

## CHAPTER 10

### THE IMAGE OF CHRISTIANS IN MEDIEVAL ASHKENAZIC RABBINIC LITERATURE

*Ephraim Kanarfogel*

Recent scholarship has sought to characterize the way that Jews perceived Christians during the medieval period, focusing especially on polemical texts in which Jews shared their understanding of Christianity.<sup>1</sup> During the trial of the Talmud in 1240, Yehi'el of Paris was asked whether the restrictive talmudic legislation that was directed toward Gentiles includes Christians. He responded in the negative, a response to which we shall return.<sup>2</sup>

In his groundbreaking work on the relationship between Jews and Christians in medieval Europe, Jacob Katz provides evidence from talmudic interpretations and halakhic literature. He maintains that Ashkenazic legists, who sought to justify ongoing economic interactions between Jews and Christians on days or with commodities proscribed by talmudic law due to affinities with idolatry (*'avadah zarah*), did not mean to suggest that Christianity or its adherents were non-idolatrous. Rather, these authorities provided narrow casuistic arguments to allow the economic interactions to continue.

The Talmud (*'Avodah zarah* 6a) limits commerce with Gentiles on their festivals for two related reasons: the idolater will give thanks during his worship for these transactions, and the commodities or funds that the non-Jew acquires will allow him to offer items in the service of idolatry that might otherwise have been unavailable. During the medieval period, as Katz notes,

Jews did business with non-Jews on the latter's holy days and dealt in any commodity that had value. So far as economic dealings were concerned, the talmudic prescriptions had fallen into almost complete abeyance...The exact meaning of such passages requires careful scrutiny before we arrive at any far-reaching conclusions as to the real opinion of the halakhists concerning the nature of the Christian religion.<sup>3</sup>

Among the texts adduced by Katz to support his approach is a responsum by Gershom b. Judah of Mainz (960–1028) that permits business dealings with Christians on their festivals, and allows accepting clerical vestments as collateral for loans. Rabbenu Gershom invokes a teaching of R. Yoḥanan (*Hullin* 13b), that “Gentiles outside the land [of Israel] are not idolaters; they are merely following the practice of their forefathers.” Katz comments that

the application of the above pronouncement to this particular point did not imply that Christians were not idolaters for all religious purposes...for here [Rabbenu Gershom] clearly assumes that the Gentiles in question, i.e., the Christians, do worship idols, but that their actions do not count as such in its strict halakhic sense. It was by a juridical formula that he made his case, and not by a distinction based on historical or theological considerations. The same applies to all the other authorities who have cited this decision without mentioning its originator.<sup>4</sup>

Katz notes a brief passage from a lengthy *Tosafot* at the beginning of ‘*Avodah zarah* (2a, s.v. *asur*) as representative of the “other authorities who have cited this decision without mentioning its originator.” Elsewhere, he cites a formulation of Rashi—preserved by his grandson Rashbam (Samuel b. Meir)—that permits business transactions with Christians on their festival days, indicating that the talmudic prohibition was meant to include only devout idolaters. Katz concludes that for Rashi as well, there was no intent to “absolve the Christians of his day from the taint of idolatry” through the positing of a theological principle about Christianity. Rather, the suggestion that Christians were less devout was sufficient to allow for the relaxation of the rabbinic prohibition against doing business with them on their festivals.<sup>5</sup> Nonetheless, David Berger has suggested that these justifications “serve to mitigate the most pejorative evaluation of the status of its worshipers,” and do go “some moderate distance toward mitigating the image of medieval Christians as idolaters.”<sup>6</sup>

Although Katz points to several *Tosafot* as further support, he does not discuss them in detail.<sup>7</sup> Moreover, other texts that have become available suggest that this situation was more fluid than imagined. A single, overarching attitude in Ashkenaz concerning the religious nature and halakhic status of Christians cannot be sustained. A number of Tosafists held that not all Christians were idolaters, whereas others suggested new ways to localize this designation within Christian society.<sup>8</sup>

### Twelfth-Century Initiatives

The *Tosafot* to ‘*Avodah zarah* that includes Rabbenu Gershom’s formulation (without attribution) judges it insufficient to permit doing business with Gentiles on their festivals.<sup>9</sup> Two of the accepted solutions are attributed (by others) to Rashi or Rashbam: “we know that the Gentiles among us do not worship ‘*avodah zarah*,’”<sup>10</sup> and engaging in commerce with the Gentiles on these

days cannot be avoided, because this would give rise to potentially damaging enmity (*evah*).<sup>11</sup> The latter reason ostensibly does not say anything about the nature of Christianity.

*Tosafot* then presents the approach of Rashbam's younger brother, Rabbenu Jacob Tam (d. 1171). Rather than arguing that "times had changed," which allowed leniencies to be proposed, Rabbenu Tam suggests an innovative interpretation of the opening Mishnah in *'Avodah zarah*: only the sale of items that an idolater can offer as part of his worship service (*tikrovet*) is prohibited. Rabbenu Tam explains that although the Mishnah also prohibits moneylending on these days, only money lent without interest is intended, since this would provide the idolater with "free funds" to purchase worship items. If interest is charged, however, the idolater's gain is significantly reduced, as is the impact of the Jewish lender on the idolater's worship.

Indeed, for Rabbenu Tam, money was the only common commodity that should not be given freely to Christians, as it could be used to procure worship objects. *Tosafot* asserts that if a Christian asked to borrow money in order to make an offering to the Church, a Jew should refuse. Elhanan, son of Isaac of Dampierre (Isaac, known by the acronym Ri, was Rabbenu Tam's nephew and leading student), allows this, because the monies collected typically went to feed the officiants and not to support the worship service, for which other funds were available. Similarly, Ri's student, Barukh b. Isaac, maintains in his *Sefer ha-tenumah* that the small amounts contributed by individual Christians, even if derived from transactions with Jews, could have been provided by other sources and are, therefore, insignificant. Ri notes, however, that if the money from a particular transaction was earmarked for worship services, those funds should be redirected.<sup>12</sup>

Although Rabbenu Tam's larger aim has been debated,<sup>13</sup> a passing remark in *Tosafot* suggests that Rabbenu Tam proposed his explanation in order to downplay the possibility that Christians were not idolaters: "According to Rabbenu Tam's interpretation, there is no reason to wonder about the widespread practice (*minhag ha-'olam*) to conduct business with them on their festival days, even if they are considered to be idolaters." The implication is that, while Rabbenu Tam's solution preserves this assumption about Christians, the other approaches presented by *Tosafot* do not.

Eli'ezer b. Nathan (Ra'avan) of Mainz applies the allowance that "we know that they do not worship *'avodah zarah*" only to those Christians "who sometimes work on their festivals and do not even go to houses of worship," and thus do not give thanks for their transactions at those times. Jews cannot transact business with Christians who attend worship services regularly, and especially on their festivals. Although Ra'avan adds a broader allowance, that these business transactions are also "vital for continued Jewish existence (*kedé hayyenu*)," he concludes "that it is better to be stringent and avoid them entirely."<sup>14</sup>

Rashbam is also cited as advocating that one should not rely on the allowance of *evah* (enmity) to conduct transactions on the day of a festival.<sup>15</sup> Israel

Ta-Shma has suggested that these calls for personal stringency were not meant to detract from the halakhic viability of the allowances that were promulgated by Tosafists, but rather to encourage the merchants to consider the specific business circumstances in which he finds himself (including the inclinations of the non-Jew with whom he is about to interact), and to conduct himself accordingly.<sup>16</sup>

Nonetheless, Ra'avan of Mainz recommends additional stringencies that were adopted by other German Tosafists. With regard to selling garments or coverings that were to be placed on or near the altar, he asserts that "one who is stringent will be blessed," even as he allows the selling of clerical vestments, coats (lit. *duslas*, dossals) and other ornaments worn by the priests, and to receive these objects and other church vessels as securities for loans. Clerical vestments were worn by priests to meet kings and rulers and not only during the worship service. There is no such justification, however, for the sale of garments used exclusively for the altar.<sup>17</sup>

Focusing again on the need to be aware of the actual practices of Christians, Ra'avan notes, with regard to renting a home to a Christian in light of certain talmudic restrictions concerning Gentiles, that "in eastern Europe and Byzantium, they are surely devout (*vaddai adukim*), since they place objects of 'avodah *zarah* in the gates, doorways and walls of their homes."<sup>18</sup> Although Ra'avan's grandson, Eliezer b. Joel ha-Levi (Ra'avyah, d. ca. 1225), generally endorsed the allowances for doing business with Christians on their festivals, he concludes that "it is best not to do business involving worship objects on their festival with those who are known to be fully invested in idolatrous worship (lit. *minim*, heretics) such as priests."<sup>19</sup> Jacob Katz also suggests that *Sefer ḥasidim*—the guidebook of German Pietism during the early thirteenth century—rejected the French Tosafists' casuistic solutions and justifications for dealing with these kinds of items.<sup>20</sup>

Ra'avyah's teacher, Eliezer of Metz (d. 1198; Eli'ezer taught in the Rhineland for a period and had been a student of Rabbenu Tam),<sup>21</sup> was emphatic about the weakness of a key Tosafist legal strategy. The leniency of potential enmity (*evah*) was rather limited, as there are forms of commerce that will not engender enmity if briefly curtailed; this leniency is, thus, best avoided.<sup>22</sup> Barukh b. Isaac held similarly, preferring instead the approach that "we know that the [Christians] do not give thanks to their deity."<sup>23</sup> Moses b. Jacob of Coucy (ca. 1240), on the other hand, limits the allowance favored by Barukh, maintaining that it is effective "only when we know that the Gentile is not linked with idolatry and does not go to give thanks."<sup>24</sup>

Isaac b. Moses Or Zarua' (d. ca. 1250) studied with Tosafists in both northern France and Germany (including Ra'avyah). He attributes several anonymous opinions in the *Tosafot* on 'Avodah *zarah* to Rashbam and even records Rashbam's hesitation about one of them. Isaac also rejects the view of Rabbenu Tam for not providing a sufficiently plausible explanation of the underlying talmudic texts, and concludes that the only approach that does not pose

any interpretational difficulties is the one of minimizing enmity (which, as noted, does not impinge on the essential question of whether Christianity is idolatrous).<sup>25</sup>

However, the rabbinic support expressed for various allowances in both northern France and Germany during the late thirteenth century suggests that these became widely accepted. Perets b. Elijah of Corbeil (d. 1297), among others, brings together and endorses those allowances that maintain contemporary Christians were not complete idolaters.<sup>26</sup>

### The Halakhic Status of Clerical and Ritual Objects

As noted by Jacob Katz, *Tosafot* on 'Avodah zarah (50a-b, s.v. *ba'iman*), along with parallel passages citing Ri of Dampierre and Rashbam, permits commerce in certain church items. These include candles and wax, loaves of bread (or cakes) that were typically brought as gifts for the priests and other officiants (but were not offered up as part of the worship service), and priestly vestments and ritual items such as chalices.

The designation of an idolatrous offering (*tikrovet*) from which a Jew cannot benefit according to talmudic law depends on whether an analogous item or process was part of the sacrificial service in the Temple. Candles are not in this category, since the *menorah* in the Temple was not connected to the sacrificial offerings. Moreover, as candles and wax are considered *meshammeshé* 'avodah zarah—items that enhance the Christian worship service rather than items that were actually offered—the extinguishing of the candles by a priest or layman constitutes a sufficient act of nullification (*bittul*) that allows them to be sold to a Jew or given as collateral. Priestly garments were provided for the use of the officiants (and were considered to be their personal property, as was the chalice), just as the loaves of bread that were given to the priests were not part of the actual church service. Indeed, the only item prohibited by these *Tosafot* passages is the incense pan or censer-bearer.<sup>27</sup>

Similar formulations were offered by Ra'avan and Ra'avyah, who allowed the priests' vestments and dossals (as noted above), as well as their goblets and other ornaments, to be sold by Jews and to be accepted as collateral for loans. They too prohibited only censer-bearers and the incense itself. Ra'avyah adds a tradition received from his father, Joel b. Isaac ha-Levi (d. ca. 1200), that while candles and wax could be sold to and purchased from Christians, these materials should not be used in the performance of Jewish ritual precepts that required the lighting of candles; further, Ra'avan adds that the statues and icons found in the church should also not be sold or accepted as pawns.<sup>28</sup> The leniencies noted were reproduced in *Sefer or zaru'a*, and in other thirteenth-century Tosafist sources.<sup>29</sup>

At the same time, however, a strongly held opinion developed among northern French Tosafists that restricted dealing with almost all priestly and church

objects, even if laymen were the ones selling or buying them.<sup>30</sup> One such restrictive passage appears in *Tosafot* on 'Avodah zarah (14b, s.v. *hatsav*), in the name of "R. Barukh ben R." (with the name of R. Barukh's father unidentified), which corresponds to a section from Barukh b. Isaac's *Sefer ha-terumah*.<sup>31</sup> Barukh prohibits buying or selling a priest's chalice, even if it had been slightly damaged as an intended act of nullification, since it could still be used by the priest, as well as books of Christian liturgy and scripture (referred to as *sefarim pesulim*). The Venice edition of *Sefer ha-terumah*, along with three manuscripts, attributes this view to the *Tosafot* of Eliezer of Metz to *Nedarim* (62b).<sup>32</sup>

Eliezer of Metz' *Tosafot* to *Nedarim* are not extant, but he writes in his *Sefer yere'im* that dealing in these clerical commodities (chalices, censer-bearers, priestly coats and other garments, and decorated covers to beautify the altar) is prohibited.<sup>33</sup> Indeed, while Eliezer was willing to be lenient regarding candles,<sup>34</sup> his student, Eleazar of Worms, notes that Eliezer wanted to prohibit them at some point because the *menorah* was found in the inner precincts of the Temple and candles are, thus, a significant aspect of the worship service.<sup>35</sup> Indeed, it was against this claim that Ri of Dampierre maintained that candles should be viewed in the lenient way that Rashbam did.<sup>36</sup>

Moreover, Eliezer of Metz' comment to *Nedarim* 62b can be reconstructed. The Talmud relates that Rav Ashi sold woodlands to idolaters. Ravina wonders why he was unconcerned that the idolaters would then use the wood to fashion objects of idolatry. Rav Ashi responds that since "most trees are used to provide heat," this is the (permitted) purpose of the sale. As recorded in the mid-thirteenth-century Italian compendium, *Shibbolé ha-leket*, Eliezer of Metz derives from this talmudic discussion that it is prohibited to lend or sell objects to Christians that are typically used for idolatrous purposes—such as priests' chalices, censer-bearers, and church liturgies—or to lend money to Christians (even at interest) if their intent was to purchase these and related items. Eliezer concludes that whoever is able to observe these restrictions "will merit God's salvation."<sup>37</sup>

As noted above, Eliezer of Metz also wished to limit the justification for doing business with Christians on their festivals because of enmity (*evah*), although few followed him.<sup>38</sup> His stringencies, however, with regard to selling church and clerical materials and objects were adopted not only by his younger colleague in northern France, Barukh b. Isaac, author of *Sefer ha-terumah*, but also by Moses b. Jacob of Coucy (d. ca. 1250), author of *Sefer mitsvot gadol*.<sup>39</sup>

### The Position of Moses of Coucy

Jacob Katz concludes that as opposed to *Sefer hasidim*, Moses of Coucy permitted dealing in Christian ritual objects, noting that although some prohibitions remained, "his method...is casuistic and he accepts the exemptions authorized by his predecessors."<sup>40</sup> In fact, however, Moses of Coucy cites restrictive passages

from both *Sefer yere'im* and *Sefer ha-terumah* (without attribution). Indeed, the only area of leniency in *Sefer mitsvot gadol* involves candles and wax, and perhaps certain priestly garments. As we have seen, these religious objects were more easily permitted for commerce, since their connection to idolatrous worship is somewhat tenuous.

Recent research has shown that Moses of Coucy composed a first version of *Sefer mitsvot gadol* that he subsequently revised. The best manuscripts of *Semag* are divided between these versions, while the first edition (Venice, 1547) appears to be a melange.<sup>41</sup> Moses follows the stringent view of Eliezer of Metz in the earlier version, even employing the language of *Sefer yere'im*. He disallows accepting a pawn from objects of worship and clerical accoutrements, including “goblets, incense pans and coats that are worn during the service.”<sup>42</sup> The later version of *Semag* adds *mitronot*, a type of priestly garb, to the list of prohibited items, subsequently citing an allowance for them in the name of Rashbam along with an allowance for candles in the name of (Moses’ teacher) Judah Sirleon (in the name of Ri), provided there is nullification.<sup>43</sup>

After discussing the allowances for doing business with Christians on their festivals (and expressing concern with one of the key justifications, as noted above), *Semag* returns to the issue of buying and selling prohibited objects. Here, both versions follow the passage from *Sefer ha-terumah* (Venice, 1523) referred to above,<sup>44</sup> and they conclude in accordance with *Sefer ha-terumah* and *Sefer yere'im*.<sup>45</sup> Moreover, at least one manuscript of *Semag* includes the restrictive passage from *Tosafot R. Eli'ezer mi-Metz* to *Nedarim* 62b.<sup>46</sup> In sum, Moses of Coucy features the stringent views of *Sefer yere'im* and *Sefer terumah*, with only a small degree of Rashbam’s and Ri’s leniencies, although to be sure, other thirteenth-century Tosafists who cite the position of Eliezer of Metz balance or reject it by presenting the more lenient northern French approach.<sup>47</sup>

Just before citing the *Tosafot* of Eliezer of Metz, which also prohibits the selling of Christian books and liturgies, *Shibbolé ha-leket* presents the view of Avigdor b. Elijah Katz of Vienna (in the name of Eliezer of Verona) that selling these is permitted.<sup>48</sup> At the same time, however, other passages in *Shibbolé ha-leket* suggest that Isaiah di Trani (Rid, d. ca. 1240) was stringent in these matters in the way that Eli’ezer of Metz and his northern French followers (Barukh b. Isaac and Moses of Coucy) were. Several passages among the writings of Isaiah, who studied in Germany with the Tosafist Simḥah of Speyer (and had access to the talmudic writings of Rabbenu Tam and his German students),<sup>49</sup> confirm this assessment.<sup>50</sup>

### Changes in Christendom during the Thirteenth Century

Bringing together the two issues that have been discussed until this point, it is clear that the Tosafist views are not nearly as monolithic as Jacob Katz had maintained; there is no single mindset among the Tosafists about the status of

Christians and their worship objects. It is possible to suggest that the lenient Tosafist position about benefiting from Christian ritual objects held that because contemporary Christians were not considered to be unmitigated idolaters (at least regarding the economic restrictions indicated by talmudic law), one may benefit even from worship items that were under the control of the church officials, provided that these items did not represent recognized images or symbols of Christianity and were not intrinsic to the worship service. Those Tosafists who were decidedly less lenient, beginning with Eli'ezer of Metz, may have been inclined to overall stringency in dealing with Christians (as idolaters), although the approaches of Barukh b. Isaac in *Sefer ha-terumah* and Moses of Coucy in *Sefer mitsvot gadol* do not easily support such a simple reading.

Indeed, while there are other halakhic issues that may have impacted these considerations,<sup>51</sup> it is possible to contextualize the (heretofore unnoticed) development of the stringent position on the part of Barukh b. Isaac and Moses of Coucy that did not allow for deriving economic benefit from church and ritual objects<sup>52</sup> by focusing on the increased clericalization of the church during the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.<sup>53</sup> As noted above, Barukh and Moses also sought to monitor the effectiveness of the approach that “we know that the [Christians] do not give thanks to their deity,” as a means of allowing Jews to do business with Christians on their festivals.<sup>54</sup>

Moses of Coucy and other like-minded Tosafists understood that a shift was occurring within Christendom. Clerics were being given greater responsibility for the affairs of Christian society. As such, clergymen were now seen, at least by the rabbinic elite, as more devoted Christians than laymen, and the practice of *'avodah zarah* could be localized among the clergy and their closest followers. This distinction is also evident in another formulation of *Sefer ha-terumah* (and *Sefer mitsvot gadol*), that distinguishes between healing performed by a Gentile doctor (from which a Jew may benefit), and healing done by someone from among the *minim*, (clerics), who invokes “an idolatrous formula” (*lahash shel 'avodah zarah*) that is prohibited according to talmudic law.<sup>55</sup>

This development may also explain Moses of Coucy's insistence that Jews not deceive Christians in economic interactions: “We have already explained concerning the remnant of Israel that they are not to deceive anyone, whether a Christian or a Moslem.”<sup>56</sup> Based on another passage in *Sefer mitsvot gadol*, in which Moses emphasizes that the “remnant of Israel” will remain in the Diaspora as long as injustices are committed against others, Jacob Katz suggests that Moses' appeal “is wedded to the messianic expectation which once again became intense at this period in Jewish history.”<sup>57</sup> Judah Galinsky maintains that this directive is part of a larger program to ensure that absolute truthfulness should be practiced in all instances, occasionally even beyond the stated dictates of talmudic law.<sup>58</sup>

In light of Moses of Coucy's awareness of clericalization and its impact, he perhaps preached moral behavior toward Christians because he held that non-clerical Christians were not so intimately involved with idolatry. In addition, in



using the phrase “the remnant of Israel,” Moses wished to indicate that, among the Jews, no such distinction existed between the rabbinic leadership and the larger community in terms of moral or religious beliefs and commitments.

At the same time that Moses of Coucy composed his *Sefer mitsvot gadol*, his Tosafist colleague, Yeḥi’el of Paris, indicates during the trial of the Talmud that there is a possibility for Christians to be saved. The only impediment appears to be the issue of *‘avodah zarah*, which Gentiles cannot practice if they wish to be considered proper followers of the Noachide laws.<sup>59</sup> Shortly before this, however, Yeḥi’el was asked about the restrictions that the Talmud placed on non-Jews, which medieval Jewry supposedly applied to Christians; he responds that this was not the case. Part of his proof stems from the fact that while “according to the Mishnah, business may not be done with non-Jews for three days before their festivals, if you were to go right now to the *rue de Juifs*, you would see how much business we do [with Christians] even on the very day of the festival(s).”<sup>60</sup>

As a French Tosafist, Yeḥi’el of Paris was undoubtedly aware of the leniencies and justifications that extended back to Rashi and Rashbam.<sup>61</sup> As has been noted, several of the formulations put forward by French Tosafists stopped short of identifying contemporary Christians as complete idolaters. Although Rabbenu Tam and a number of German Tosafists argued against this softer perception, the more lenient view largely won the day.

Moreover, unlike Moses of Coucy, who was firmly committed to the more restrictive approaches of Eli’ezer of Metz and Barukh b. Isaac concerning the status of the clergy and their religious implements, Yeḥi’el was free to suggest that if Christians could move further in the direction that had already led to the dissolution of business restrictions on their festivals, salvation might indeed be possible. Yeḥi’el’s intention is reflected in his use of the phrase, “let me tell you a way that you can be saved even through your faith,” which can also be translated according to the Hebrew original as “a way that you can be saved even according to your belief.”<sup>62</sup>

For Yeḥi’el of Paris and those Tosafists whose approach he supported, Christianity could not easily be removed from the halakhic category of *‘avodah zarah*. However, individual Christians were perceived as not fully idolatrous, just as Moses of Coucy and the Tosafist approach that he favored held that Christians who were not members of the clergy were also somewhat removed from idolatrous worship. These nuanced Tosafist perceptions had important ramifications for economic and social practices and interactions, if not for larger theoretical reassessments or reimaginings.<sup>63</sup>

## Notes

1. See Ivan Marcus, “Jews and Christians Imagining the Other in Medieval Europe,” *Prooftexts* 15 (1995), 209–217; Anna Sapir Abulafia, “Invectives against Christianity in the Hebrew Chronicles of the First Crusade,” in *Crusade and*

- Settlement*, ed. Peter W. Edbury (Cardiff, 1985), 66–72; David Berger, “On the Image and Destiny of Gentiles in Ashkenazic Polemical Literature,” in *Persecution, Polemic and Dialogue* (Boston, 2010), 117–138; David Berger, “Medieval Christians and Jews: Mutual Perceptions and Attitudes,” in *Cambridge History of Judaism*, vol. 6, ed. Robert Chazan (in press).
2. See *Vikkuaḥ R. Yehi’el mi-Paris*, ed. Reuven Margoliot (Lemberg, 1888), 21; and below, n. 60.
  3. See Jacob Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance* (Oxford, 1961), 29–32.
  4. See *Ibid.*, 33–34. See also Jacob Katz, *Ben yehudim le-goyim* (Jerusalem, 1960), 43, 116; David Berger, “Jacob Katz on Jews and Christians in the Middle Ages,” in *The Pride of Jacob*, ed. Jay Harris (Cambridge, MA, 2002), 41 n. 1, 60–61; Berger, *Persecution, Polemic and Dialogue*, 169–170.
  5. See Katz, *Halakhah ve-kabbalah* (Jerusalem, 1986), 284, which cites the Rashbam passage from *Toldot adam ve-havvah* by Yeroḥam b. Meshullam (d. ca. 1350). It is found already in Asher b. Yehi’el, *Piské ha-rosh al massekhet ‘avodah zarah*, 1:1 (Asher was a teacher of Yeroḥam), and in *Tosafot R. Elhanan*, ed. Aaron Kreuzer (Bnei Brak, 2003), fols. 1b–2a, which Ephraim E. Urbach, *Ba’alé ha-tosafot* (Jerusalem, 1980), 1:254, dates to 1182. See also Israel Elfenbein, ed., *Teshuvot Rashi* (New York, 1943), sec. 327 (on deriving benefit from Christian wine: “they are not well-versed in the worship of idols,”) cited by Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, 34, n. 2; *Sefer or zaru’a*, *piské ‘avodah zarah*, secs. 95–96, ed. Machon Yerushalayim (Jerusalem, 2010), 3:582.
  6. See Berger, “Medieval Christians and Jews,” (above, n. 1), at n. 25.
  7. See Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, 29 (n. 3); Katz, *Bein Yehudim Le-Goyim*, 40 (n. 20); and below, n. 27.
  8. Menaḥem ha-Me’iri of Perpignan (d. 1315) considered Christianity to be excluded from ‘*avodah zarah*, although the motivation and scope of Meiri’s approach has been debated. See Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, 114–128; Katz, “‘Od ‘al savlanuto ha-datit shel R. Menaḥem ha-me’iri,” *Zion* 46 (1981): 243–246; Berger, *Persecution, Polemic and Dialogue*, 293–294; Israel Ta-Shma, *Halakhah, minhag, u-metsi’ut be-ashkenaz, 1000–1350* (Jerusalem, 1996), 251–261; Israel Ta-Shma, *Ha-sifrut ha-parshanit la-talmud* (Jerusalem, 2000), 2: 167–170; Moshe Halbertal, *Ben torah le-ḥokhmah* (Jerusalem, 2000), 80–108.
  9. Urbach, *Ba’alé ha-tosafot*, 2:654–657, identifies the editor of *Tosafot ‘avodah zarah* as a student of Rabbenu Perets b. Elijah of Corbeil (d. 1297). Prior strata include those from Elhanan b. ha-Ri and Samuel of Falaise (based on the *Tosafot* of his teacher, Judah Sirleon, a student of Ri). Passages from the halakhic works *Sefer ha-terumah*, *Sefer mitsvot gadol*, and *Sefer or zaru’a* are also cited in these *Tosafot*; on these Tosafist works and authors, see below, nn. 12, 24, 25.
  10. See Kreuzer, *Tosfot R. Elhanan*, above, n. 5. Passages in *Tosfot R. Elhanan* and *Tosfot Rash mi-Shantz* also assert that the Christians in their day did not express gratitude to their deity as a result of the business transactions that they did with Jews. See Ta-Shma, *Halakhah, minhag, u-metzi’ut be-ashkenaz*, 248 (n. 22).
  11. See *Sefer or zaru’a*, secs. 95–98 (3:582, col. 2); *Sefer Ra’avyah ‘al massekhet ‘avodah zarah*, ed. David Deblitzky (Jerusalem, 1976), 23 (sec. 1051); and the precis to Barukh b. Isaac, *Sefer ha-terumah, hilkhot ‘avodah zarah*, sec. 134 (Jerusalem, 2003), 23.

12. See *Sefer ha-terumah, hilkhoh 'avodah zarah*, sec. 134, fol. 47b-c; Urbach, *Ba'alé ha-tosafot*, 1:350–351; Kreuzer, *Tosfot R. Elhanan*, fol. 5a; and *Sefer Mordekhai 'al massekhet 'avodah zarah*, sec. 795. See also *Piské ha-Rosh 'al massekhet 'avodah zarah*, 1:1; *Hiddushé ha-Ritva 'al massekhet 'avodah zarah*, ed. Moshe Goldstein (Jerusalem, 1982), 6, s.v. *le-halvotan*; and *Piské R. Yésha'yah di-Tiani le-massekhet 'avodah zarah*, ed. A. Y. Wertheimer et al. (Jerusalem, 2006), 167; and below, n. 50.
13. See, for example, Shalom Albeck, “Yaḥaso shel Rabbenu Tam le-va'ayot zem-anno,” *Zion* 19 (1954): 106–112, 123–126, 141; Urbach, *Ba'alé ha-tosafot*, 1:62–66, 89–93; and Haim Hillel Ben-Sasson, “Hanhagatah shel Torah,” *Behinot be-vikkoret ha-sifrut* 9 (1956): 46–48.
14. See *Sefer Ra'avan – even ha-'ezer* (Jerusalem, 1975), sec. 288, fol. 124b. The twenty-first canon of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 requires every Christian who had attained the age of reason to confess his sins at least once a year and to receive communion at least at Easter. See also Solomon Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century* (New York, 1966), 115, for the letter by Innocent III (1205) to the Archbishop of Sens and the Bishop of Paris.
15. See *Sefer or zaru'a, piské 'avodah zarah*, sec. 99 (end), 3:584.
16. See Ta-Shma, *Halakhah, minhag u-metsi'ut*, 249.
17. See *Sefer Ra'avan*, sec. 289. See also Deblitzky, *Sefer Ra'avayah 'al massekhet 'avodah zarah*, 24 (sec. 1051); *Sefer ha-asufot*, ms. Montefiore 134, fol. 130c (sec. 450), and below, 28. See also Joseph Shatzmiller, “Church Articles: Pawns in the Hands of Jewish Moneylenders,” *Wirtschaftsgeschichte der mittelalterlichen Juden*, ed. Michael Toch (Munich, 2008), 98–99; Joseph Shatzmiller, *Cultural Exchange* (Princeton, 2013), 28–33. Rabbenu Tam and Rashbam also allowed Jews to sell priestly garments, as noted by their nephew Ri, who nonetheless recommended stringency because of the confusion that might ensue. See *Shittat ha-kadmonim 'al massekhet 'avodah zarah, (Teshuvot u-fesakim le-Ri ha-Zaken)*, ed. Moshe Blau (New York, 1991), 3: 245 (sec. 137). See also *Shibbolé ha-leket—ha-ḥelek ha-sheni*, ed. Simḥa Ḥasida (Jerusalem, 1988), 41 (sec. 9).
18. See *Sefer Ra'avan*, sec. 291, fol. 125a; Shlomo Eidelberg, “Tseror he'arot,” *Tarbiz* 52 (1983): 647–648; Israel Ta-Shma, *Keneset mehkarim* (Jerusalem, 2000), 1: 224–229, 245–249.
19. See Deblitzky, *Sefer Ra'avayah 'al massekhet 'avodah zarah*, 22–23. Ra'avayah rejects the innovative approach of Rabbenu Tam because “it does not reflect the simple sense of the Talmud,” but he ends up following it *de facto*. See Ta-Shma, *Halakhah, minhag u-metsi'ut*, 248.
20. See Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, 97–102 (based on *Sefer ḥasidim*, ed. Judah Wistinetki [Frankfurt, 1924], secs. 1233, 1349–1350, 1359). See also Shatzmiller, “Church Articles” 97–98; and Ephraim Kanarfogel “R. Judah *he-Ḥasid* and the Rabbinic Scholars of Regensburg: Interactions, Influences and Implications,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 96 (2006): 17–37.
21. See Rami Reiner, “Rabbenu Tam: rabbotav (ha-tsarfattim) ve-talmidav bené Ashkenaz,” (MA thesis, Hebrew University, 1997), 111–113 and compare with Urbach, *Ba'alé ha-tosafot*, 1:156–158.
22. See *Sefer yere'im ha-shalem* (Jerusalem, 1973), sec. 270, fol. 129a; and above, n. 14. Eliezer's position is also found (nearly a century later) in the (halakhic) *derashot* of

- Ḥayyim b. Isaac Or Zarua'; see *Piské halakhah shel R. Ḥayyim Or Zarua': derashot Maharah*, ed. Y. S. Lange (Jerusalem, 1972), 39 [ed. Abbittan, sec. 11, p. 15, col. 2], to *parashat va'era*. Ta-Shma, *Halakhah, minhag u-metsi'ut*, 250, suggests that this perhaps reflects an approach akin to that of the German Pietists, one of whose principals, Eleazar of Worms, also studied with Eliezer of Metz; see below, n. 35. As we shall see, however, there was also a tendency toward strictness in northern France during the thirteenth century.
23. See *Sefer ha-terumah, hilkhot 'avodah zarah*, sec. 134 (fol. 47a). *Tosafot 'avodah zarah* 2a also notes this limitation.
  24. See Moses b. Jacob of Coucy, *Sefer mitsvot gadol (Semag), lo ta'aseh* 45 (Jerusalem, 1993), 1: 78.
  25. See *Sefer or zarua'*, secs. 95–99, 3:582–584. See also above, n. 15; and *Piské halakhah shel R. Ḥayyim Or Zarua'*, ed. Lange, above, n. 22. Isaac b. Moses rejects the allowance of “we know that they do not worship idolatry,” because the talmudic case on which it was based assumes that the former idolater now had the status of a *ger toshav* (an assertion that had been rejected by *Sefer ha-terumah*, above, n. 23), although he also rejects the allowance of *evah* in a situation “where it is certain that the Gentile is an idolater,” as his teacher Ra'avyah did (above, n. 19).
  26. See, for example, *Sefer ha-dinim le-Rabbenu Perets*, ms. Vienna (National Library) 180, fol. 366r. This manuscript passage has been blurred, undoubtedly due to censorship. Rabbenu Perets' view is recorded clearly, however, in *Sefer kol bo*, ed. David Avraham (2001), 5: 895, (sec. 97), and is also found in the parallel *Orhot ḥayyim le-R. Aharon ha-Kohen (mi-Lunel)*, ed. Moshe Schlesinger (Berlin, 1899), 2: 226 (sec. 21). On the surviving manuscript fragments of R. Perets' *Sefer ha-dinim*, see Ismar Elbogen, “Les ‘Dinim’ de R. Pereç,” *REJ* 45 (1902), 99–111, 204–217 (and esp. 104). Asher b. Yeḥi'el (*Piské ha-Rosh 'al massekhet 'avodah zarah*, 1:1) presents a formulation similar to that of Rabbenu Perets (in the names of Rashi and Rashbam; above, n. 5), although he also records the allowance of *mishum evah*. *Sefer Mordekhai 'al massekhet 'avodah zarah*, sec. 795, cites each of the leniencies.
  27. See Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, 44, where he also cites *Tosafot 'Avodah zarah* 14b, s.v. *ḥatsav*, although this passage represents a rather different Tosafist view; see below, nn. 31, 44. See also *Shittat ha-kadmonim 'al massekhet 'avodah zarah*, ed. M. Blau (New York, 1969), 2:251–252; Aaron. Kreuzer, “Tosfot Ri ha-Zaken 'al massekhet 'avodah zarah,” *Moriah* 33:1–3 (B'nei B'rak, 2013): 4–5. See *Semak mi-Tsirikh*, ed. Isaac J. Har-Shoshanim (Jerusalem, 1979), 1:139 (sec. 211: the chalice is merely a receptacle and does not require nullification).
  28. See *Sefer Ra'avan*, sec. 289; Katz, *ibid.*, 45; Deblitzky, *Sefer Ra'avyah*, 24 (sec. 1051); and above, n. 17. At the end of this section (p. 26), Ra'avyah cites the (lenient) rulings of Rashbam in his name. See also *Sefer ha-asufot*, ms. Montefiore 134, fol. 130c (sec. 450). R. Meir of Rothenburg (d. 1293) ruled similarly that priestly garments should not be fashioned into a *tallit* or used for any other *mitsvah*, nor should jewels worn by priests be used to adorn a *tallit*. See *R. Meir b. Barukh mi-Rotenburg: teshuvot, pesakim u-minhagim*, ed. Isaac Z. Kahana (Jerusalem, 1957), 1: 227–228 (secs. 123–125). Dr. Pinchas Roth was kind enough to provide Provençal rabbinic material on the loaves given to priests. While almost all Ashkenazic authorities considered these loaves to be gifts for the priests, several Provençal halakhists considered them to be a *tikrovet*, perhaps because they were presented in tithing baskets. See, for example, Samuel ben

- Mordekhai's commentary on *Mishneh torah* (to *hilkhot 'avodah zarah*, 7:15), in ms. Paris 355, fol. 42a; Zerahyah ha-Levi, *Sefer ha-ma'or* or '*Avodah Zarah* (chapter four), fol. 23b in the pagination of the Rif (*Sefer ba'al ha-ma'or*, ed. Daniel Bitton [Jerusalem, 2005], 3:422). See also Yeroḥam b. Meshullam, *Toldot adam ve-havvah*, 17:4 (fol. 128). Ra'avad of Posquières disagrees with Zerahyah ha-Levi; for his (lenient) position and an Ashkenazic view that prohibited these breads (since *bittul* cannot be accomplished), see below, n. 36.
29. See *Sefer or zarua'*, *piské 'avodah zarah*, sec. 209, 636 a-b. See also Ḥasida, *Sefer shibbolé ha-leket*, 39 (sec. 9), who cites Rashbam extensively *ibid.*, 41, and below, n. 37, for his citation of the stringent view of Eliezer of Metz. *Sefer Mordekhai*, secs. 842–843 (=ms. Vercelli C235, fols. 117b-c) cites the allowances of both Rashbam and Ra'avayah (and rejects the position of Eliezer of Metz). In his *Sefer ha-dinim*, ms. Vienna 180, fols. 374r-v (*Kol bo*, 945, and *Orhot ḥayyim*, 230–231, sec. 6), Rabbenu Perets cites various French allowances mentioning both Rashi and Rashbam. However, he considers the priest's chalice to be a genuine '*avodah zarah* accessory, just like the censer-bearer; see also *Piské ha-Rosh*, 4:1. See also *Bayit ḥadash to Arba'ah turim, Yoreh de'ah*, sec. 139, s.v. *va-ḥatikhot*; and the position attributed to R. Meir of Rothenburg in *Semak mi-Tsirikh* (above, n. 27), expressed also by R. Meir's student, R. Ḥayyim b. Isaac Or Zarua', in his *Derashot*, ed. Lange (above, n. 22), 38, that the chalice can hold materials that were integral to the church service. See also Perets's glosses to Isaac of Corbeil's *Sefer mitzvot katan (Semak)* (sec. 68, and ms. Hamburg-Levi 70); and *Orhot ḥayyim*, 2:230–231. On the citation of Eliezer of Metz' view by *Tosfot Rabbenu Perets* (to *Nedarim*), see below, n. 37. Note also (above, n. 9) the role of Rabbenu Perets and his students as editors of *Tosafot* on '*Avodah zarah*, in which many of the French leniencies are found.
30. An ordinance whose attribution to Rabbenu Tam is uncertain, prohibits buying church vessels and vestments or accepting them as security, a position that is not associated with him elsewhere as far as I can tell. Moreover, a version of this *takkanah* specifies that it refers to the purchase of stolen church items; the restriction is due to the possible peril involved, rather than to distinctly halakhic considerations. See Louis Finkelstein, *Jewish Self-Government in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1964), 171–175, 178, 188–189, 211. See also Shatzmiller, "Church Articles," 97.
31. See *Sefer ha-terumah* (Venice, 1523), *hilkhot 'avodah zarah*, sec. 138; and Urbach, *Ba'alé ha-tosafot*, 1:354 (n. 65).
32. See Simha Emanuel, *Shivré luḥot* (Jerusalem, 2006), 295 (n. 337); ms. Parma [de Rossi] 617, fols. 190c-d; ms. Paris BN Heb. 359, fols. 132r-v; ms. JTS Rab. 1115, fols. 153v-154r; and see also *Piské haRrosh*, 1:15. See also Shatzmiller, *Cultural Exchange*, 26–27. On the linkage with *Nedarim* 62b, see below, n. 37.
33. See *Sefer yere'im*, sec. 102 (fols. 37a-b); sec. 270 (fol. 129a); sec. 364 (fol. 197a); and see the next note. Although the word *kippot* in this passage perhaps refers to a priestly head-covering, the version of *Sefer yere'im* cited in *Sefer Mordekhai* (which is otherwise identical to *Sefer yerei'im*, sec. 102) reads *ve-kaps she-lovshim ha-shammashim*, suggesting that this refers to some kind of cape-like garment. Compare *Haggahot maimuniyyot, hilkhot 'avodah zarah*, 7:2; and below, n. 43; *Teshuvot rabbenu gershom*, ed. Shlomo Eidelberg (New York, 1955), 75 (and Katz, above, n. 27). Rabbenu Gershom maintains that the priests' garments are akin

to the garments that *kohanim* wore during their Temple service (which were an intrinsic part of the service). He therefore based his own allowance to sell or accept priests' garments as collateral on R. Yohanan's principle that Gentiles outside of Israel were not considered to be idolaters.

34. See *Sefer yere'im ha-shalem*, sec. 101 (end). See also ms. Vercelli C235, fol. 117b.
35. See R. El'azar mi-Vermaiza, *ma'aseh rokeah 'al pi ketav yad "sefersinai"* Berlin *ha-muze'on ha-yehudi* (VII.262.5), ed. Emese Kozma (Jerusalem, [www.imhm.blogspot.com](http://www.imhm.blogspot.com), entry for 2/08/10), 74 (sec. 600; top). See also Simha Emanuel, *R. El'azar mi-Vermaiza: derashah le-fesah* (Jerusalem, 2006), 25 (n. 89). In the previous section in Eleazar's work (sec. 599, about eating milk and meat at the same table), Eliezer of Metz is cited by name, and earlier within sec. 600, Eleazar of Worms cites the lenient view of Rashbam with regard to candles and wax (above, n. 27). See also *Sefer or zaru'a', piské 'avodah zarah*, secs. 208–209, and below, n. 50.
36. See Blau, *Shittat ha-kadmonim 'al massekhet 'avodah zarah*, (above, n. 17), 3:265, sec. 161 (end). See also ms. Mantua 30, fol. 245v. Ra'avod of Posquière, *Katuv sham* (to 'avodah zarah), ed. Haim Freiman (Jerusalem, 2003), 213, also prohibits the wax and candles as *tikrovet*. See also *Ḥiddushé ha-Ramban to 'Avodah zarah* (51b), ed. Chaim D. Chavel (Jerusalem, 1970), 202. After citing the allowance for candles according to Rashbam, Naḥmanides notes that an unnamed figure prohibited them, concluding, however, that this view is mistaken (since the *menorah*, although lit in the inner sanctum of the Temple, was not part of the sacrificial service). See Ta-Shma, *Halakhah, minhag u-metsi'ut be-ashkenaz*, 250–251; and Ephraim Kanarfogel, "Between Ashkenaz and Sefarad: Tosafist Teachings in the Talmudic Commentaries of Ritva," in *Between Rashi and Maimonides*, ed. Ephraim Kanarfogel and Moshe Sokolow (New York, 2010), 246 (n. 30).
37. See Hasida, *Shibbolé ha-leket*, (above, n. 17); and without attribution in *Tosfot ha-Rosh 'al massekhet nedarim*, ed. Bezalel Deblitzky (Jerusalem, 2001), 87; *Tosfot Rabbenu Perets ha-shalem 'al massekhet nedarim*, ed. Mordekhai Y. Weiner (Jerusalem, 2006), 150; and *Tosafot on Nedarim 62b*, s.v. *ha'ikka* (in truncated form). See also *Ḥiddushé ha-Rashba 'al massekhet nedarim*, ed. Yaakov Salomon (Jerusalem, 1991), 250; ms. Vatican 144 (below, n. 46); and Urbach, *Ba'alé ha-tosafot*, 1:162–163, 2:635.
38. See above, nn. 22–26. Note also Eliezer's concern about the idolatrous nature of saint worship, and those who might encounter public displays or processions involving saint veneration, in *Sefer yere'im*, sec. 270 (fols. 128a–b). See Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, 45; and below, n. 51. Here too, Eliezer's approach does not seem to have impacted Ashkenazic halakhic literature. See *Ḥiddushé ha-Ran 'al massekhet sanhedrin*, ed. Yisrael Sklar (Jerusalem, 2004), 445 (s.v. *yakhol afillu*); *Semak*, sec. 29; and Judah Galinsky, "Gishot shonot le-tofa' at mofté ha-kedoshim ha-notsrin be-sifrut ha-rabbanit shel yemé ha-benayim," *Ta-Shma: meḥkarim le-zikhro shel Yisra'el M. Ta-shma*, ed. Moshe Idel et al. (Jerusalem, 2011), 1:195–200.
39. Citing one passage from *Sefer yere'im*, Katz (*Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, 44, n. 2) considers Eliezer of Metz to be the lone holdout, preventing the lenient northern French Tosafist view regarding Christian ritual objects from being

- “universally accepted.” See also idem., *Ben yehudim le-goyim*, 52 (n. 25). Compare with Isaac b. Moses, *Sefer or zaru'a*, *piské 'avodah zarah*, sec. 130, 3:597, who ratifies a stringency endorsed by Eliezer b. Isaac of Prague (or Bohemia) prohibiting a Jew to sell writing tablets and ink to priests lest they record their teachings on them. See, *Haggahot maimuniyyot*, *hilkhot 'avodah zarah*. 7:2; *Haggahot asheri*, 1:15; and below, n. 48. On Eliezer of Prague, see Urbach, *Ba'alé ha-tosafot*, 1:212–215; *Sefer or zaru'a*, pt. 1, *she'elot u-teshuvot*, sec. 113, 1:107–108; *hilkhot netilat yadayim*, sec. 75 (1:81); and *hilkhot se'udah*, sec. 155 (1:146).
40. See Jacob Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, 102–103; Moses b. Jacob of Coucy, *Sefer mitsvot gadol* (Venice, 1547), *lo ta'aseh* 45 (fols. 10a–b); and above, n. 27.
41. See *Semaq*, vol. 1 (*mitsvot lo ta'aseh*), editor's introduction, 17–24; and vol. 2 (*mitsvot lo ta'aseh*), editor's introduction, 17–24.
42. See *Semaq*, *lo ta'aseh* 45, 77 and see above, n. 33.
43. See *ibid.*, 77–78. Compare *Haggahot maimuniyyot*, *hilkhot 'avodah zarah*, 7:2. A rabbinic commentary suggests (*Semaq*, *ibid.*, n. 45) that *me'ilim* connotes garments that serve as coverings for the religious implements or for the altar, while *mitronot* refers to priestly garb. However, the simple meaning of the term *me'il* in Ashkenazic texts is priestly clothing. Since the word *mitronot* may connote a cape, it is possible that *me'ilim* refer to the basic service garments of the priest, while *mitronot* are outerwear. This distinction is found in one version of Eliezer of Metz' formulations (above, n. 33). Outerwear may be more easily permitted since it was worn publicly, outside the church service. However, it is more likely that the later version of *Semaq* simply includes a more lenient view concerning priestly garments generally (like that of Rashbam), and the two terms mean the same thing.
44. See *ibid.*, 79; and above, n. 31.
45. *Ibid.*
46. See ms. Vatican 144, fol. 112d; and above, n. 37.
47. See above, n. 29. See also *Kitsur sefer mitsvot gadol le-R. Avraham ben Efrayim*, ed. Yehoshua Horowitz (Jerusalem, 2005), 145, which cites the various French leniencies of Rashi, Rashbam, Ri and R. Judah Sirleon, along with perhaps the only leniency associated with Eliezer of Metz: if certain ritual objects had already reached the hands of a Jew, they could be nullified by a Christian at that point so that the Jew would not now have to forego benefit.
48. See Ḥasida, *Shibbolé ha-leket*, (above, n. 17). Eliezer of Verona was a student of Ri of Dampierre. He composed *Tosafot* to *Bava Batra* and was apparently a teacher of Avigdor Katz' teachers. See Urbach, *Ba'alé ha-tosafot*, 1:433–36. Yosef Karo, *Shulḥan 'arukh*, *Yoreh de'ah*, sec. 139:15, rules in accordance with the view of Eliezer and Avigdor, while Moses Isserles rules stringently, following *Sefer ha-terumah* and *Semaq* (above, nn. 44–45). Note that the leading fifteenth-century Austrian rabbinic authority, Israel Isserlein (*Terumat ha-deshen*, *pesakim*, #112, cited by Isserles) rules that selling *sefarim pesulim* to priests is prohibited if these books discuss matters of Christian faith (*sefer yir'atam*). If, however, the contents of a book are not known (seemingly due to a language barrier), it is possible to be lenient since the majority are works of “law, medicine, astronomy, mathematics and music.”
49. See Israel Ta-Shma, *Keneset mehkarim* (Jerusalem, 2005), 1: 9–48.

50. See Ḥasida, *Shibbolé ha-leket*, 40 (sec. 9). See the references to these formulations in Rid's *tosafot* and *pesakim*, Ḥasida, *Shibbolé ha-leket*, nn. 28, 29, 33, 36, 39, 42; and see above, n. 12.
51. Note, for example, the acceptance of a Christian oath for business transactions. See Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, 34; Berger, "Jacob Katz on Jews and Christians," 60–61; idem., *Persecution, Polemic and Dialogue*, 170, 294; and Galinsky, "Gishot shonot," 195–196. For Ra'avyah's stringent view, see Deblitzky, *Sefer ra'avyah 'al massekhet 'avodah zarah*, 28 (sec. 1053); *Sefer Mordekhai 'al massekhet 'avodah zarah*, sec. 809.
52. Compare, Urbach, *Ba'alé ha-tosafot*, 1:176–177, 351–352, 474–475.
53. See, for example, Caroline Bynum, *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley, 1982), 9–21, 53–58, 236–241, 247–262; Richard William Southern, *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe* (Oxford, 1995), 134–137; Richard William Southern, *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages* (Harmondsworth, 1970), 36–41; and Jeremy Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews* (Ithaca, 1982), 33–44.
54. See above, nn. 23–24.
55. See *Sefer ha-terumah*, *hilkhot 'avodah zarah*, sec. 153; *Semaḡ, lo ta'aseh* 45 (and ms. Berlin Or. Phillip 1392, fol. 189r); Galinsky, "Gishot shonot," 215–216, who notes the presence of this passage in Rabbenu Peretz' *Sefer ha-dinim*. See also *Semaḡ*, sec. 13 (end); above, n. 31; and Ya'akov Fuchs, "Ketav yad Mantua ha-kehilah ha-yehudit 30 u-terumato," *Tarbiz* 79 (2011): 402–408. The German Tosafist Simhah of Speyer (d. ca. 1230), and his student, R. Bonfant (Samuel ha-Levi of Worms), indicate that the penance (of immersion) for a reverting apostate was meant to atone for sins committed while living among Christians such as consuming non-kosher foods; no mention is made of atonement for the worship of idolatry. See *Teshuvot u-fesakim*, ed. Efraim Kupfer (Jerusalem, 1973), 290–91 (sec. 71), and see Ephraim Kanarfogel, "Returning to the Jewish Community in Medieval Ashkenaz: History and Halakhah," in *Tirim: Studies in Jewish History and Literature Presented to Dr. Bernard Lander*, ed. Michael A. Shmidman (New York, 2007), 1: 69–97.
56. See *Sefer mitsvot gadol* (ed. Venice), *mitsvat 'aseh* 82 (fol. 167d).
57. See Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, 104–105.
58. See Judah Galinsky, "R. Moshe mi-Coucy ke-ḥasid, darshan u-folmosan: hebbetim me-'olamo ha-maḥshavti u-fe'iluto ha-tsibburit," (MA thesis, Yeshiva University, 1993), 43–50. See *Semaḡ, mitsvat lo ta'aseh* 152 (fol. 58b); *lo ta'aseh* 170 (fol. 61a); and Jeffrey Woolf, "Some Polemical Emphases in the *Sefer Mitsvot Gadol* of Rabbi Moses of Coucy," *JQR* 89 (1998): 98.
59. See Margaliyot, *Vikkuaḥ R. Yehi'el*, 22–23 (translated in David Berger, *Polemic, Persecution and Dialogue*, 119): "The rabbi responded: let me tell you a way that you can be saved even through your faith. If you observe the seven commandments that you have been commanded, you will be saved through them. The bishops rejoiced and responded: indeed we have ten! The rabbi replied: that is fine with me."
60. See Margaliyot, *Vikkuaḥ R. Yehi'el*, 21 (and above, n. 2). See also Woolf, "Some Polemical Influences," 99 (n. 84); and Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, 108–109, 122–123; and Katz, *Ben yehudim le-goyim*, 113 (n. 15a), and 123 (n. 43).



61. For the full range of Yeḥi'el's intellectual activities and literary productivity, see Simha Emanuel, "R. Yeḥi'el mi-Paris: toldotav ve-zikkato le-erets yisra'el," *Shalem* 8 (2008): 86–99, and Ephraim Kanarfogel, "R. Tobia de Vienne et R. Yehiel de Paris: La créativité des Tosafists dans une période d'incertitude," *Les cahiers du judaïsme* 33 (2011): 4–17.
62. See above, n. 59.
63. Fuchs, "Ketav yad Mantua" (above, n. 55).

JEWS AND CHRISTIANS IN  
THIRTEENTH-CENTURY  
FRANCE

*Edited by*

*Elisheva Baumgarten and Judah D. Galinsky*

palgrave  
macmillan