

Chapter 3

Conversion to Judaism as Reflected in the Rabbinic Writings and Culture of Medieval Ashkenaz

Between Germany and Northern France

EPHRAIM KANARFOGEL

Attitudes Toward Converts

More than a half century ago, Jacob Katz briefly sketched the attitudes that the Tosafists of northern France and Germany—and other related rabbinic decisors—displayed toward converts to Judaism. In doing so, he identified several key Talmudic interpretations and halakhic constructs as the axes around which the rabbinic positions could be charted.¹ At the same time, Ben Zion Wacholder published a study on conversion to Judaism in Tosafist literature.² Rami Reiner has supplemented these earlier efforts by focusing on the status of converts in the rabbinic thought of medieval Ashkenaz.³

Crucial to any such undertaking is the ability to distinguish between the attitude of a particular rabbinic authority to an individual convert (*ger*), and his sense of how accepting the Jewish community should be of the halakhic institution of conversion (*giyyur*) as a whole. As an extreme example of this problematic, one cannot properly assess Maimonides' overall approach to conversion solely on the basis of the fact that he was obviously quite impressed and encouraged by the commitment and knowledge of R. 'Ovadyah *ba-Ger*.⁴ In medieval Ashkenaz as well, leading Tosafists and halakhic

authorities had interactions with individual converts. These relationships, however, do not automatically signal that these authorities favored the steady acceptance of converts as a matter of communal halakhic policy.

A case in point is Katz's assertion that in order to demonstrate that "the desirability of *gerey sedeq* (righteous proselytes) was indeed taken for granted, it is sufficient to quote the description by R. Joel b. Isaac of Bonn" (d. ca. 1200, father of Rabiah of Cologne and a noted German Tosafist and halakhist in his own right) of an actual case of conversion: "And the Spirit went forth from the Lord and rested in the heart of that man, R. Abraham son of Abraham our father, and it came to pass that when the Spirit rested on him . . ." ⁵ Katz concludes that "to conceive of the act as the descent of God's Spirit into the heart of the proselyte presupposes a positive evaluation of the conversion." ⁶

R. Joel most certainly judged this conversion to be a success, as the citation reproduced by Katz indicates. Indeed, R. Joel further characterizes this convert, whom he had the opportunity to observe for a lengthy period of time, as an *ish tam ve-yashar yoshev ohalim*. Despite the *ger's* deep interest in studying Torah and his pure intentions, R. Joel did not permit him, as some rabbinic figures in Speyer had done, to study the text of the Bible from the Latin (referred to in this responsum as *leshon galahim*, the language of priests), which was more familiar to him at this point than Hebrew was. R. Joel did allow him to serve as a prayer leader, against the position taken by the rabbinic authorities in Würzburg, although this issue depends on halakhic considerations beyond the basic religious worthiness of the convert, such as whether a *ger* may fully recite those sections of the prayers that describe the lineage and inheritance of the Jewish people vouchsafed to them through the patriarchs. ⁷ Nonetheless, R. Joel's consistent recognition of the sincerity and religious integrity of this particular convert does not demonstrate that he was necessarily supportive of ongoing conversions as a desired phenomenon.

Similarly, the great praise reserved for individual converts who gave their lives in the course of various Christian persecutions, following the distinctive tenets of this precept as expressed in Ashkenazic thought and practice, does not shed any conclusive light on the status of converts in Ashkenaz more broadly. The Crusade chronicle composed by Solomon b. Samson records the case of an unnamed *ger zedeq* in the northern Rhineland town of Xantes, who inquired of a certain R. Moses *ha-Kohen* (known locally as the Kohen ha-Gadol) as to what his fate would be if he slaughtered himself in the name of the Holy One. R. Moses responded that he would be joined together with

all of the other Jewish martyrs (in the same circle, *bi-mehbitsatenu*). At the same time, however, he would also be situated along with other righteous converts to Judaism and would “sit in their circle.”⁸

R. Moses clearly intended to encourage and to praise the convert in this instance, suggesting perhaps that the nature of his reward would be even loftier than the rewards of those martyrs who were not converts. And yet R. Moses’ response also suggests that truly righteous converts were considered to be “equal to but separate from” the rest of the righteous. The act of martyrdom rendered this convert very special. Yet even in this instance, there is a measure of separation presumed between righteous converts and those righteous Jews who were born as Jews, even as this R. Moses cannot be identified as a known rabbinic or halakhic authority, and Solomon b. Samson’s Crusade chronicle does not carry any inherent halakhic valence.⁹

In a similar vein, while the leading twelfth-century northern French Tosafist, R. Isaac b. Samuel (Ri) of Dampierre (d. 1189), wrote that “if potential proselytes are persistent in their sincere desire to convert [*mit’amsim le-hitgayyer*],” and are not accepted too quickly or for purposes of marriage, “we should accept them.”¹⁰ He also maintains, on the basis of a Talmudic formulation, “that the Divine presence rests fully only with families of pure lineage.”¹¹ In short, we are dealing here with some rather nuanced texts and conceptions, both halakhic and nonhalakhic, whose valences are not always unified or unequivocal.

The studies noted earlier maintain that the rabbinic attitudes toward converts in northern France and Germany were fundamentally similar, and that when and where attitudes did change, they did so in parallel ways.¹² However, on the basis of several manuscript passages and a concomitant re-reading of published materials, it is possible to demonstrate that the Tosafists in northern France were more welcoming and tolerant of prospective converts over time than were their German counterparts. This can be seen not only with regard to the interpretation of descriptive Talmudic passages but also in the ways that they framed and discussed the halakhic requirements for conversion. This dichotomy is further supported by evidence from both Jewish and Christian sources that suggests that there was a steadier stream of converts to Judaism in northern France than in Germany during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries,¹³ and, even more significantly, as we shall see, by aspects of the self-image of these often like-minded yet ultimately distinct centers of Jewish life and scholarship in northern Europe. Moreover, this distinction can also be correlated with the nature of the

relationship between the Jewish populace in each of these geographic centers and the various groups of church figures who lived and served there.

Not surprisingly, dedicated converts to Judaism tended to reach out to—or to be brought to the attention of—leading Tosafists in both northern France and Germany. In turn, these rabbinic figures, who were often impressed with the achievements and devotion of the converts, sometimes welcomed them into their homes and otherwise provided guidance and support.¹⁴ There appears, however, to be a sharp difference in the levels of rabbinic involvement with prospective converts before their conversions.

Northern French Tosafists dealt with procedural questions of how a particular conversion should be performed and with problems that actually arose during that process and did not only put forward Talmudic interpretations or larger, theoretical halakhic prescriptions in these matters. German Tosafists commented on the relevant Talmudic *sugyot* and issued halakhic rulings based on those *sugyot*, but these efforts tended to be much less innovative or reflective than those of their northern French counterparts. The German rabbis presented or summarized the Talmudic material with little or no comment and did not make efforts to correlate (or to qualify) the Talmudic requirements in ways that the northern French authorities did. Moreover, there does not appear to have been a single instance in which a German Tosafist discussed or put forward the case of a potential convert (i.e., before his or her conversion) whose process of conversion generated a specific halakhic problem or query. Among northern French Tosafists, on the other hand, such instances are relatively easy to come by, not only in *Tosafot* texts themselves but also within responsa and briefer rulings (*pesakim*) by these Tosafists. While documentation exists for northern French Tosafists who dealt with specific cases and questions of individuals undergoing a *giyyur* process, there is no such documentation for German Tosafists.

This finding is both surprising and suggestive because typically the writings of the German Tosafists focused much more heavily on recording the application of halakhic policies and principles in actual cases (*ma'asim*) than did the Tosafist literature of northern France. Indeed, German Tosafists often shared such actual *ma'asim* (and the approaches that they took) with their colleagues so that they could express their own halakhic or judicial opinions in a way that French Tosafists did not.¹⁵ With regard to matters of conversion, however, these patterns are not at all evident, which further suggests that the relative silence and less nuanced approach maintained by the German authorities with regard to pre-*gerut* cases and policies were

carefully considered and quite deliberate. In short, it would appear that German Tosafists and rabbinic authorities during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries were far less encouraging of potential converts to Judaism than their counterparts in northern France. What follows is a detailed presentation and analysis of sources from both sides of the divide, which will also detail the operant practices and procedures for conversion in Ashkenazic lands at this time. At the end of the study, two larger reasons or causes for this dichotomy will be proposed.

Conversion Procedures in Northern France

R. Isaac (Ri) of Dampierre dealt directly with a number of procedural problems and situations in connection with actual instances of *gerut*, and he offers several creative Talmudic interpretations that address such matters, although he did not rule in a consistently lenient fashion. In a case concerning a candidate for conversion who had been circumcised (incorrectly) at night in front of three individuals, two of whom were related and technically unacceptable as judges (since they were married to sisters), Ri ruled that in the absence of any confirmation that the circumcision had been performed by day, it was proper to now draw some blood (as an indicator of circumcision) since the process of conversion is to be treated as a case of *mishpat*, which required judicial conventions to be followed. This meant that its major constituent parts must be undertaken during the day, as per the scripturally mandated requirements for the proper meeting of a rabbinic court. Although Ri was apparently less concerned in this instance with the fact that two of these individuals were related (since there were ultimately two nonrelated judges from among the three who had witnessed the circumcision or the immersion), he reiterates that the standing requirement is to appoint three appropriate nonrelated judges who would oversee all aspects of the conversion process by day.

Ri adds that leniencies with respect to witnessing the immersion and the circumcision are possible to countenance after the fact (*be-di'eved*), since the Talmud at one point in tractate *Yevamot* (45b) allows the immersion of the *ger* to follow the model of the immersion of a *nidab*, for which three (male) witnesses are not typically present, and yet the immersion was considered valid. However, where it is possible to do everything a priori in accordance with the court procedures indicated by *mishpat*, even with respect to the immersion and circumcision, this is clearly the preferred approach (as

indicated by the Talmud in nearby passage, *Yevamot* 47b). It should be noted that at no point does Ri allow for any deviation with regard to the basic acceptance of Judaism and its commandments, which must precede the circumcision and the immersion.¹⁶

Ri was asked whether two converts were permitted to marry each other, and he responded in the affirmative. Some rabbinic authorities were concerned about this, lest both partners return to their preconversion ways, and they cited proof from a *Tosefta* passage to this effect. Ri, however, saw no halakhic difficulty in such a case, since the Talmud itself clearly does not prohibit this marriage.¹⁷

Tosafot texts to tractate *Avodah Zarah* record in Ri's name a ruling in the case of a convert who had accepted the commandments and undergone circumcision but did not properly immerse. Although this conversion was considered incomplete and did not confer full Jewish status on the candidate, Ri ruled (according to his student R. Judah Sirleon, d. 1224) that the touch of this person did not render wine unfit for Jewish consumption.¹⁸ The parallel passage in the standard *Tosafot* to tractate *Avodah Zarah* concludes that Ri did not wish to implement this lenient ruling in practice, although this final comment may well be a subsequent addendum.¹⁹

Ri's halakhic sensibilities regarding the shortcomings in the case of an actual conversion court described earlier make their way into several collections of northern French *Tosafot*, although his insistence on requiring three judges a priori for all aspects of the conversion process does not. Indeed, there appears to be an assertion in these later Tosafist passages, against the approach of Ri, that the paradigm (and rules) of *mishpat* applies only to the initial *kabalat ha-mitsvot*. The specific issue of circumcision at night is not raised in these variant passages, even as the question of immersion at night is.²⁰ This may perhaps constitute another example of the disconnect that sometimes existed between interpretational formulations and strategies recorded in *Tosafot* texts and the practical *pesakim* of even important Tosafists such as Ri.²¹

In light of the firm insistence by French Tosafists during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries that *kabalat ha-mitsvot* had to be undertaken in the presence of three judges, even as the immersion of a convert is deemed to be valid after the fact if fewer observers were present, *Tosafot* passages discuss why it was indeed so necessary to have three judges for *kabalat ha-mitsvot* (as derived from the verses that link *gerim* to *mishpat*), since there are several types of Jewish monetary law that can be tried in front of a single expert

judge (*yahid mumbeh*). These *Tosafot* texts quickly conclude that no such leniency is possible in the case of conversion, but they further assert (as does the standard *Tosafot* to *Yevamot* 46b–47a) that the three judges whose presence is required need not be formally ordained experts themselves (as is required for certain more complex forms of monetary law). This is because the Talmud derives that present-day judges may generally perform these necessary and fairly common judicial functions as duly constituted representatives of the fully invested judicial system of yore in the land of Israel, when the original form of authorization, or *semikbah*, was in vogue.

The frequent emergence of common types of cases that required judicial services to adjudicate them meant that judges had to be authorized to hear them, even if they were not ordained with the original form of *semikbah*. As the concluding passage in *Tosafot ha-Rosh* to *Kidushin* puts it (found also in other *Tosafot* variants): “Just as the rabbis were concerned that borrowers should not be stymied [lit., the door should not be locked in their faces] in their attempts to borrow money [since the lenders would tend not to lend if there was no way to appoint judges who could adjudicate any disputes that arose], they were also concerned about ‘the door not becoming locked’ in the face of [potential] converts.”²²

The standard *Tosafot* to *Kidushin* ends with a formulation by R. Netan’el of Chinon (ca. 1180–1260), who studied with Ri’s student R. Isaac b. Abraham (Ritsba) of Dampierre and was later linked with R. Yehi’el of Paris and the Tosafist academy at Evreux, that provides a second justification for the ability of judicial tribunals consisting of non-*mumbim* judges to continue to handle cases of *gerut*: “Regarding a *ger*, the word *le-doroteikhem* is written [in the Torah], which suggests that these laws apply in all contexts even though we do not now have *mumbin* since there are no longer any who are ordained. The word *ule-doroteikhem* means for all generations, forever.”²³ Here again, these formulations of Tosafist interpretation would appear to ratify the presence of actual halakhic conversion activities that were taking place “on the ground.”²⁴

Ri’s leading student and immediate successor, R. Samson of Sens, does not refer to any actual cases involving potential adult converts. He does, however, describe the physical difficulties in performing the ritual circumcision or extraction of blood (for purposes of conversion) on a one-year-old Christian child “in our neighborhood” who was being converted according to the Talmudic principle that a minor convert could be immersed (and initiated into Judaism) under the authority of the Jewish court (*Ketubot* 11a, *ger katan matbilin oto al da’at beit din*).²⁵

Several of Ri's views, including both his leniencies and some of his concerns, made their way into the (prescriptive) *Sefer Mitsvot Gadol* by R. Moses of Coucy (d. ca. 1250, and a student of Ri's direct student R. Judah Sirleon). As Ri did in his *pesak*, R. Moses stresses that three judges are necessary a priori for the immersion, and that the immersion must be done by day (as a function of *mishpat*) and cannot be done at night or on the Sabbath, although he rules that an immersion at night is acceptable after the fact. Against the various northern France *Tosafot* passages that we have seen, and perhaps somewhat closer to Ri's stated preferences in his written *pesak*, R. Moses of Coucy required that three judges be present for the immersion under all conditions.²⁶

R. Moses of Coucy lays out the details of the conversion process as they appear in several *sugyot* in tractate *Yevamot*. He notes that the requirement to inform the potential *ger* of a selection of difficult (or costly) commandments, and of the punishments that were assigned for the violation of various commandments, was intended primarily as a means of dissuading the candidate or, alternatively, as a means of properly warning him about what his new responsibilities would be, as a matter of fairness and not necessarily as a means of dissuading him.²⁷ Similarly, *Semag* presents a mixed series of views as to the desirability of converts for the Jewish people, reflecting the range of opinions that had been noted by Ri and other northern French Tosafists, including a formulation that compares *gerim* most favorably to the Jews who stood at Mount Sinai.²⁸ Once again, R. Moses stresses as Ri did (and perhaps even more so) that three judges must be present not only for the initial acceptance of the *mitsvot* by the convert but also for the confirmation of his (or her) acceptance at the time of immersion.²⁹

Conversion as Reflected in German Rabbinic Literature

If we look at the way that German Tosafists and rabbinic authorities during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries dealt with the Talmudic *sugyot* that discuss *gerut*, we are struck by the differences not only in terms of their conclusions but also with respect to the methods employed and the halakhic values expressed in the course of these interpretations. R. Eli'ezer b. Nathan (Raban, d. ca. 1165) discusses matters of *gerut* in two sections of his *Even ha-Ezer*. In the first instance, which is included among his collected responsa in the first part of this work, one of Raban's sons-in-law asked him to explain

a *sugya* in *Yevamot* (97b) that raises the concern that people will be dissuaded from undergoing conversions. A prior *sugya* in *Yevamot* (47b) that deals with the procedures for telling a potential convert about certain difficult *mizvot* expects that this detail may well dissuade the individual from converting, which is seen as an appropriate result.

Raban responds by distinguishing between the circumstances in each case. He does not appear to entertain the possibility, as *Semag* later did, that the more practical *sugya* in *Yevamot* (47b) does not seek to dissuade the convert per se, but rather to let him (or her) know what his responsibilities will be, so that he will not be able to put forward the claim subsequently that he was unaware of the consequences of his actions.³⁰

When Raban discusses the procedural *sugyot* in *Yevamot* (46b–47a) in the body of his halakhic work, he offers little analysis of any of the procedures and does not address any deviations from the Talmudic requirements that might occur (*be-di'eved*), twice stressing that three rabbinic scholars must be present at both the point of initial acceptance and when the acceptance is reenunciated at the point of immersion (for women as well as for men), which must take place during the day because of the requirement of *mishpat*. He also repeats that the goal of imparting the information concerning the stringent *mitsvot* is to dissuade the potential convert. Raban follows the Talmudic material to the letter, but he does so in a way that suggests that there was nothing especially current here. Nor does he offer any guidance for exigencies that might occur, as Ri and others in northern France did.³¹

Just before his instruction in this section concerning the immersion of a female convert, Raban includes a brief paraphrase of the *sugya* (in *Ketubot* 11a) concerning the conversion of a *ger katan*. He concludes, however, with a similarly brief paraphrase of the final piece of the Talmudic discussion (*Yevamot* 48b, end), which is a *Baraita* on the theme of why *gerim* suffer and are downtrodden at this time.³²

Raban's grandson, Rabbiah (d. ca. 1225), also appears to have been rather unyielding with regard to the composition of a *beit din* for the various facets of *gerut*. A passage in *Sefer Mordekhai* (an important late thirteenth-century halakhic compendium) begins by noting that the leading Sefardic authority R. Isaac Alfasi (Rif, d. 1103 in Lucena) ruled (based on a passage in *Yevamot* 45b) that *be-di'eved*, an immersion for purposes of conversion could be effective even if fewer than three people were present. The *Gemara* presents the case of a female convert who had given birth to a child and had gone to the *mikveh* (to remove her status as a *nidab*) once she was married. According to

Rif's understanding, this *sugya* indicates that just as the immersion of a *nidab* is valid even if it was not witnessed, so too this convert's immersion is valid after the fact, at least in order to consider her child as born of a Jewish mother (and there is an analogous situation of a man who immerses after his conversion to remove the taint of *qeri*).

The *Mordekhai* passage then cites Rabiah, from his no longer extant *Sefer Avi'asaf*. Although Rabiah was prepared to understand the initial *sugya* a bit differently from how Rif did (in that the mother's subsequent immersion would also confirm her own conversion *be-di'aved*), the larger Talmudic construct that accepts the immersion of a *nidab* to ratify the conversion does so only if it was also possible to verify that this woman conducted herself publicly in accordance with the tenets of the Jewish religion (*mitnabeget ke-dat yebudit*) even before her immersion as a *nidab*; otherwise, her conversion was not valid to any extent. As such, it is difficult according to Talmudic law to establish the validity of a conversion if three judges were not present at the convert's immersion.³³

Similarly, Rabiah sought to limit the possibility of a minor (and especially a baby or a very young child) converting to Judaism via the principle of *ger katan matbilin oto al da'at beit din*. This procedure was still in vogue in northern France for babies and young children, as was noted earlier in the case of R. Samson of Sens. Rabiah, however, maintained that the *sugya* of *ger katan* (*Ketubot* 11a, and see also *Sanhedrin* 68b) applies only to a minor who had himself come before the community and its court and asked that he be converted to Judaism. This *sugya* allows the community to honor his request even though he is technically not a *bar da'at*. If, however, the minor does not want this change in status (and does not initiate this request himself for whatever reason), a conversion performed by the *beit din* alone would not be valid.³⁴

Irrespective of whether Rabiah's limitation of the *sugya* of *ger katan* was widely cited or accepted, there are no references to any actual cases in which a *ger katan* was converted to Judaism in Germany in this period. Although there are a small number of German rabbinic sources that discuss the need for a convert who was born circumcised to undergo *batafat dam berit*, these discussions are presented incidentally with regard to the larger halakhic problem—and actual cases that had to be resolved—of whether a Jew who was born already circumcised was allowed to have *batafat dam berit* on the Sabbath. The theoretical situation of the convert was introduced principally as a foil.³⁵

A similar pattern is evident for R. Isaac b. Moses of Vienna, author of the halakhic compendium *Sefer Or Zaru'a*. R. Isaac studied in northern

France with R. Judah Sirleon and R. Samson of Coucy (who were both students of Ri), but he also studied in Germany with Rabiah and R. Simhah of Speyer.³⁶ One of his responsa in *Sefer Or Zaru'a* suggests that R. Isaac did not follow Ri's halakhic approach to *gerim*, but identified instead with the less flexible German approach.³⁷

The subject of this responsum is not a case of conversion but rather whether a bill of divorce (*get*) can be given at night. R. Isaac concludes that just as a *get* may not be written and produced at night, it cannot be given at night, deriving this in large measure from the determination that the immersion of a *ger* cannot take place at night. Immersion is an integral part of the conversion process and is linked with the word *mishpat*. Formal rabbinic pronouncements of *mishpat*, as noted earlier, can take place only by day. R. Isaac notes that there is nothing specific about the immersion of the convert that is associated with *mishpat*. Nonetheless, the Talmudic requirement that the immersion take place during the day results from the convention that "all issues concerning a *ger*" are subsumed under the rubric of *mishpat*. R. Isaac concludes that since the writing of a *get* also cannot take place at night (on the basis of a scriptural derivation), a *get* cannot be given at night either.³⁸

The only other discussion of moment in the voluminous *Sefer Or Zaru'a* that even touches on *gerut* is found within a responsum that deals with the need for every repentant sinner (*ba'al teshuvah*) to undergo immersion as a form of expiation, in accordance with a teaching of R. Simhah of Speyer. In his discussion, R. Isaac suggests that the immersion of a returning apostate is undertaken to atone for the now prohibited acts that he or she had committed as a non-Jew.³⁹ There is no evidence that R. Isaac dealt with any actual cases of *giyyur*, nor is there any other discussion of the laws of *gerut* in *Sefer Or Zaru'a*, with the exception of its recording of the case of the *ger katan* in Sens, noted earlier, that was handled by R. Samson of Sens.

Indeed, R. Simhah of Speyer (as cited by R. Meir of Rothenburg) was the only German Tosafist to offer support for a significant procedural adjustment regarding *gerut*—in accordance with a view that had been enunciated by a northern French rabbinic scholar, R. Judah b. Yom Tov—that a lone judge could preside over conversions as a kind of *yahid mumbeḥ*, a singular judicial expert. At the same time, however, R. Simhah's formulation is focused on technical aspects and requirements of *mishpat* (and the role of a *yahid mumbeḥ*), and once again, there is no evidence that this position was ever enunciated—or implemented—by him in an actual situation or case.⁴⁰

The wide-ranging work of supererogatory ethics and religious behavior produced by the German Pietists, *Sefer Hasidim*, which is often seen as a barometer of the social and personal issues that confronted the Jews in Germany circa 1200,⁴¹ refers to *gerim* in only a handful of sections, even as it refers to apostates, whose presence in Ashkenaz by the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries can be amply documented, in nearly fifteen sections.⁴² Two of the sections in *Sefer Hasidim* about *gerim* are quite positive, although they refer to those who have already converted and focus on points of broader spirituality. In one instance (found only in the so-called French recension of *Sefer Hasidim*), an expansion of the imperative to love the *ger* is suggested.⁴³

The second passage recommends that it is better for a truly good and compassionate *ger* to marry a *giyyoret* with a similar disposition (so that together they will practice modesty and kindness and do business ethically) than to marry a Jewess from birth (*mutav le-bitbaten be-zar'am mile-bitbaten be-zera Yisra'el*) who does not possess these fine character traits. The union with a compassionate *giyyoret* will result in the *ger*'s progeny moving forward to be righteous and good.⁴⁴ Although this passage calls to mind Ri's (lenient) ruling, noted earlier, that a *ger* and a *giyyoret* may marry, *Sefer Hasidim*'s formulation here highlights and upholds the fundamental separation between the lineage of *gerim* and that of the larger Jewish people as a whole.⁴⁵

In another passage, one of the few that appears to address an actual situation involving a candidate for *giyyur* before his conversion, *Sefer Hasidim* maintains, in this instance against a lenient ruling proposed by Ri (see n. 18), that if a male convert was not able to be circumcised because of fears on the part of the local community about taking this step (such that no immersion was able to take place either), his touch still renders Jewish wine undrinkable, even as other Jews should not go so far as to feed him nonkosher food at this point.⁴⁶ Moreover, *Sefer Hasidim* advises that an impotent man should marry a *giyyoret*, as per the Talmudic ruling that one who is impotent is permitted to marry a woman of lesser lineage.⁴⁷

The anonymous author of the halakhic compendium *Sefer Asufot* was a student of Rabbiah and of R. Eleazar b. Judah of Worms (d. ca. 1230), author of *Sefer Rokeah*. *Sefer Asufot* includes a fairly lengthy manual of circumcision composed by an unnamed *mohel*, based heavily on the teachings and instructions (*kelalei ha-milah*) of a *mohel* of note, R. Gershom b. Jacob *ha-Gozer*. Within this manual is a section that begins with the laws of conversion and concludes with a brief section entitled *bilkhot nashim ha-mitgayyerot*.⁴⁸

The section is characterized by a clear degree of strictness and rigidity. It opens with a discussion of the need to inform the potential convert, as per the Talmudic instruction (*Yevamot* 47a), about the downtrodden state of the Jewish nation, which the potential convert is told of in order to dissuade him; the text adds that “most certainly at this time when there is a grave danger to life, conversions are not performed.” Assuming that the candidate—and the religious authorities—nonetheless wishes to proceed, the text continues with a regimen about *kabalat ha-mitsvot*, again noting that if the candidate resigns after hearing the list of commandments, obligations, and punishments, this is an acceptable consequence—if the candidate wishes to terminate the process, let him do so.

This section specifies that one who is circumcised but does immerse, or one who immerses himself but is not circumcised, is treated as a non-Jew in every respect and renders wine not kosher by his very touch. Moreover, one does not properly become a *ger* until he has undergone circumcision and immersion, in that order. Indeed, “there was a case in Mainz with a *ger* who was immersed and then circumcised, and the rabbinic scholar of Mainz required him to undergo another immersion since this must be preceded by circumcision,” yet another example of the strictness that typifies this text. A major concern of the unnamed rabbinic authorities involved in the Mainz case (which is perhaps the only documented case in which German rabbinic figures considered the halakhic status of a convert before his conversion) also seems to have been the blessing: How can the convert make his blessing on the immersion, since he is not yet obligated to perform *mitsvot* as a Jew before his circumcision occurs? Perhaps the pain of the circumcision will cause him withdraw from pursuing the conversion process to its conclusion. This constitutes an additional layer of deterrence that is not found within the Talmudic regulations.

The treatise goes on to rule that an immersion undertaken for removing the status of *keri* or of a *nidab* is unacceptable under all conditions, and that the immersion cannot be done in the evening or on the Sabbath. Three Torah scholars or *hashuvei ha-ir* must always be present to witness the immersion (just as the original intake and questioning concerning acceptance of the commandments required a formally constituted *beit din*). At the point of immersion, these three figures review with the candidate the obligations incumbent on a convert to Judaism, as well as the potential punishments and rewards, and the candidate must once again accept all of this on himself.

The *Asufot* text requires that the convert cut his hair and pare the nails on both his hands and his feet before his immersion, acts that appear to be

necessary independent of the broader requirement to eliminate any visible traces of *batsitsab* before immersion. The precise phrasing of this requirement originates in a passage from *Hilkhot ha-Rif* to tractate *Shabbat*, in which Alfasi outlines the procedures for *giyyur*, and it is possible that *Hilkhot ha-Rif* is the source for the passage here.⁴⁹ At the same time, however, these requirements are mentioned in German rabbinic sources from this period that deal with the return of a repentant apostate, and it is therefore possible that these acts of penance for the returning apostate were added by *Sefer Asufot* to the requirements for conversion as well.⁵⁰ In any case, once the convert has properly undergone all of these various procedures, *Sefer Asufot* concludes that it is incumbent on all Jews to accept and love him.

In the brief section about a woman who seeks to convert, the *Asufot* text calls for her to fast each day (with the exception of the Sabbath) for a month before her conversion. This was perhaps meant as an act of expiation, an aspect that was noted earlier in connection with *Sefer Or Zaru'a* (and with regard to the preparations for immersion just outlined), although there is no explanation given for this practice by *Sefer Asufot* itself. Other women must put the female convert into water up to her neck, at which point two *talmidei hakhamim* or *tovei ha-ir* stand outside. This leniency, that two witnesses rather than a full court are sufficient for this aspect of the process, is based on a passage in *Yevamot* (47b), although these two rabbinic scholars must also inform her again about the various *mitsvot*, and their punishments and rewards.

Once again, according to *Sefer Asufot*, if these demands cause the potential convert to walk away from the process, so be it. If, however, the potential female convert accepts all of this, she is immersed immediately and is permitted to marry a Jewish man. The woman cannot be immersed at night, but only by day. In short, the rather detailed material in *Sefer Asufot* is in full accord with the more limiting approach to conversion that was advocated in Germany already by Raban.⁵¹

Accounting for the Differences

There are two overarching issues or reasons that may account for the rather stark differences with regard to the acceptance of *gerim* that I have outlined between the writings of the rabbis of northern France and those of the rabbis of Germany during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries on both the theoretical and practical levels, differences that are supported and confirmed by

the smaller number of converts overall who appear to have been accepted in Germany as compared with northern France.⁵² The first is the value or consideration of lineage, *yibus*, and its role in the development and ongoing existence of the Jewish communities in northern France and Germany. As Avraham Grossman has demonstrated, this concept or value was an exceptionally powerful one in Ashkenaz from the eleventh century onward. However, while the rabbinic circles of northern France placed significant value on this consideration, the rabbinic families of Germany were even more committed to it.⁵³

As noted toward the beginning of this study, Ri of Dampierre was well aware, on the basis of a Talmudic formulation, of the differences between *gerim* and those born as Jews in terms of the possibility of their receiving the presence of the *Shekbinab*. Nonetheless, there was little, if any, discussion within northern France about the practical application of this kind of larger spiritual principle, and there is no indication that marrying accepted converts who had expended full effort and intention during their conversion (in Ri's words as cited earlier, *mit'amsim le-bitgayyer*) constituted a diminution in any way in the individual status of the Jews who married them. As such, northern French rabbinic authorities did not hesitate to rule leniently on behalf of potential converts, and to deal with them benevolently even before they had completed the conversion process. Although no German halakhist would necessarily disagree once the conversion process had been completed, it was left to Ri of Dampierre to exclaim (in a halakhic context), "Ve-khi bekhil ha-mitsvot ein ger zedek bikhlal Yisrael?" (Is there no righteous convert among the Jewish people who observes all of the commandments?).⁵⁴

On the other hand, *Sefer Hasidim* and the contemporary German Tosafist Rabbiah appear to have enunciated an identifiable hierarchy in this regard. Rabbiah utilizes the phrase "the select among your brethren" (*muvhav shebe-abikha*) to characterize the members of the larger Jewish community, who must be especially careful in terms of marriage partners and thus may not marry a *giyyoret* or a *shifhab kena'anit*.⁵⁵ The *bakham* in *Sefer Hasidim* counsels individuals on instances in which it is appropriate to marry women with "defective" or "lesser" *yibus*. In one such discussion, *Sefer Hasidim* actively follows the Mishnaic and Talmudic prescription (in *Yevamot*) that an impotent man should marry a *giyyoret*.⁵⁶ Given the extra measure of sensitivity to these considerations of *yibus* found among the Jewish communities in Germany, it may be possible to understand the relative stringency and inflexibility

that German Tosafists and other rabbinic decisors displayed with regard to the Talmudic regulations governing conversion (as well as their hesitancy to rule on cases of potential converts in practice) even as they fully welcomed those who made it through this arduous process in any case.

Perhaps even more telling is that there appears to have been a significant difference in the ways that the Jewish communities of northern France and Germany interacted with the surrounding Christian society. Conversion to Judaism was a grave offense throughout Latin Christendom during the medieval period, and there are a host of doctrinal (and temporal) texts and materials that speak strongly against this possibility.⁵⁷ There is evidence to suggest that during the late twelfth century, when efforts to prevent conversion to Judaism were largely in the hands of local bishops, and in the first half of the thirteenth century, when responsibility for enforcement of this restriction was transferred to the mendicant orders, both the local bishops and the mendicant friars were closer in terms of proximity to and possible impact on the Jewish communities in Germany than they were to the communities of northern France.⁵⁸ It should also be noted that in two recent studies on rabbinic attitudes toward apostates, *meshumadim*, during the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, I have found that German Tosafists were significantly more sensitive than their northern French counterparts toward separating these apostates from the larger Jewish community. Jewish apostates who wished to return to the community were allowed to do so only after demonstrated acts of repentance, and a clear rejection of their prior state.⁵⁹

Thus, while there is little (if any) mention in Jewish sources about Christian pressures against conversion to Judaism in northern France, there are several explicit and strongly worded reflections of this concern in Germany. In addition to the statement in *Sefer Asufot* (from the mid-thirteenth century) noted earlier, that it is presently a *sakanat nefashot* (a danger to one's life) to convert anyone to Judaism, and a passage in *Sefer Hasidim* (composed in Germany during the first quarter of the thirteenth century) that indicates that the circumcision of a potential convert could not be performed because the Jews of his town feared doing so lest the Christians become aware of it,⁶⁰ R. Meir of Rothenburg (Maharam, d. 1293) describes in a responsum the case of four Jews who were ordered by the ruling authorities to testify under oath about the identity of a fifth Jew, who was a *ger*; they faced confiscation of their property if they did not tell the truth. Although they would have been permitted to swear falsely (that the fifth Jew was not a convert) or to

otherwise prevaricate in their response (even if they would thereby have been required to forfeit some of their own assets), since this was a case of *sakanat nefashot*, they testified instead that he was indeed a convert.

Maharam notes that, most fortuitously, this *ger* was not burned at the stake, adding that the heavens had great mercy on him, since Maharam would have believed that “not one in a thousand is saved [from this fate], since even when apostates [from Judaism to Christianity] testify against a convert [to Judaism], he is burned, how much more so when Jews testify against him.” Instead, the *ger* was assigned a very stiff monetary penalty in this instance, for which, according to Maharam, the other Jews involved were required to repay him. It is to Maharam’s great astonishment, however, that the *ger* escaped the fate of being burned at the stake in this instance (which was otherwise apparently enforced), which is most striking.⁶¹

A responsum by R. Hayyim Eli’ezer, son of R. Isaac *Or Zaru’a* and a student of Maharam, mentions the case of a certain Rabbi Isaac who circumcised *gerim* and, as a result, caused his community to be placed under some kind of serious charge (or the threat of physical persecution), an *alilab*, by the Christian authorities.⁶² Taken together, all of these various rabbinic sources suggest that the pressure being brought to bear by the Christians in Germany when Christians converted to Judaism was often much more than just rhetoric.⁶³

Although manuscripts of *sidurim* and *mabzorim* of German rites from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries retain the blessings to be recited at the circumcision of a *ger*, their presence may be akin to the material found in *Sefer Asufot*: the laws and procedures for conversion must always be kept “on the books,” as part of the halakhic and ritual process. Nonetheless, the extent to which these blessings had occasion to be recited in medieval Germany remains unclear. At the same time, their recitation in northern France during this period appears to have been more likely.⁶⁴

95. Lunn-Rockcliffe, *Ambrosiaster's*, 41.
96. Robert Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late Fourth Century* (Berkeley, 1983), 161–62.
97. Although it is worth pointing out the opinion of a historian of Jews in late ancient Rome: “The works of Ambrosiaster tell us little or nothing about the Jews of Rome in Late Antiquity.” Leonard V. Rutgers, *The Jews in Late Ancient Rome: Evidence of Cultural Interaction in the Roman Diaspora* (Leiden, 2000), 212.
98. Speller, “Ambrosiaster,” 76.
99. Lunn-Rockcliffe, *Ambrosiaster's*, 41. I make a similar point with respect to Ambrosiaster and the slightly later *Collatio legum mosaicarum et romanarum*, or *Lex Dei*: Jacobs, “Papinian,” 94–97.
100. On Jerome’s ambivalence with respect to Jews and Jewish knowledge, see Andrew S. Jacobs, *Remains of the Jews: The Holy Land and Christian Empire in Late Antiquity*, Divinations (Stanford, Calif., 2004), 56–100.
101. Paula Fredriksen, *Augustine and the Jews: A Christian Defense of Jews and Judaism* (New York, 2008).
102. On epistemology and religious power in ancient Rome, see Clifford Ando, *The Matters of the Gods: Religion and the Roman Empire* (Berkeley, 2008).
103. On this score, we might read Epiphanius’ forays into biblical translation and historical criticism as a cipher for Mossman’s own historical theses.
104. For the multiplicity of legends about Tiresias (including a lost poem outlining six gender switches), see James J. O’Hara, “Sostratus *Supp. Hell.* 773: A Lost, Possibly Catullan-Era Elegy on the Six Sex Changes of Tiresias,” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 126 (1996): 173–219; and a complete register of Tiresias’ literary appearances (only some of which involve his sex change) in Gherardo Ugolini, *Untersuchungen zur Figur des Sebers Teiresias* (Tübingen, 1995). The figure of Tiresias is more compelling than that of (for instance) the hermaphrodite, particularly for its diachronicity: Tiresias is a *former* woman (just as he was a *former* man) and simultaneously speaks truth (because he has knowledge through experience) and upholds the patriarchal order (by siding with Jupiter over Juno).
105. Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 3.316–38, gives the classic story of Tiresias—who spent seven years as a woman and, blinded by Juno for his honesty, was given the gift of prophecy by Jupiter. Ovid recounts Pentheus’ tragedy at the conclusion of the same book of the *Metamorphoses* (3.708–34), notably stripped of Euripides’ famous cross-dressing.
106. Michel de Certeau, *Heterologies: Discourse on the Other* (Manchester, 1986), 217.
107. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *A Critique of Post-colonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present* (Cambridge, Mass., 1999), 216. See also *ibid.*, 6: “I think of the ‘native informant’ as a name for that mark of expulsion from the name of Man—a mark crossing out the impossibility of the ethical relation.” On the “potentially paralyzing situation” of the “native informant,” see Shahnaz Khan, “Reconfiguring the Native Informant: Positionality in the Global Age,” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30 (2005): 2017–35.

CHAPTER 3

1. Jacob Katz, *Bein Yebudim le-Goyim* (Jerusalem, 1960), 84–88, published in English as *Exclusiveness and Tolerance* (Oxford, 1961), 77–82.

2. B. Z. Wacholder, “Cases of Proselytizing in the Tosafist Responsa,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 51 (1961): 288–315.

3. A. R. Reiner, “Ha-Ger: Ha-Omnam Ahikha Hu? Li-She’elat Ma’amad ha-Gerim bi-Kehilot Ashkenaz ve-Tsarefat ba-Me’ot ha-Yod Alef—ha-Yod Gimmel,” in *Ta-Shma—Mebkarim le-Zikbro shel Yisra’el M. Ta-Shma*, ed. M. Idel et al. (Alon Shvut, 2011), 747–69, published in French as “L’attitude envers les prosélytes en Allemagne et en France du XIe au XIIIe siècle,” *Revue des Études Juives* 167 (2008): 99–119. See also Kenneth Auman, “Conversion from Christianity to Judaism in the Middle Ages” (MA thesis, Yeshiva University, 1977), which deals with the evidence from medieval Europe more broadly.

4. See, e.g., Isadore Twersky, *Introduction to the Code of Maimonides* (New Haven, Conn., 1980), 485–86. This Ovadiah should not be confused with Ovadiah the Norman proselyte; e.g., see Norman Golb, “The Music of Obadiah the Proselyte and His Conversion,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 18 (1967): 43–63.

5. See *Sefer Rabiab*, ed. A. Aptowitz (repr., Brooklyn, 1983), 2:253–56 (*Masekhet Megilah*, sec. 549); and *Sefer Mordekhai al Masekhet Megilah*, ed. M. A. Rabinowitz (Jerusalem, 1997), 21–23 (sec. 786). Cf. Wacholder, “Cases of Proselytizing,” 302–4; and E. E. Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot* (Jerusalem, 1984), 1:210–11.

6. Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, 78–79. See also Auman, “Conversion from Christianity,” 10.

7. The latter halakhic consideration was a matter of ongoing discussion within both northern France and Germany during the Tosafist period. See, e.g., *Tosafot Bava Batra* 81a, s.v. *lim’utei*; *Teshuvot u-Fesakim*, ed. E. Kupfer (Jerusalem, 1973), 101–5 (sec. 60); *Sefer ha-Manbig le-R. Avraham b. Natan ha-Yarbi*, ed. Y. Raphael (Jerusalem, 1978), 1:225–26; *Sefer Rokeach*, ed. B. Schneerson (repr., Jerusalem, 1967), fol. 229 (sec. 331); *Hagahot Asheri to Berakhot* 3:13; *Sefer Or Zaru’a, hilkhot tefilah*, ed. Makhon Yerusalayim (Jerusalem, 2010), 1:103 (sec. 107); *Piskei Maharam li-Verakhtot*, ed. S. Spitzer (Jerusalem, 1988), 99 (in a gloss to sec. 22); and the commentaries of R. Samson of Sens and Rosh to *Bikurim* 1:3. See also *Teshuvot Rabiab*, ed. D. Deblitzsky (Bnei Brak, Israel, 1996), vol. 1, sec. 939, where Rabiab appears (again) to agree with his father R. Joel’s approach in these matters.

8. A. M. Habermann, *Gezerot Ashkenaz ve-Tsarefat* (Jerusalem, 1945), 49.

9. See Avraham Grossman, “Yihus Mishpahah be-Ashkenaz ha-Kedumah,” in *Perakim be-Toledot ha-Hevrah ha-Yebudit Bimei ha-Benayim uve-Et ha-Hadasbab—Mukdashim li-Prof. Ya’akov Katz*, ed. I. Ertes and Y. Salmon (Jerusalem, 1980), 15. See also Habermann, *Gezerot Ashkenaz ve-Tsarefat*, 37, 53, 100–103; and Reiner, “Ha-Ger,” 747–50. Two or three additional converts who perished during 1096 are also noted. See S. Salfeld, *Das Martyrologium des Nürnberger Memorbuches* (Berlin, 1898), 9. While the Crusade chronicles reflect certain societal attitudes, as well as a strong degree of idealization—see, e.g., Jeremy Cohen, “A 1096 Complex? Constructing the First Crusade in Jewish Historical Memory, Medieval and Modern,” in *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. J. Van Engen and M. Signer (Notre Dame, Ind., 2001), 9–26; Cohen, *Sanctifying the Name of God: Jewish Martyrs and Jewish Memory of the First Crusade* (Philadelphia, 2004); and Shmuel Shepkaru, *Jewish Martyrs in the Pagan and Christian Worlds* (Cambridge, England, 2006), 141–205—they do not necessarily reflect halakhic attitudes toward conversion. Cf. Avraham Grossman, *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim* (Jerusalem, 1981), 360–61, 404, 408, who suggests that these sources support the abiding conception and importance of *yibus* within the Jewish communities of Germany; and see n. 53 of the present chapter.

10. Ri's formulation is found in *Tosafot Yevamot* 109b, s.v. *ra'ah abar ra'ah li-mekablei gerim*. Cf. *Tosafot ha-Rosh* to *Yevamot* 109b and *Tosafot Yevamot* 24b, s.v. *lo bimei David*. See also ms. Vercelli (bishop's seminary) C1 (Institute for Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts #30923), fol. 291d (in a marginal gloss); and ms. JTS Rab. 526 (39216), fol. 190v. Ri's formulation is recorded anonymously in a number of *Mordekhai* texts. See, e.g., ms. JTS Rab. 655, fol. 220r; ms. Hamburg 247 (1051), fol. 91r; ms. Moscow Guenzberg 1329 (47575), fol. 148v; ms. Toronto-Friedberg 3-004, fol. 98v; ms. Montefiore 129 (4641), fols. 126v–127r; ms. Parma (de Rossi) 1334 (13031), fol. 247v; and ms. Vatican 324 (8635), fol. 230v.

11. *Tosafot Kidushin* 71a, s.v. *kashim gerim*. Reiner, "Ha-Ger," has suggested that, overall, Ri and his *beit midrash* exhibited newfound support for converts and conversion to Judaism, in both ideological and halakhic texts and contexts.

12. See, e.g., Wacholder, "Cases of Proselytizing," 297–301; Auman, "Conversion from Christianity," 11–16; Reiner, "Ha-Ger," 764–65; and Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, 78n5.

13. See Auman, "Conversion from Christianity," 46–54, 57–60.

14. See Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, 79; *Sefer ha-Yasbar le-Rabenu Tam (helek ha-teshuvo)*, ed. S. Rosenthal (Berlin, 1898), 106–8 (sec. 51); Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:130–31; and Wacholder, "Cases of Proselytizing," 295–97, for the case of a recently deceased *ger* who had been taught scripture and Mishnah "night and day" (following his conversion) by a brother of one of Rabenu Tam's leading students, R. Moses of Pontoise. The *ger*'s subsequent death prompted a complex question about the original allocation of his assets (which disbursed them in the main to his devoted teacher, the brother of R. Moses of Pontoise), and whether these assets could have been willed at a later point by the convert to his own brother's son, who was himself a *ger*. This question was dealt with by R. Meshullam of Melun, R. Elijah of Paris, and Rabenu Tam himself. *Mordekhai le-Masekhet Mo'ed Katan*, secs. 907–8, records a situation (*ma'aseh*) that came before Ri, concerning whether a *ger* should observe formal *avelut* for his deceased mother (who had also converted to Judaism). The *Mordekhai* passage then correlates this decision with the question of inheritance of the parent in this instance by the *ger*. Cf. *Mordekhai Mo'ed Katan*, sec. 938; and Wacholder, "Cases of Proselytizing," 301n57. *Mordekhai Bava Mezi'a*, secs. 258–59 [= ms. Vercelli C1, fol. 38d], recounts the story of a convert who dwelled in the house of R. Isaac *ha-Levi* of Speyer (and perhaps became his student). When this *ger* passed away, a question arose as to whether an amount of gold found within the deceased's clothing belonged to R. Isaac *ha-Levi* or to the student of R. Isaac who made this find. Questions concerning the distribution of a *ger*'s assets after his death were presented for adjudication before both Raban of Mainz and his grandson, Rabbiah of Cologne, but there does not appear to have been any relationship between the converts and the rabbinic figures in these instances. See R. Eliezer b. Nathan, *Even ha-Ezer*, ed. S. Ehrenreich (repr., Jerusalem, 1975), fol. 196b (*masekhet Bava Mezi'a, hilkhot dinin*); and A. Aptowitz, *Mavo la-Rabiah* (repr., Jerusalem, 1984), 479; and cf. *Teshuvot Rabiab*, ed. D. Reblitzky (Bnei Brak, Israel, 2000), vol. 2, sec. 1007; *Mordekhai Bava Batra*, sec. 553 (citing R. Barukh of Mainz); and Simcha Emanuel, *Shivrei Lubot* (Jerusalem, 2006), 133n136.

15. See, e.g., Ephraim Kanarfogel, "Religious Leadership During the Tosafist Period: Between the Academy and the Rabbinic Court," in *Jewish Religious Leadership: Image and Reality*, ed. J. Wertheimer (New York, 2004), 1:297–305; and Emanuel, *Shivrei Lubot*, 1–12.

16. See ms. Vercelli C1, fol. 291c (in a marginal gloss); and n. 26 of the present chapter. Regarding the status of a circumcision for *gerut* that was performed at night, see *Maharam Mi-Rothenburg: Teshuvot, Pesakim u-Minbagim*, ed. I. Z. Kahana (Jerusalem, 1957), 1:144–45

(secs. 149–50); and *Haggabot Maimuniyyot, hilkbet milah*, 1:5 [40]; cf. *Hiddushei ba-Ritva al Maskhet Yevamot* 45b, ed. R. A. Jofen (Jerusalem, 1992), 2:266.

17. See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:236. As Urbach notes, Ri's view was presented by his student R. Isaac b. Abraham (Rizba), as recorded in the commentary (*Tosafot*) to *Hilkbet ha-Rif* by R. Moses of London (to *Yevamot* 42a), in *Ha-Tosafot she-al ha-Alfas*, ed. M. Y. Blau (New York, 1970), 317. R. Moses of London immediately adds the restrictive Tosefta reference. Various *Tosafot* passages to *Yevamot* 42a, including the standard *Tosafot, Tosafot ha-Rosh* and *Tosafot Yesbanim*, do not specify Ri's name in their citation of this position. The same is true for *Mordekhai li-Yevamot*, secs. 34–35, which cites the restrictive position from an unspecified *midrash agadab*. See also ms. Vercelli C1, fol. 291b; ms. Vatican 141 (11627), fol. 174v; ms. Budapest 2^o1 (31445), fol. 269c; ms. British Museum 537 (5018 = Add. 19972), fol. 345v; ms. Vienna 72, fol. 213c; and ms. Parma (de Rossi) 929 (13795), fol. 235c.

18. See *Shitat ha-Kadmonim al Massekhet Avodah Zarab*, ed. Blau, 309–10 (*Tosafot Rabenu Yehudab b. Yitsbak mi-Paris*). Cf. *Hagabot Mordekhai to Yevamot*, sec. 111, regarding the (much later) case of a *ger* who underwent immersion (or the conversion process more broadly) in front of judges who were related, and leading, albeit unnamed, rabbinic authorities argued about the status of wine that he then touched. This passage intimates that there is a responsum on this matter to be found in the *Mordekhai ha-Katsar le-Perek ha-Holets*. To this point, however, I have been unable to locate this responsum, in either printed texts or manuscript.

19. See *Tosafot Avodah Zarab* 64b, s.v. *ein*. See also Reiner, “Ha-Ger,” 764n69.

20. See *Tosafot Kidushin* 62b, s.v. *ger*; *Tosafot Yevamot* 45b; *Tosafot ha-Rosh al Massekhet Kidushin*, ed. D. Metzger (Jerusalem, 2006), 529–31, s.v. *ger zarikh sheloshah*; and *Tosafot Yevamot* 45b, s.v. *mi lo tavlah le-nidutab*; cf. *Tosafot ha-Rosh*, to *Yevamot* 45b. *Piskei ha-Rosh to Yevamot* (4:31, and see also *Maharam Mi-Rothenburg: Teshevot, Pesakim u-Minbagim*, ed. I. Z. Kahana [Jerusalem, 1960], 2:262–63, *pesakim* 212) records this formulation as a response by Rosh's teacher, R. Meir (of Rothenburg), whose teachings were sometimes added by the Rosh to the earlier version of northern French *Tosafot* that he preserved. (R. Meir of Rothenburg studied in northern France with several Tosafist colleagues of R. Moses of Coucy, including R. Yehi'el of Paris and R. Samuel of Evreux.) See also *Tosafot Yesbanim ha-Shalem al Massekhet Yevamot*, ed. A. Shoshana (Jerusalem, 1994), 273 (to *Yevamot* 46a, s.v. *mi lo tavlah*); and cf. *Hidushei ba-Ritva al Massekhet Yevamot* 46b, ed. Jofen, 2:311. On the northern French provenance of all of these *Tosafot* collections, see Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot* 2:620–25, 630–33. On *Tosafot ha-Rosh*, see *ibid.*, 2:587–98 (and esp. 595, 596n39); and cf. E. Chwat, introduction to *Hidushei ha-Ramban le-Massekhet Ketubot*, ed. E. Chwat (Jerusalem, 1993), 32–37. The essential French formulation is also found in *Sefer Mordekhai li-Yevamot*, sec. 33. See also, e.g., ms. Vercelli C1, fols. 291b–c.

21. See, e.g., S. Emanuel, “Ha-Meneket ha-Notserit Bimei ha-Benayim—Halakhah ve-Historiyyah,” *Zion* 73 (2008): 21–40; cf. R. Aharon Lichtenstein, “Gerut: Leidah u-Mishpat,” *Torah shebe-Al Peh* 13 (1971): 82–94.

22. See *Tosafot Kidushin* 62b, s.v. *ger*; *Tosafot ha-Rosh* 62b, ed. Metzger, s.v. *mishpat*, 531–32; and *Tosafot Yevamot* 47a, s.v. *mishpat*. See also *Tosafot ha-Rosh al Massekhet Gitin*, ed. H. B. Ravitz (Bnei Brak, Israel, 1974), 296 (to *Gitin* 88b, s.v. *ki avdinan shlibutaihu be-milta de-shekhiva*); and *Tosafot Gitin* 88b, s.v. *be-milta*, citing Ri.

23. *Tosafot Kidushin* 62b, s.v. *ger*. On R. Netan'el of Chinon, see Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:480–81, 2:623n15; A. Shoshana, introduction to *Tosafot Yesbanim al Yevamot*, ed. Shoshana, 22–24; and Avraham Grossman, “R. Netan'el me-Chinon: Mi-Gedolei Ba'alei

ha-Tosafot be-Tsafefat ba-Me'ah ha-Yod Gimmel," in *Mebkerei Talmud* 3, ed. Y. Sussmann and D. Rosenthal (Jerusalem, 2005), 174–84.

24. See also the *Tosafot* to *Yevamot* in ms. Vatican 162 (8624), fol. 47r, s.v. *tikunei gavra* (= *Tosafot Yevamot* 46b); and ms. Rome Angelica Or. 38 (11692), *Tosafot* to *Kidushin*, fol. 35v, published as *Sbitat ha-Kadmonim al Masekhet Kidushin*, ed. M. Blau (New York, 1970), 155.

25. *Sefer Or Zaru'a*, ed. Yerushalayim, 2:145 (pt. 2, sec. 99, at the end of the section). See also Wacholder, "Cases of Proselytizing," 306. The addressee of this responsum by R. Samson was R. Judah, the son of (*ba-kadosh*) R. Yom Tov of Joigny. (R. Judah was also a student of Rabbenu Tam, as his father had been.) See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:146, 318. *Sefer Or Zaru'a, piskei Bava Kama*, sec. 436, also records R. Samson of Sens' description of how a *beit din* was constituted in Sens, in response to a question from his student R. Jacob b. Solomon of Courson. Cf. Kanarfogel, "Religious Leadership," 289–90.

26. *Sefer Mitsvot Gadol*, ed. Machon Yerushalayim (Jerusalem, 1993), 2:195 (*mitsvat lo ta'aseh* 115–16).

27. *Ibid.*, 2:198.

28. Note that in *Semag, mitsvat aseh* 74 (ed. Venice, 1517), fol. 152b, R. Moses urges that since, according to the Talmud, the purpose of the exile of the Jewish people among the nations of the world is to attract proselytes, Jews should deal honestly with non-Jews as well because if they behave inappropriately or unfairly, who will want to join them? Cf. Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, 80; and Reiner, "Ha-Gerim," 769nn86–87.

29. *Semag*, ed. Machon Yerushalayim (Jerusalem, 2007), 2:200. It should be noted, however, that there is only ancillary discussion of *gerut* in R. Eliezer of Metz's *Sefer Yere'im* (see *Sefer Yere'im ha-Shalem*, secs. 31–32, 180–81, where the blessings for the circumcision are noted), 402, and no discussion in either the published or manuscript version of R. Barukh b. Isaac's *Sefer ha-Terumah*, two works that were typically among *Semag's* most important sources. *Semag's* firm insistence that the immersion take place in the presence of three may also reflect the influence of Maimonides; see *Mishneh Torah, hilkhot issurei bi'ab*, 13:6.

30. *Sefer Raban*, ed. S. Z. Ehrenreich (New York, 1957), fols. 29b–30a (sec. 36).

31. *Ibid.*, fol. 243a.

32. *Ibid.*

33. *Sefer Mordekhai al Masekhet Yevamot*, secs. 35–36. This passage is found similarly in ms. Vercelli C1, fol. 291b; ms. Budapest 2⁹¹, fol. 269c; ms. Parma 929, fol. 235r; and ms. Vienna 72, fol. 213c. For Rif's approach, see also *Arba'ab Turim, Yoreh De'ab*, sec. 268.

34. See *Mordekhai al Masekhet Yevamot*, sec. 40 (immediately following an entirely different citation from *Avi'asaf* concerning an apostate). See also, e.g., ms. Vatican 324, fol. 229d; ms. Vienna 72, fol. 230r; and ms. Moscow–Guenzberg 1329, fols. 148r–v.

35. See, e.g., *Sefer Rabiab*, ed. Aptowitz, vol. 1, sec. 285. Cf. *Sefer Rokeah*, ed. Schneerson, fols. 59–60 (sec. 108); and *Shibolei ha-Leket, hilkhot milab*, ed. S. Buber (Vilnius, Lithuania, 1887), fol. 185b (sec. 1).

36. On R. Isaac of Vienna's teachers, see Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:436–39; and Zvi Fuchs, "Iyyunim be-Sefer Or Zaru'a le-R. Yizhak b. Mosheh me-Vienna" (MA thesis, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1993), 12–40.

37. For a similar pattern of *pesak* on the part of R. Isaac in an unrelated case, see Ephraim Kanarfogel, "The Appointment of *Hazanim* in Medieval Ashkenaz: Communal Policy and Individual Religious Prerogatives," in *Spiritual Authority: Struggles over Cultural Power in Jewish Thought*, ed. H. Kreisel et al. (Beersheba, Israel, 2009), 5–31.

38. *Sefer Or Zaru'a*, sec. 745 [5] (responsum to R. Avigdor Katz of Vienna), ed. Yerushalayim, 1:640. On this responsum, cf. Uzi Fuchs, “Shalosh Teshuvot Hadashot shel R. Yitshak Or Zaru'a,” *Tarbiz* 70 (2001): 109–14, 121–27.

39. *Sefer Or Zaru'a*, ed. Yerushalayim, 1:105–7 (pt. 1 [response], sec. 112). Although this formulation perhaps implies that the same is true, at least in part, for the immersion of a new convert to Judaism, Maharil (d. 1427) is the first Ashkenazic rabbinic authority to say so explicitly. See *Sefer Maharil: Minbagim shel Rabenu Ya'akov Molin*, ed. S. Spitzer (Jerusalem, 1989), 315 (*bilkhot erev yom ha-kippurim*); and cf. *Teshuvot u-Pesakim*, ed. Kupfer, 290–91 (sec. 171).

40. *Sefer Mordekhai li-Yevamot*, sec. 33. See also ms. Vercelli C1, fol. 291c (in the body of *Sefer Mordekhai*); ms. Budapest 2^o1, fol. 269c; ms. British Museum 537, fol. 345v; ms. Vienna 72, fol. 231d; and ms. Parma (de Rossi), fol. 235r (sec. 419). The R. Judah b. Yom Tov mentioned in this passage was the grandson of Rashi's son-in-law R. Judah b. Nathan, who married the widow of Rabenu Tam's brother, R. Isaac b. Meir, and was the grandfather of R. Judah Sirleon. See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:46, 58, 120, 227, 229, 284, 307, 321, 329.

41. See, e.g., I. Ta-Shma, *Halakhah, Minbag u-Mezi'ut be-Ashkenaz, 1100–1350* (Jerusalem, 1996), 112–18, 125–27; Elisheva Baumgarten, *Mothers and Children: Jewish Family Life in Medieval Europe* (Princeton, N.J., 2004), 17, 42, 159–63, 168; A. Grossman, *Pious and Rebellious: Jewish Women in Medieval Europe* (Waltham, Mass., 2004); Ivan Marcus, *Piety and Society* (Leiden, 1981), 2–17; and Ephraim Kanarfogel, *Jewish Education and Society in the High Middle Ages* (Detroit, 2007), 20–21, 31, 36–41, 86–99, 137–41.

42. On apostates in Ashkenaz at this time, see, e.g., Ephraim Kanarfogel, “Returning to the Jewish Community in Medieval Ashkenaz: History and Halakhah,” in *Turim: Studies in Jewish History and Literature Presented to Dr. Bernard Lander*, ed. M. Shmidman (New York, 2007), 1:69–97; and Kanarfogel, “Changing Attitudes Toward Apostates in Tosafist Literature, Late Twelfth–Early Thirteenth Centuries,” in *New Perspectives on Jewish-Christian Relations in Honor of David Berger*, ed. E. Carlebach and J. J. Schacter (Leiden, 2011), 297–327.

43. *Sefer Hasidim (defus Bologna)*, ed. R. Margoliot (Jerusalem, 1957), sec. 116. On the French recension of *Sefer Hasidim*, see, e.g., Ephraim Kanarfogel, “Peering Through the Lattices”: *Mystical, Magical and Pietistic Dimensions in the Tosafist Period* (Detroit, 2000), 33–35; and Haym Soloveitchik, “Piety, Pietism and German Pietism: *Sefer Hasidim I* and the Influence of *Hasidei Ashkenaz*,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 92 (2002): 455–66.

44. *Sefer Hasidim (defus Parma)*, ed. J. Wistinetzki (Frankfurt, 1924), 1097 = *Sefer Hasidim (defus Bologna)*, 377.

45. See also SHP 1098; and Reiner, “Ha-Ger,” 766n77. SHP 215 (= SHB 691) rules stringently, in accordance with the *sugya* in *Yevamot* (48b; noted also by Raban, n. 31 of the present chapter), that a *ger* must pay any outstanding monetary obligations that he incurred, even though he is spiritually considered to be *ke-katan she-nolad*. Cf. *Tosafot Sanhedrin* 71b, s.v. *ben*. Similarly, *Sefer Hasidim* writes that the *ger* still requires expiation (*kaparah*) if he has committed a murder, since even as a non-Jew, he knew that this act was sinful.

46. SHP 214 (= SHB 690).

47. See SHP 1911–12; and n. 53 of the present chapter. At the same time, however, R. Judah *be-Hasid* notes that there are instances in which a *ger* results from the soul of a Jew that the angel who oversees pregnancies mistakenly placed in the womb of a non-Jewish woman. See *Teshuvot Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, ed. I. A. Agus (New York, 1954), 286; and the passage from R. Eleazar of Worm's prayer commentary cited in Reiner, “Ha-Ger,” 765n75. SHP,

986, maintains that “ha-Torah kashah le-gerim mipnei ha-boshet.” This notion about *gerim* is expressed, however, as a counterexample in the context of a larger argument by *Sefer Hasidim* that when a person is trained from his youth to observe *mitsvot*, it is not difficult for him to continue to do so when he gets older. Indeed, he will not so easily abandon *mitsvot* at that point because to do so would cause him to feel *boshet*. See also *SHP*, 1011.

48. *Zikbron Brit la-Rishonim*, ed. J. Glassberg (Berlin, 1892), 132–36 (= ms. Montefiore 134, fols. 85a–86a). On this work, see, e.g., Ta-Shma, *Halakhah, Minbag u-Mezi’ut be-Ashkenaz*, 96–97; and Baumgarten, *Mothers and Children*, 46–54.

49. See *Hilkhot ha-Rif’al Masekhet Shabbat*, fol. 55b (to the end of chapter 19). See also *Pisqei ha-Rosh le-Shabbat*, 19:11; *Arb’ab Turim*, *Yoreh De’ab*, sec. 268; and the *Beit Yosef* commentary, s.v. *ve-ein marbin alav*.

50. See the *pesak* attributed to *Avi ha-Ezri* (= Rabiah) in *Semak mi-Zurikh*, ed. M. Ha-Shoshanim (Jerusalem, 1977), 2:49; the passage in the *Sifra Commentary* attributed to R. Samson of Sens (Jerusalem, 1959), *parashat Emor*, *parsbeta* 14n1, fol. 110b, which lists both shaving the head and cutting the nails; R. Avigdor Katz of Vienna (d. ca. 1270, a student of R. Simhah of Speyer), in *Perushim u-Fesakim le-R. Avigdor* (Jerusalem, 1996), 409–10; and cf. *Kitsur Sefer Mitsvot Gadol le-R. Avraham b. Ephraim*, ed. Y. Horowitz (Jerusalem, 2005), 194. Note that the *Sifra* commentary attributed to Samson of Sens was not composed by a Frenchman but rather by a German contemporary of Rabiah; see Kanarfogel, “Returning to the Jewish Community,” 86–87n34.

51. See nn. 30–32 of the present chapter. See also the *Hagabot Mordekhai li-Yevamot*, sec. 110: “ani hedyot ha-kotev nir’ah li de-mi she-ba lefanenu ve-yadua lanu she-bishvil to’elet davar hem osim ein le-kablam.” R. Avigdor Katz of Vienna is one of the few German rabbinic authorities of his age to exhibit a wider range of interests in *gerim* and *gerut* in both exegetical and halakhic contexts, although his awareness of rabbinic materials from northern France (and Italy) is well attested. See his *Perushim u-Fesakim le-R. Avigdor*, 43, 58, 103, 113, 162, 228, 361, 400, 410–11, 463–64, 474; and cf. Kanarfogel, “Peering Through the Lattices,” 107–9, 225–27; Emanuel, *Shivrei Lubot*, 173–81; and the next note.

52. Among the learned converts who surfaced in northern France during this period, mention should be made of R. Yehosefiah *ba-Ger*, who composed a number of *piyyutim*, and R. Avraham (b. Avraham) *ba-Ger*, whose well-known opinion on the usefulness of *gerim* in urging other Jews to fulfill the commandments is cited in *Tosafot Kidusbin* 71a, s.v. *kashim*. See, e.g., Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:226. Interestingly, R. Avigdor Katz of Vienna cites the approach of R. Avraham b. Avraham in the name of his learned northern French ancestor, the Tosafist R. Menahem b. Perez of Joigny. See *Perushim u-Fesakim le-R. Avigdor*, 361.

53. See Grossman, *Hakbmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*, 400–415; idem, “Yihus Mishpahah u-Mekomo ba-Hevrah ha-Ashkenazit be-Ashkenaz ha-Kedumah,” *Perakim be-Toledot ha-Hevrah ha-Yehudit Bimei ha-Benayim uve-Et ha-Hadasbah*, ed. I. Etkes et al. (Jerusalem, 1980), 9–23; idem, “Yerushat Avot be-Hanhagah ha-Runhanit shel Kehilot Yisra’el Bimei ha-Benayim ha-Mukdamim,” *Zion* 50 (1985): 207–20; and idem, *Hakbmei Tsarefat ha-Rishonim* (Jerusalem, 1995), 281; and cf. nn. 7–8 of the present chapter.

54. See *Tosafot Bava Mezi’a* 111b, s.v. *mi-gerkha*; and Urbach, *Ba’alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:237n41. (*Tosafot Rabenu Perets* to *Bava Mezi’a* 11b does not record this citation.)

55. *Teshuvot Rabiab*, ed. D. Deblitzky, 2:284 (sec. 1026).

56. See Ephraim Shoham-Steiner, *Harigim Be’al Korham* (Jerusalem, 2008), 230–34; *SHP*, 19; nn. 44 and 46 of the present chapter; *Semag, lo ta’aseh* 118; *Piskei ha-Rosh Rosh li-Yevamot*, 8:1–3; and *Arba’ab Turim, Even ha-Ezer*, sec. 5:1.

57. See, e.g., Solomon Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the Thirteenth Century*, vol. 1 (New York, 1966), 22–26, 59–60, 199–200; idem, *The Church and the Jews in the Thirteenth Century*, vol. 2, ed. K. Stow (New York, 1989), 13–17, 102–3, 122–23; Robert Chazan, *Church, State and Jew in the Middle Ages* (West Orange, N.J., 1980), 191–94; J. M. Ziolkowski, “Put in No-Man’s Land: Guibert of Nogent’s Accusations Against a Judaizing and Jew-Supporting Christian,” in Van Engen and Signer, *Jews and Christians*, 110–22; J. R. Rosenbloom, *Conversion to Judaism: From the Biblical Period to the Present* (Cincinnati, 1978), 71–83; and the varied examples collected in Auman, “Conversion from Christianity,” 20–43. The monk Rigord of Saint Denis, in accounting for Phillip Augustus’ expulsion of the Jews from the royal realm in 1182, includes the following claim: “They had Christians in their homes as menservants and maidservants, who were open backsliders from the faith of Jesus and judaized with the Jews.” See R. Chazan, *Medieval Jewry in Northern France* (Baltimore, 1973), 43–45; cf. W. C. Jordan, *The French Monarchy and the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1989), 9–10, 33–37.

58. On the bishops who monitored conversions, see, e.g., Alfred Haverkamp, “Baptised Jews in German Lands During the Twelfth Century,” in Van Engen and Signer, *Jews and Christians*, 255–310. On the monasteries and the Jews of Germany, see, e.g., J. D. Young, “Neighbors, Partners, Enemies: Jews and the Monasteries in Germany in the High Middle Ages” (PhD diss., Notre Dame, 2011), esp. 183–92, which documents the “neighborly relations” (and close proximity) between Jews in Germany and various monks and friars during the early thirteenth century that allowed anti-Christian behavior to be monitored more closely. See also Jeremy Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1982), 229–34. As noted by Cohen, the Franciscan friar Berthold Von Regensburg (who was active ca. 1240–70), in his German vernacular sermons, railed against the Jews who collaborated to lead the faithful astray, in very specific and intimate terms: “A Jew wants to make conversation with you, so that you might therefore become weaker and weaker in your belief. . . . He has thought out for a long time how he will converse with you, in order that you might thereby become even weaker in your faith. For the same reasons, it is declared by scripture and the papacy that no unlearned man should speak with a Jew” (234). See Almut Suerbaum, “Language of Violence: Languages as Violence in Vernacular Sermons,” in *Polemic: Language as Violence in Medieval and Early Modern Discourse*, ed. A. Suerbaum et al. (Farnham, England, 2015), 125–48. (My thanks to the anonymous reader for the press for this reference.) In 1233, Pope Gregory IX admonished the German clergy of Germany regarding Christians who “of their own free will adopt their [the Jews’] faith, following their rites and permit themselves to be circumcised, publicly professing themselves Jews.” S. Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews*, 1:199. In the very same year, the Church Council in Mainz “excommunicated such Christians as choose to live in Jewish homes in order to act as their servants,” and order their colleagues to do so as well, “to make this decision thoroughly observed by their subjects.” *Ibid.*, 1:325.

59. See n. 42.

60. See *SHP* 214; and n. 46 of the present chapter. In the parallel passage in *SHB* (690), the reason that the circumcision was delayed (because of fear on the part of the community) is not found, reflecting perhaps a measure of censorship.

61. See *Teshuvot Maharam b. Barukh defus Prag*, sec. 103; I. A. Agus, *R. Meir of Rothenburg* (New York, 1947), 2:666–67 (sec. 772); and Auman, “Conversion from Christianity to Judaism,” 24–25, 33–34.

62. *Teshuvot Maharab Or Zaru’a*, ed. M. Abbitan (Jerusalem, 2002), 133 (sec. 142 [end]). R. Hayyim concludes by indicating that this episode was (also) recorded in his father’s *Sefer Or Zaru’a* (to which he composed an abridgement). Although this material has

not been located within any extant versions of *Sefer Or Zaru'a*, perhaps because of censorship (cf. Katz, *Bein Yehudim le-Goyim*, 84n53), a brief reference to this situation is found in *Pesakim le-Rabenu Hayyim b. Yitshak Or Zaru'a*, ed. M. Blau (New York, 1997), 2:377 (sec. 33). See also *Teshuvot Maharash*, ed. Abbitan, 275 (*teshuvot hadashot mi-ktav yad*), sec. 14.

63. R. Isaac *Or Zaru'a* spent part of his student days in northern France (see n. 36 of the present chapter), but he lived for the most part, and certainly during his mature years as a rabbinic decisor, in Germany and Austria. His son, R. Hayyim, lived in a variety of locales in Germany and Austria, and there is no evidence that he was ever in northern France. See Noah Goldstein, “R. Hayyim Eli'ezer ben Isaac Or Zaru'a—His Life and Work” (DHL diss., Yeshiva University, 1960), 23–26.

64. See, e.g., ms. Parma (de Rossi) 605 (13061; a *mabzor* of the western Ashkenazic rite), fol. 143r; ms. Cluny Museum 12290 (14772; a Worms *siddur*), fols. 68v–69r; and ms. Jewish National and University Library 4^o682 (B398; an eastern Ashkenazic rite), fol. 41r; and cf. ms. Parma 3518 (14025; a northern French *mabzor*), fol. 15r. On the incidence and significance of interpretational, methodological, and halakhic differences between the Tosafists in northern France and Germany, see Ephraim Kanarfogel, *The Intellectual History and Rabbinic Culture of Medieval Ashkenaz* (Detroit, 2013), 68–84.

CHAPTER 4

1. An early version of this essay was presented at the Herbert D. Katz Center for Advanced Judaic Studies at the University of Pennsylvania. I am grateful to David Ruderman and the many colleagues there who shared their insights. I am grateful also to Pere Benito, Joel Colomer, and Steven Schoenig for discussing particular documents; to Judah Galinsky, Benjamin Gampel, and Sarit Kattan–Gribetz for their incisive comments on early drafts; and to Theodor Dunkelgrün, Paweł Maciejko, and the anonymous reviewers for their editorial suggestions. In this essay, translations are my own unless otherwise indicated.

2. Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogi contra iudaeos, Patrologiae cursus completus*, Series Latina, ed. Jacques-Paul Migne (Paris, 1854), 157:538.

3. Avraham ben David, *Teshuvot u-fesakim*, ed. Yosef Kapach (Jerusalem, 1964), no. 126. Also see Louis Jacobs, *Theology in the Responsa* (London, 1975), 50. Warm thanks to Judah Galinsky for bringing this source to my attention.

4. *Teshuvot Maharam mi-Rothenburg ve-haverav*, ed. Simcha Emanuel (Jerusalem, 2012), 489 (no. 188).

5. David Berger, ed. and trans., *The Jewish-Christian Debate in the High Middle Ages: A Critical Edition of the Nizzabon Vetus* (Philadelphia, 1979), 206 (no. 211).

6. Sefer Hasidim, ed., *Yehudah Wistinetzki* (Berlin, 1891), 75 (no. 200). On approaches to *Sefer Hasidim*, see Ivan G. Marcus, *The Religious and Social Ideas of the Jewish Pietists in Medieval Germany: Collected Essays* [in Hebrew] (Jerusalem, 1986), 11–24.

7. Translated in Benjamin Gampel, “A Letter to a Wayward Teacher: The Transformations of Sephardic Culture in Christian Iberia,” in *Cultures of the Jews: A New History*, vol. 2, *Diversities of Diaspora*, ed. David Biale (New York, 2002), 391. Also see the discussion in *ibid.*, 391–403. On Pablo de Santa María, see Yosi Yisraeli, “Between Jewish and Christian Scholarship in the Fifteenth Century: The Consolidation of a ‘*Converso*’ Theology’ in the Theological Writings of Pablo de Santa María” (PhD diss., Tel Aviv University, 2015).

BASTARDS AND BELIEVERS

Jewish Converts and Conversion
from the Bible to the Present

Edited by
Theodor Dunkelgrün
and Paweł Maciejko

PENN

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PRESS

PHILADELPHIA