

*David Berger*

Dr. Berger is Broeklundian Professor of History, Brooklyn College and the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, and a member of *Tradition's* Editorial Committee.

## A GENERATION OF SCHOLARSHIP ON JEWISH-CHRISTIAN INTERACTION IN THE MEDIEVAL WORLD

*To what extent has research in the past three decades changed our understanding of Jewish-Christian interaction in the pre-modern period?*

*To what degree has the assumption that Jewish-Christian relations were dominated by the facts of irreconcilable theological differences, legal discrimination, and outbreaks of violence obscured the complexities of these relations?*

*How have insights from other disciplines shed new light on Jewish-Christian interactions? In particular, how has the scholarly awareness of differences between "high" and "low" culture contributed to interpretation of these relations?*

*How have the Holocaust, on the one hand, and the founding of the State of Israel, on the other, affected modern historiography of Jewish-Christian relations?*

*Which aspects of Jewish-Christian relations remain least understood?*

**T**his assignment has been a salutary and humbling experience. We all pay lip service to the recognition that history is rewritten in every generation, but if we did not believe that something of our own contributions would endure, we would, I think, lose much of the drive that impels us to do our work. The study of medieval Jewish-Christian relations is after all a relatively small field, and yet a hard look

---

*At the conference of the Association for Jewish Studies in December, 2001, I was one of three historians of medieval Jewish-Christian relations asked to address a series of questions about the state of the field. It is a pleasure to present a written, annotated version of my remarks as a tribute to Rabbi Emanuel Feldman, whose learning, commitment and stylistic flair have preserved and enhanced the tradition of this distinguished journal.*

at the state of that field three decades ago reveals a dramatically different, often thoroughly alien landscape.

This is especially true of Northern Europe in the Middle Ages. Truly great scholars of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries —people whose command of classical Jewish and Christian sources renders us all *ammei ha-arets* by comparison—had begun to examine the relationship through a historical lens: Heinrich Graetz, Avraham Berliner, David Kaufmann, Samuel Krauss, Adolf and Samuel Posnanski, and more. By 1970, which happens to be the year I received my doctorate, Yitzhak Baer's work on *Hasidei Ashkenaz* and Northern France,<sup>1</sup> Judah Rosenthal's editions and studies of polemical works,<sup>2</sup> Solomon Grayzel's volume on papal documents,<sup>3</sup> Bernhard Blumenkranz's collection and analysis of pre-crusade Christian materials,<sup>4</sup> several chapters of Salo Baron's *History*, the early studies of Frank E. Talmage,<sup>5</sup> and Jacob Katz's seminal, remarkably insightful, though largely impressionistic *Exclusiveness and Tolerance* had begun to set a new agenda. Nonetheless, I think it is fair to say that the prevailing impression of Northern European Jewry in the High Middle Ages continued to be one of an insular community, hostile to and ignorant of the society that surrounded it.

Both new information and new methodologies have produced a significant reassessment. In the last generation, arguments have been presented for a variety of theses that would have seemed implausible thirty years ago: that Northern European Jews discussed biblical texts with Christians in non-polemical contexts,<sup>6</sup> that Jewish exegesis was profoundly influenced by both the Jewish-Christian confrontation and the intellectual atmosphere of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance,<sup>7</sup> that sharp polemical exchanges, sometimes initiated by Jews, took place on the streets and even in homes,<sup>8</sup> that Jews were sorely tempted by Christianity and converted more often than we imagined,<sup>9</sup> that Jewish religious ceremonies arose and developed in conscious and subconscious interaction with Christian rituals,<sup>10</sup> that martyrdom itself reflects a religious environment shared with the dominant culture and even an awareness of its evolving theology,<sup>11</sup> that the crusades were not a significant turning point,<sup>12</sup> and that images of self and other were formed through constant, shifting interaction.<sup>13</sup>

This incomplete list concentrates on the North and refers almost exclusively to Jewish reactions to Christian society. If we expand our purview to Spain and to Christian perceptions and policies, a different set of suggestive, largely new questions emerges. Were the conversos really crypto-Jews?<sup>14</sup> How did Jews utilize their growing historical

## TRADITION

sophistication, developed in significant measure through exposure to Christian thought, in responding to Christianity?<sup>15</sup> Can we still speak of fifteenth-century Spanish Jewry as a community suffering decline and demoralization?<sup>16</sup> Does Christian familiarity with the Talmud explain policies of intolerance?<sup>17</sup> Does the charge of ritual murder emerge out of a Christian interpretation of real Jewish behavior?<sup>18</sup> Must our understanding of the treatment of Jews be rethought in light of attitudes toward other “others”: Muslims, witches, lepers, heretics, homosexuals, even a non-other other—women?<sup>19</sup> Is there a deep difference between Crusade-era hostility toward Jews and the arguably irrational sort manifested in charges of ritual murder, host desecration, and well poisoning?<sup>20</sup> Does the close examination of specific histories require us to jettison our perception of an overarching pattern in which the condition of Jews deteriorates from the early to the late Middle Ages?<sup>21</sup>

All these questions and contentions were first framed—or framed in significantly new forms—during the last three decades. I cannot, of course, address them all in the purview of this presentation, and so let me concentrate on just a few central points regarding cultural interaction that may be methodologically fruitful.

Influence is notoriously difficult to pin down. To return to Northern European Jews, we can now take it for granted that they were acutely aware of many Christian ceremonies and symbols. Festive religious processions wended their way through the streets, and routine, everyday activities brought Jews into contact with Christian discourse. Popular, hostile euphemisms for Christian sancta—chalice (*kelev*), priest (*gallah*), sermon (*nibbu’ah*), church (*to’evah*), saints (*kedeshim*), the host (*lehem mego’al*), baptismal water (*mayim zedonim*), the holy sepulcher (*shuha*), not to speak of Peter (*Peter Hamor*), Jesus (*ba-Taluy*), and Mary (*Haria*)—testify to the ubiquitous presence of these symbols in the daily life of Ashkenazic Jews. The very hostility in these terms leads anyone attempting to assess Christian influence on expressions of Jewish culture and thought into a methodological thicket where psychology, halakha, and theology meet.

I do not believe that any medieval Jew, Ashkenazic or Sephardic, would have explicitly said, even to him or herself, *Kammah na’ah avodah zarah zo*: “How lovely is this quintessentially Christian religious practice or idea; let us import it into our faith.” The refusal to do this was rooted only secondarily in formal strictures prohibiting imitation of Gentile statutes; it spoke to elemental instincts.<sup>22</sup> Moreover, I am not persuaded that Ashkenazic Jews—even those who specialized in inter-

faith confrontations—actually read Christian literary works other than the New Testament. They do not cite such works either explicitly or by convincing implication, and this silence counts. Even the Southern French case that I noted in the early 1970s—Jacob ben Reuben’s familiarity with a polemical collection, including selections from Gilbert Crispin—is exceptional and results from his having been handed the collection by his Christian interlocutor.<sup>23</sup> The familiarity with Christian works in the writings of R. Elhanan b. Yaqar of London is so atypical that it is nothing less than stunning.<sup>24</sup>

Thus, we must be cognizant of a complex of questions when we approach the issue at hand: Is the practice or belief or symbol or exegetical approach likely to have been known to Jews? How evident was it to an outsider? How clear would its religious, i.e., its specifically Christian, character be? In this particular instance, can we plausibly posit unconscious influence? Would this practice be expected to trigger reflexive Jewish aversion if its Christian character were understood? If the religious character of the practice is evident, do classic Jewish texts nonetheless provide enough basis for adopting it that a Jew attracted by it could persuade himself and others that it is really Jewish after all? Perhaps a Jewish text weighs so powerfully in favor of this practice or belief that Jews really affirmed it for internal reasons—not through Christian influence but *despite* full awareness of its Christian resonance. Does a Jewish practice change the Christian original sufficiently that intentional religious competition or symbolic inversion can plausibly be proposed? Since Jews and Christians examined history, studied sacred texts, and molded their religious lives in the context of a common biblical tradition and essentially monotheistic theology, can the phenomenon under discussion be reasonably understood as a result of independent development?

Much more rarely, such questions can even be relevant where our focus is on Christian behaviors or beliefs. Thus, the assertion that Christians developed their views about Jewish ritual murder in response to Jewish actions during the Crusades and even to Jewish prayers and eschatological conceptions requires a prior assessment of the likelihood that Christians were aware of these conceptions at the relevant time. If such awareness seems implausible, so do conclusions drawn from it.<sup>25</sup>

To some degree, these criteria generate a question that might be described as an analytical chicken and egg. Even if I have no independent knowledge that Jews knew a Christian doctrine, and even if I would consider such knowledge intrinsically implausible, I may still be per-

## TRADITION

suaded by connections that seem so striking that I will posit such knowledge. Still, in such a case the burden of argument (there are few “proofs” in this discourse) is heavily on the advocate of the hypothesis of influence or reaction. It must be acknowledged, of course, that if I am indeed persuaded by striking connections in more than a few instances, I would have to reassess the threshold of probable influence when examining new questions.

So far, all this has been highly abstract, and I have to provide some concrete examples to flesh out these principles, though to dwell on any of them is beyond the scope of this presentation.

With respect to *Hasidei Ashkenaz*: The movement itself is now seen as a manifestation of a largely internal Jewish dynamic.<sup>26</sup> Penances, however, are a different matter. Christian self-mortification was almost certainly known to Jews, its Christian character was clear enough to raise warning flags, there were enough Jewish sources to make the argument for the Jewishness of the practice but not enough for this to be an internal, immanent development, and it could serve subconsciously and perhaps even consciously as an affirmation of superior Jewish religious devotion in the face of Christian piety. Weighing all this, I am inclined to think that influence, or response, is highly likely.<sup>27</sup>

With respect to biblical exegesis: Both Jews and Christians were sufficiently familiar with the approaches of the other for influence—in both directions—to be plausible. Religiously neutral aspects of the twelfth-century Christian cultural efflorescence have sufficient affinities to certain predilections of *pashtanim* (e.g., interpreting according to *derekh erets*) to have inspired them without their seeing these predilections as deriving from a specifically Christian environment. I am convinced that polemical encounters were considerably more common, even among ordinary people, than we used to think, and Jews may well have so internalized their polemical insistence on straightforward interpretation that they applied this approach ruthlessly even in works directed at their own coreligionists.

In matters of exegetical detail, polemical motives are occasionally obvious, occasionally likely, and occasionally asserted implausibly. When a Jewish commentary is alleged to counter a Christian interpretation never (or hardly ever) cited by Jewish polemicists, and not prominent in Christian exegesis of the period, we would do well to be wary. Here is an example proposed in the scholarly literature that strikes me as a close call: Did Rashbam’s assertion that Moses dropped rather than threw down the tablets result from his desire to counter the view that the first

tablets represent the Old Law, which is to be superseded? The Christian interpretation is not particularly prominent; it is not, however, altogether obscure either, and Rashbam's comment does say "*darsheni*." To take another concrete example, this time from a passage where polemical sensibilities are obvious, I do not accept the widespread view that Rashi adopted a vicarious atonement reading of Isaiah 53 as a result of historical considerations relating to the first Crusade.<sup>28</sup> Here, vicarious atonement is adopted despite its evident Christological valence because of internal exegetical considerations reinforced by sufficient rabbinic precedent to justify the doctrine itself.

With respect to the Tosafists: The similarity between the dialectical methods they used and those of more or less contemporary Christian theologians and canon lawyers are striking indeed, but significant Christian familiarity with talmudic discourse or substantial Jewish knowledge of scholastic discussions and the concordance of discordant canons appears very low. If one were to be persuaded of influence, this would be a case of being swept away by a parallelism that is difficult to attribute to coincidence. Conflicting, very powerful considerations leave us in limbo.

With respect to popular practices and rituals: My inclination, for reasons already noted, is to privilege immanent development, but here too I take very seriously the possibility of influence and response where the Christian parallel, as in the case of certain "rituals of childhood,"<sup>29</sup> was not glaringly evident to the medieval Jew. Here "high" and "low" culture intersect, but the essential methodology does not, I think, change fundamentally even though one's verdict in a specific case must consider the knowledge and sensibilities of the presumed objects of influence.

I have already alluded to the complex interaction between attraction and hostility. Here as elsewhere I am inclined to think that the most relevant discipline outside history is psychology, where an understanding of the dynamics of fascination and hate, of self and other, is central to illuminating our concerns. Since both history and psychology are among the most imperialistic of disciplines—there really are no humanistic or social scientific pursuits that are not part of the historian's craft, and no study of human activity is alien to psychology—this assertion may be a truism. But whatever disciplinary labels we assign—cultural studies, anthropology, social history—we are considerably more sensitive to the crucial insight that in certain circumstances subcultures can interact and influence one another despite a sense of existential difference, even of mutual hatred.

## TRADITION

With respect to Christian attitudes to Jews, I will be much more brief, relying on my essay on new approaches to medieval anti-Semitism.<sup>30</sup> Still, it is self-evident that psychological assertions play a central role in this discourse as well. A case in point is the distinction put forth in the last decade between irrational and other forms of medieval anti-Semitism.<sup>31</sup> Even if we can satisfy ourselves that late medieval Christians were insecure in their beliefs, a proposition that seems plausible with respect to transubstantiation but much less well established on a larger scale, the assertion that they coped with the perceived irrationality of their own faith by attributing irrational behavior to Jews does not follow ineluctably. I do not know whether such coping mechanisms can be firmly established through psychological research, but the possibility of such investigation—even though it would not be wholly determinative for our purposes—is intriguing.

With respect to anti-Jewish attitudes and policies, the question of high and low culture has played a particularly significant role. Approaches that privilege—or blame—the former include the assertion that Christian intellectuals reacted to a perceived Jewish challenge,<sup>32</sup> the emphasis on the Christian discovery of the Talmud,<sup>33</sup> and concentration on the evolution of Church law regarding Jews.<sup>34</sup> Low culture takes center stage in analyses emphasizing economic grievances, satanic fantasies, and, more ambiguously, millennial upheavals<sup>35</sup> and enhanced piety. Since high and low culture constantly interact, and in the case of the very important lower clergy cannot even be clearly distinguished, I am inclined to see a sharp division between these categories as misleading.

Then there is the question of *longue duree* patterns in the treatment of Jews. Despite important work calling traditional periodization into question,<sup>36</sup> I continue to believe that a pattern of decline from early to late Middle Ages remains a reality. Sometimes increasing historical sophistication along with additional information can blur differences between communities and periods so that things that “everyone knew” about continuities and discontinuities now appear questionable. Usually, however, if everyone knows something is true, it is true, or at least more or less true. This is a point that concerns me in many areas and periods, some well out of my field of specialized expertise. At the risk of revealing my own lack of sophistication, here is a partial list of old-fashioned views that I think deserve some defense against revisionist critiques that have in some instances become the new orthodoxies: Despite everything, Ashkenazic culture *was* more insular than that of Spanish Jewry; sixteenth-century Jewish messianism and historiography *are* noteworthy; rabbinic Judaism

in the early Christian centuries *was* a more direct continuation of Second Temple Judaism in all its forms than Christianity; Orthodox Judaism in modern times *is* a more direct continuation of medieval Judaism than Reform Judaism; the eastern Haskalah *did* begin later than that of the West; and the condition of late medieval Jewry under Christendom *was* more precarious than that of the Jews of the earlier Middle Ages.

A final word on the question about Zionism: The impact of Zionism on twentieth-century Jewish historiography is beyond question, and beyond the scope of this presentation. At this moment in history, I do not think that the relevant fault lines, to the extent that they exist, are along Israel-Diaspora lines. If they do exist, they may reflect religious commitments, so that historians with traditionalist sympathies or beliefs may be less inclined, for example, to endorse connections between Jewish behavior during the Crusades—behavior lionized in the liturgy—and stories of ritual murder. Both Israeli and diaspora historians live in societies where anti-Semitism in its medieval form has receded, and this liberates everyone from some of the constraints of the past, notwithstanding the virulent resurgence of attacks against both the Jewish people and its State in the last several years. I must confess to having experienced some uneasiness when translating the *Nitsahon Yashan*'s anti-Christian invective into English and listing a medieval Christian's bill of particulars against the Talmud in an English article,<sup>37</sup> but, for better or worse, I overcame that uneasiness. That queasy feeling, however, has its own historiographic benefits. It enables us better to understand the often wrenching struggles of Jews from R. Yehiel of Paris to the participants in the Napoleonic Sanhedrin to balance candor and self-interest in presenting the teachings of their classical texts. I do not react well when people speak with bemused condescension about the quaint notes in old editions of *selihot* affirming that the gentiles of the poet are the Visigoths or the heathens of old. There is not a scintilla of doubt that the condescending critic would have done the same thing had he or she been put in the same position.

I end where I began. The chastening effect of considering the monumental changes that have been effected during the last three decades in the historiography of medieval Jewish-Christian relations makes me loath to draw up a list of areas requiring further study, though it is not difficult to list such areas: interaction in the economic sphere, in folk beliefs, in perceptions of the role of women,<sup>38</sup> and much more. The greatest changes, I am afraid, may well come in areas that I think I understand best.



## TRADITION

### NOTES

1. "Ha-Megammah ha-Datit-Hevratit shel Sefer Hasidim," *Zion* 3 (1938): 1-50; "Rashi ve-ha-Metsiut ha-Historit shel Zemanno," *Tarbits* 20 (1949): 320-32, and more.
2. Jacob ben Reuben, *Milhamot ha-Shem* (Jerusalem, 1963); Joseph Official, *Sefer Yosef ha-Mekanne* (Jerusalem, 1970); the studies collected in Rosenthal, *Mehkarim u-Mekorot* (Jerusalem, 1967), and more.
3. *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century* (Philadelphia, 1933). See now the expanded version edited by Kenneth Stow (New York, 1989).
4. *Les Auteurs Chrétiens Latins du Moyen Age sur les Juifs et le Judaïsme* (Paris, La Haye, 1963); *Juifs et Chrétiens dans le Monde Occidental, 430-1096* (Paris, 1960).
5. "Rabbi David Kimhi as Polemicist," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 38 (1967): 213-35; "An Hebrew Polemical Treatise, Anti-Cathar and anti-Orthodox," *Harvard Theological Review* 60 (1967): 323-48. These and some of his later studies have now been collected in Frank Ephraim Talmage, *Apples of Gold in Settings of Silver: Studies in Medieval Jewish Exegesis and Polemics*, ed. by Barry Dov Walfish (Toronto, 1999).
6. Aryeh Grabois, "The *Hebraica Veritas* and Jewish-Christian Intellectual Relations in the Twelfth Century," *Speculum* 50 (1975): 613-34.
7. A mini-literature has grown up around this theme. See the overall argument presented in Elazar Touitou, "Shitato ha-Parshanit shel ha-Rashbam al Reka ha-Metsi'ut ha-Historit shel Zemanno," in *Iyyunim be-Sifrut Hazal ba-Mikra u-be-Toledot Yisrael: Mukdash li-Prof. E. Z. Melamed*, ed. by Y. D. Gilat et al. (Ramat Gan, 1982), pp. 48-74. For a particularly good discussion containing some important methodological observations, see Avraham Grossman, "Ha-Pulmus ha-Yehudi ha-Notsri ve-ha-Parshanut ha-Yehudit la-Mikra be-Zarfah ba-Meah ha-Yod-Bet," *Zion* 91 (1986): 29-60.
8. See my "Mission to the Jews and Jewish-Christian Contacts in the Polemical Literature of the High Middle Ages," *American Historical Review* 91 (1986): 576-91.
9. Avraham Grossman, *Hakhmei Tsarfah ha-Rishonim* (Jerusalem, 1995), pp. 502-03.
10. Ivan G. Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood* (New Haven, 1996); Yisrael Yuval, *Shenei Goyim be-Bitnekh: Yehudim ve-Notsrim—Dimmuyim Hadadiyyim* (Tel Aviv, 2000), pp. 219-66.
11. See most recently Shmuel Shepkaru, "To Die for God: Martyrs' Heaven in Hebrew and Latin Crusade Narratives," *Speculum* 77 (2002): 311-41.
12. Robert Chazan, *European Jewry and the First Crusade* (Berkeley, 1987), pp. 197-222.
13. See my "Al Tadmitam ve-Goralam shel ha-Goyim be-Sifrut ha-Pulmus ha-Ashkenazit," in *Yehudim mul ha-Tselav: Gezerot Tatn'u ba-Historiah u-ba-Historiographiyah*, ed. by Yom Tov Assis et al. (Jerusalem, 2000), pp. 74-91. Cf. Robert Chazan, *Medieval Stereotypes and Modern Antisemitism* (Berkeley, 1997). On this and related matters, see now Ivan Marcus, "A Jewish-Christian Symbiosis: The Culture of Early Ashkenaz," in *Cultures of the Jews: A New History*, ed. by David Biale (New York, 2002), pp. 449-518.

14. This question has produced a significant body of historiography since the late 1960's, especially in the wake of B. Netanyahu's *The Marranos of Spain from the Late XIVth to the Early XVIth Century According to Contemporary Hebrew Sources* (New York, 1966). For a brief statement of my own perspective, see my review of Netanyahu's *The Origins of the Inquisition in Fifteenth Century Spain* (New York, 1995) in *Commentary* 100:4 (October, 1995): 55-57.
15. Ram Bar Shalom, *Dimmuy ha-Tarbut ha-Notsrit ha-Toda'ah ha-Historit shel Yehudei Sefarad u-Provence (Ha-Meah ha-Shtem-Esreh ad ha-Hamesh-Esreh)*, Ph.D. dissertation (Tel Aviv University, 1996). See too my "On the Uses of History in Medieval Jewish Polemic against Christianity: The Search for the Historical Jesus," in *Jewish History and Jewish Memory: Essays in Honor of Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi*, ed. by E. Carlebach, J. M. Efron, and D. N. Myers (Hanover and London, 1998), pp. 25-39. On Jewish-Christian interaction in Spain, see now Benjamin Gampel, "The Transformation of Sephardic Culture in Christian Iberia," in *Cultures of the Jews* (above, n. 13), pp. 389-447.
16. Eleazar Gutwirth, "Towards Expulsion: 1391-1492," in Elie Kedourie, ed., *Spain and the Jews* (London, 1992), pp. 51-73.
17. Jeremy Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews* (Ithaca and London, 1982). Cf. my review in *American Historical Review* 88 (1983): 93.
18. Yisrael Yuval, "Ha-Naqam ve-ha-Qelalah, ha-Dam ve-ha-Alilah," *Zion* 58 (1992/93): 33-90, and the reactions in *Zion* 59:2-3 (1994).
19. R. I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society* (Oxford, 1987).
20. Gavin Langmuir, *History, Religion and Antisemitism and Toward a Definition of Antisemitism* (Berkeley, 1990). For reactions to this thesis, see Robert C. Stacey, "History, Religion and Medieval Antisemitism: A Response to Gavin Langmuir," *Religious Studies Review* 20 (1994): 95-101; Marc Saperstein, "Medieval Christians and Jews: A Review Essay," *Shofar* 8:4 (Summer, 1990): 1-10; Robert Chazan, *In the Year 1096: The First Crusade and the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1996), pp. 143-46; David Berger, *From Crusades to Blood Libels to Expulsions: Some New Approaches to Medieval Antisemitism*. The Second Victor J. Selmanowitz Memorial Lecture, Touro College Graduate School of Jewish Studies (1997), pp. 14-16.
21. David Nirenberg, *Communities of Violence* (Princeton, 1996).
22. On the importance of instincts in this discourse see my "Jacob Katz on Jews and Christians in the Middle Ages," in *The Pride of Jacob: Essays on Jacob Katz and his Work*, ed. by Jay M. Harris (Cambridge, Mass., 2002), pp. 41-63.
23. See my "Gilbert Crispin, Alan of Lille, and Jacob ben Reuben: A Study in the Transmission of Medieval Polemic," *Speculum* 49 (1974): 34-47.
24. G. Vajda, "De quelques infiltrations chrétiennes dans l'oeuvre d'un auteur anglo-juif du XIIIe siècle," *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Age* 28 (1961): 15-34.
25. See my observations on Yuval's "Ha-Naqam ve-ha-Qelalah" in *From Crusades to Blood Libels to Expulsions*, pp. 16-22.
26. Haym Soloveitchik, "Three Themes in the Sefer Hasidim," *AJS Review* 1 (1976): 311-57. See too Ivan Marcus, *Piety and Society* (Leiden, 1981).
27. See Talya Fishman, "The Penitential System of Hasidei Ashkenaz and the Problem of Cultural Boundaries," *The Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 8 (1999): 201-29. Cf. my remarks in *The Jewish-Christian Debate*

## TRADITION

- in the High Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 1979), p. 27, and in “Al Tadmitam ve-Goralam shel ha-Goyim” (above, n. 13), pp. 78-79.
28. Joel Rembaum, “The Development of a Jewish Exegetical Tradition Regarding Isaiah 53,” *Harvard Theological Review* 75 (1982):289-311.
  29. Marcus (above, n. 10).
  30. *From Crusades to Blood Libels to Expulsions* (above, n. 20).
  31. Langmuir (above, n. 20).
  32. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society* (above, n. 19).
  33. Cohen, *The Friars* (above, n. 17).
  34. This is a significant motif in Kenneth Stow’s *Alienated Minority: The Jews of Medieval Latin Europe* (Cambridge, Mass., 1992) and in many of his other studies.
  35. Richard Landes, “The Massacres of 1010: On the Origins of Popular Violence in Western Europe,” in *From Witness to Witchcraft: Jews and Judaism in Medieval Christian Thought* (Wiesbaden, 1996), pp. 79-112.
  36. Nirenberg, *Communities of Violence* (above, n. 21).
  37. “Christians, Gentiles, and the Talmud: A Fourteenth-Century Jewish Response to the Attack on Rabbinic Judaism,” in *Religionsgespräche im Mittelalter*, ed. by Bernard Lewis and Friedrich Niewöhner (Wiesbaden, 1992), pp. 115-130.
  38. See now Avraham Grossman, *Hasidot u-Mordot: Nashim Yehudiyyot be-Eropah bi-Yemei ha-Beinayim* (Jerusalem, 2001); Elisheva Baumgarten, *Mothers and Children: Jewish Family Life in Medieval Europe* (Princeton, N.J., 2004).