44. *Jewish-Christian* 1979, par. 123 (lines 28–32), p. 133.
45. KIMHI 1974, 27; transl. KIMHI 1972, 34–35.
46. See SOURCE MATERIAL 5: 2. DAROM 1967 (ad Ps. 15,5), 37.
47. See CHAZAN 1974a: 1975.
48. See SOURCE MATERIAL 6: 3. DINUR 1965, 284–285.
49. For an exposition of the relations between the Church and the Jews in the first half of the thirteenth century, with documents in Latin and in English translation, see GRAYZEL 1966.

50. Translation: ROSENBAUM, M. and A. SILBERMANN, Pentateuch with Targum Onkelos, Haphtaroth and Rashi's commentary, New York 1930.
51. POSNANSKI 1904, XIX.
52. For an explanation of *notarikon*, see [Anonymous] 1972b.
53. Cf. OFFICIAL 1970, par. 22, p. 44-45.
54. *Jewish-Christian* 1979, par. 28 (lines 13-18); transl.: p. 60.
55. KIMḤI 1974, 37; translation: KIMḤI 1972, 45.
56. See TALMAGE 1967b; 1975.
57. For a common source of polemical arguments, see REMBAUM 1978.
58. For Narbonne in the thirteenth century and the complex political conditions, see EMERY 1941.

ABBREVIATIONS

EJ	Encyclopaedia judaica
HTR	Harvard theological review
HUCA	Hebrew Union College annual
JJS	Journal of Jewish studies
JQR	Jewish quarterly review
MGWJ	Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums
PAAJR	Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research
REJ	Revue des études juives
TZ	Theologische Zeitschrift

SOURCE MATERIAL

- 1a. Rabbenu Tam (Rabbi Jacob ben Meir): 1. Tosafot to Baba Mezia 70b in the standard editions of the Babylonian Talmud. 2. Posnanski, A., Schiloh. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Messiaslehre. Leipzig 1904.
- 1b. Joseph Bekhor Shor: Commentary to the Pentateuch by R. Joseph Bekhor Shor. A facsimile ed. based on various edd., with a foreword. 1-3. Jerusalem 1978.
2. Joseph Official: Sepher Joseph Hamekane. Ed. by J. Rosenthal. Jerusalem 1970.
3. *Nizzahon Vetus*. Ed. by D. Berger. Philadelphia 1979.
4. Joseph Kimḥi: *Sefer ha-Berit u-Vikkuḥe RaDaQ im ha-Nazrut*. Ed. by F. Talmage. Jerusalem 1974.
5. Radak (Rabbi David Kimḥi): 1. The commentary of David Kimḥi on Isaiah. Ed. by Louis Finkelstein. Part 1. New York 1926. 2. *Ha-Perush ha-shalem al Tehillim*. Ed. by A. Darom. Jerusalem 1967.
6. Meir ben Simon of Narbonne: *Milḥemet miḥwah*. Parma manuscript 2749. Ed. in part by: 1. Moshe Blau: *Sefer hameorot... u-sefer ha-hashlama*. New York 1964. 2. Moshe Blau: *Shitat ha-kadmonim*. New York 1973. 3. Benzion Dinur: *Yisrael ba-Golah*. 2:1. Tel Aviv & Jerusalem 1965.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABRAHAMS, I.
1981 *Jewish life in the middle ages*. New York.
[Anonymous]
1972a *Apologetics*. *EJ* 3, 188-201.
1972b *Notarikon*. *EJ* 12, 1231-1232.
- AWERBUCH, M.
1980 *Christlich-jüdische Begegnung im Zeitalter der Früh-scholastik. Abhandlungen zum christlich-jüdischen Dia-log*. 8. München.
- BARON, S.W.
1965a *A social and religious history of the Jews*. 9. 2nd ed. New York.
1965b *A social and religious history of the Jews*. 10. 2nd ed. New York.
1967 *A social and religious history of the Jews*. 11. 2nd ed. New York.
- BEN-SASSON, H.H.
1972 *Disputation and polemics*. *EJ* 6, 79-103.
1976 *The middle ages. A history of the Jewish people*. Ed. by H.H. Ben-Sasson, 385-723.
- BERGER, D.
1972 *The attitude of St. Bernhard of Clairvaux towards the Jews*. *PAAJR*. 40, 89-108.
1975 *Christian heresy and Jewish polemic in the twelfth and thirteenth century*. *HTR*. 68, 287-303.
- BLUMENKRANZ, B.
1949 *Die Juden als Zeugen der Kirche*. *TZ* 5, 396-398.
1964 *Anti-Jewish polemics and legislation in the middle ages*. *JJS*. 15, 125-140.
1966 *Jüdische und christliche Konvertiten im jüdisch-christlichen Religionsgespräch des Mittelalters. Judentum im Mittelalter*. Hrsg. von P. Wilpert, 264-282.
1968 *Die Entwicklung im Westen zwischen 200 und 1200. Kirche und Synagoge*. Hrsg. von K.H. Rengstorff und S. von Kortzfleisch. 1, 84-135.
- BROWE, P.
1942 *Die Judenmission im Mittelalter und die Päpste. Miscellanea historiae pontificiae*. 6. Rom.
- CHAZAN, R.
1973 *Medieval Jewry in Northern France. A political and social history. The John Hopkins University studies in historical and political science*. 91,2. Baltimore.
1974a *Confrontation in the synagogue of Narbonne. A Christian sermon and a Jewish reply*. *HTR*. 67, 437-457.
1974b *A Jewish plaint to Saint Louis*. *HUCA*. 45, 287-305.
1975 *Anti-usury efforts in thirteenth century Narbonne and the Jewish response*. *PAAJR*. 41-42, 45-67.
- Church
1980 *Church, state and Jew in the middle ages*. Ed. by R. Chazan. New York.
- COHEN, G.D.
1967 *Esau as symbol in early medieval thought. Jewish medieval and renaissance studies*. 4, 19-48.
- COHEN, J.
1982 *The friars and the Jews. The evolution of medieval anti-Judaism*. Ithaca.

- EMERY, R.W.
1941 Heresy and inquisition in Narbonne. *Studies in history, economics and public law*. 480. New York.
- GRAYZEL, S.
1966 *The Church and the Jews in the 13th century. A study of their relations during the years 1198-1254, based on the Papal letters and the conciliar decrees of the period*. New York.
- GROSS, H.
1881 Meïr ben Simon und seine Schrift Milchemeth Mizwa. *Analekten. MGWJ.* 30, 295-305. 444-452. 554-569.
- HAY, M.
1960 *Europe and the Jews*. Boston.
Jewish-Christian
1979 The Jewish-Christian debate in the high middle ages. A critical edition of the *Nizzahon Vetus* with an introd., transl., and commentary by D. Berger. *Judaica. Texts and translations*. 4. Philadelphia.
- Judaism*
1982 *Judaism on trial. Jewish-Christian disputations in the middle ages*. Ed. and transl. by H. Maccoby. Toronto.
- KIMḤI, Joseph
1972 *The Book of the Covenant*. Transl. by F. Talmage. Toronto.
1974 *Sefer ha-Berit u-Vikkūḥe ha-RaDaQ im ha-Nazrut*. Ed. by F. Talmage. Jerusalem.
- LASKER, D.J.
1977 *Jewish philosophical polemics against Christianity in the middle ages*. New York.
- LIEBESCHÜTZ, H.
1959 The crusading movement in its bearing on the Christian attitude towards Jewry. *JJS.* 9, 97-111.
1965 Relations between Jews and Christians in the middle ages. *JJS.* 16, 35-46.
- OFFICIAL, Joseph ben Nathan
1970 *Sepher Joseph Hamekane*. Ex manu scriptis ed. et notis instruxit J.M. Rosenthal. Jerusalem.
- PARKES, J.
1976 *The Jew in the medieval community*. New York.
- POPPER, W.
1899 *The censorship of Hebrew books*. New York.
- POSNANSKI, A.
1904 *Schiloh. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Messiaslehre*. Leipzig.
- RABINOWITZ, L.
1938 *The social life of the Jews of Northern France in the 12-14 centuries as reflected in the rabbinical literature of the period*. London.
- REMBBAUM, J.E.
1978 The influence of the *Sefer Nestor HaKomer* on medieval Jewish polemics. *PAAJR.* 45, 155-185.
- ROSENTHAL, E.I.J.
1960 Anti-Christian polemic in medieval Bible commentaries. *JJS.* 11, 115-135.
- ROSENTHAL, J.M.
1956 The talmud on trial. *JQR.* 47, 58-76. 145-169.
Sefer
1978 *Sefer Nizzahon Yashan (Nizzahon Vetus). A book of Jewish-Christian polemics*. A critical ed. by M. Breuer. Jerusalem.
- SOUTHERN, R.W.
1953 *The making of the middle ages*. London.
- STEIN, S.
1955 The development of the Jewish law on interest from the Biblical period to the expulsion of the Jews from England. *Historia judaica.* 17:1, 3-40.
1959 A disputation on moneylending between Jews and gentiles in Me'ir b. Simeon's *Milhemeth Miṣwah* (Narbonne 13th C.). *JJS.* 10, 45-61.
1969 *Jewish-Christian disputations in thirteenth century Narbonne*. London.
- SYNAN, E.A.
1965 *The popes and the Jews in the middle ages*. New York.
- TALMAGE, F.
1967a An Hebrew polemical treatise. Anti-Cathar and anti-Orthodox. *HTR.* 60, 323-348.
1967b David Kimḥi as polemicist. *HUCA.* 28, 213-235.
1975 *David Kimḥi. The man and the commentaries*. Cambridge, Mass.
- TRACHTENBERG, J.
1943 *The devil and the Jew*. New Haven.
- TRAUTNER-KROMANN, H.
1984 Sources of Jewish polemics against Christianity in the late middle ages. *Temenos* 20, 52-65.
- TWERSKY, I.
1971 Aspects of the social and cultural history of Provençal Jewry. *Jewish society through the ages*. Ed. by H.H. Ben-Sasson and S. Ettinger, 185-207.
- URBACH, E.E.
1935 Études sur la littérature polémique du moyen-âge. *REJ.* 100, 49-77.