INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

AUTHOR Elliot Michael Strom

TITLE "Theology in Crisis: Jewish Theodicy at the Time of the Crusades"

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. [ ] D.H.L. [ ] Rabbinic [XX]

Master's [ ] Prize Essay [ ]

1. May circulate [✓]) Not necessary
2. Is restricted [ ] for ___ years.) for Ph.D.) thesis

Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. ✓ yes ___ no

March 1/77
Date

Elliot Strom
Signature of Author

Library Record

Microfilmed Date 7/6/77

Ivona Steiner
Signature of Library Staff Member

THEOLOGY IN CRISIS:

Jewish Theodicy at the Time of the Crusades

Elliot Michael Strom

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for Ordination

Hebrew Union College--Jewish Institute of Religion
Cincinnati, Ohio
1977

Referee, Prof. Michael A. Meyer

I would like to express my sincerest thanks to Elinor Grumet, who greatly assisted me in my translations from the Hebrew; to my friend, Mark Shapiro, whose interest and encouragement helped me throughout; to my wife, Susan, for her invaluable aid in the editing of the manuscript; and to my advisor and teacher, Michael Meyer, whose insight, erudition and precision of thought inspired me to explore the limits of my own capabilities.

For my parents who, by their example, taught me love.
For Susan, whom I love with all my heart,
And for Adam, the living testimony of our love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	INTRODUCTION	page 1
1.	PREVENTIVE MEASURES	page 13
2.	ANGER	page 27
3.	DESPAIR	page 36
4.	ACCEPTANCE OF DEATH	
	i. Introduction	page 44
	ii. Trial	page 56
	iii. Guilt	page 64
	iv. Summary	page 75
5.	CONCLUSIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS	page 78
	NOTES	page 84
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	page 100

DIGEST

The cruel events of the medieval period--the Crusader persecutions and the pogroms associated with the blood libel and well-poisoning charges--presented the Jews of the Rhineland with a sharp challenge to their faith and thus to their survival. For the survivors the challenge was inescapable--to attempt to reconcile the traditional notion of a benevolent deity, who had chosen the Jews as His people, with the reality of enormous Jewish suffering and death.

The immediate response of many Rhineland Jews was to attempt to forestall calamity. To this end, they appealed to both the secular and Christian religious authorities for aid and protection. Some also sought refuge in flight to the Holy Land. Finally, some even resorted to armed resistance, although this option was generally less effective since the Jews were inexperienced in warfare, outnumbered by their enemies, and ambivalent in their attitude toward employing violent means, even for self-defense.

Faced with death's inevitability, many responded with rage and indignation. This anger was directed not only at the Crusaders and the Church they represented, but also at those Jews who chose to convert to Christianity and also at God Himself.

Not infrequently, anger developed into enervating despair. The more inconsolable among the Jews cited the mounting violence and destruction as evidence that God had decided to

abandon His people to its fate. Especially demoralizing was violence spilled out against the sacred Torah; to many Jews its desecration was a clear representation of God's abandonment of His people and the ephemeral nature of the covenant.

But neither anger nor despair could provide much solace for these Jews nor provide them with purpose in life and the will to survive. They therefore sought a unified, consistent explanation for their suffering which could enable them to continue the daily struggle to find meaning in abuse, degradation and even death. Most Jews did so through the notion of dying al kiddush ha-Shem, "for the sanctification of the Name" of God.

Martyrdom was increasingly viewed as the supreme means for honoring and obeying the Eternal; it was the ultimate ritual act. It was intended as well to achieve certain more tangible results--saving Jews from forced conversion, displaying contempt for their Christian conquerors, and attaining reward in the next world.

Not infrequently, the martyr viewed himself as being tried or tested by God as he was forced to chose between the immediate benefits of conversion and the ultimate rewards of suffering the martyr's death. He also frequently viewed his suffering as punishment inflicted by God as punishment for sins.

Kiddush ha-Shem was, then, an explanation through which defenceless Jews could testify to the truth of their faith, prove their courage and affirm God's providence. Unable to

defend themselves, they chose to resist in the only way possible--by taking their inevitable deaths into their own hands and imbuing them with special significance. Dying al kiddush ha-Shem allowed a hopeless people to maintain intact those ideals and beliefs which had always sustained them--that the universe was orderly and rational, that Israel enjoyed a special relationship with God, and that, petty and insignificant as their lives and deaths might have appeared, they partook of a larger meaning because they had had the privilege to die for the unification of God's name.

INTRODUCTION

The problem of theodicy--of reconciling God and evil--looms as the greatest of the theological issues of our own day. The shoah ("holocaust")--the destruction of approximately six million Jews in Nazi-occupied Europe between the years 1933 and 1945--demands our attention even as it defies our comprehension. It threatens the security of our faith in the essential goodness of God and man and in the meaning and purpose of the historical process. It is for this reason that we are increasingly drawn to an examination of historical precedents, of earlier instances when widespread suffering and death seemed to threaten Jewish survival, in the hope that they might shed light on our own situation.

The cruel events of the medieval period--the Crusader persecutions and the pogroms associated with the blood libels and well-poisoning charges--presented the Jews of Central Europe with a sharp challenge to their faith and thus to their survival. Many once-flourishing Jewish communities were decimated; others were obliterated entirely.[1] But those who survived the carnage faced a different kind of crisis, an intellectual and theological crisis. For these survivors the challenge was inescapable: to attempt to reconcile the traditional notion of a God of justice and mercy, of a benevolent Creator God who had selected the Jews as His people, with the reality of enormous Jewish suffering and death. This, surely, was no easy task.

Whatever the particular response of the individual, it was in each instance necessary to re-evaluate one's theological position in confrontation with the manifest evil of the time.

The period of the Crusades was an era in which Jews, of necessity, refined their response to persecution and suffering. Since the Bar Kochba rebellion of the years 132 to 135 C. E., the Jewish people had not experienced dislocation, death and destruction on such a mammoth scale. Fueled by an unquestioned and unquestioning religious loyalty, Christian mobs descended repeatedly, with savage fury, upon the Jews of Europe--threatening, torturing and slaughtering. Whatever practical purposes may have been served by such harassment of Jews--purposes such as easy access to provisions needed for the long journey, plunder, and satisfying the bloodlust of the more desperate members of the Crusading armies--certainly it was sincere religious fervor, combined with the Church's traditional hostility toward the Jews, which sparked the innumerable outbreaks of anti-Jewish violence. There was a secure faith among the Crusaders that they were engaged in the holy task of accomplishing God's purposes: rescuing the shrines of the faith and defeating God's own enemies, the Muslims, who held the Holy Land. In such an intense and emotionally-charged atmosphere, it is not surprising that this 'holy' expedition against the infidels of the East should spawn an 'internal Crusade' against the infidels in

their very midst, the Jews. At Rouen, before the inception of the First Crusade, the following words were uttered: "We have set out to march on a long road against the enemies of God in the East, and behold before our eyes are the Jews, His worst enemies. To ignore them is preposterous."[2]

The great popularity of the Crusades and the high degree of antipathy toward the Jews within the broad ranks of European Christendom were unmistakable. Some early Crusaders declared that all those who killed a Jew would have their sins forgiven them,[3] and a certain Count Ditmar even proclaimed that he would not begin his journey until he had dispatched at least one Jew.[4] Another leader swore an oath that he would avenge the blood of God upon the blood of Israel wherever he found himself.[5] While this same leader was dissuaded from fulfilling the terms of the oath by warnings from the Emperor and by healthy amounts of bribe-money from the Jewish community of Cologne, his original holy wrath and righteous fervor were indicative of the climate of anti-Jewish feeling among Christians throughout the entire Crusades period.

The rationalization for such anti-Jewish violence was, thus, of a religious and not a racial nature. The Jew could always escape the violence and guarantee his own safety through conversion to Christianity. In no recorded case was a Jew who accepted baptism injured in any way. Under such

circumstances, Jewish resistance to the Crusaders was particularly poignant, since they were victimized solely on account of their chosen beliefs. Had they agreed to abandon these beliefs and accept the faith of the invaders, their suffering would surely have come to an end. Yet for them it was inconceivable that they should abandon the beliefs which were so integral to their lives--beliefs in the strength of their God, in the covenant between God and His people, in the accumulated wisdom and divinely ordained mode of life which the people had acquired through the centuries. Nevertheless, it is apparent that this pattern of belief and practice was severely buffeted by the unrelenting pressure of Crusader violence and persecution.

Not surprisingly, the legacy of these bitter years is a tragic literature of suffering and loss. In both poetry and prose, the reader sees the outpouring of the hearts of a people facing terrible suffering and death. The portrait emerges of a religiously and theologically secure people, imbued with faith in a good, omnipotent Creator God, having the very foundations of its faith shaken by death and destruction of tremendous magnitude. Such radical evil threatened to shatter the secure, traditional Jewish world-view, leaving the victims not only defenceless against the blows of the invaders, but also unable to continue to make sense of their world. However, the Jewish capacity for

rationalizing suffering, for making it comprehensible and bearable, proved as strong as their capacity for physically withstanding it. These Jewish responses, refined in the furnace of suffering in the Crusades period, continued and further developed the pattern of theological response which had allowed the people to survive similar threats to their survival, beginning with the loss of their territorial sovereignty and central shrine more than a millenium earlier. It was not sufficient to withstand the physical suffering itself; the people could not have survived without a theological world-view which made the suffering comprehensible.

Previous studies of this period have concentrated on historical recreation of the events of the time or on analysis of its literature qua literature. None, however, has examined the notion that the suffering associated with the period of the Crusades was the crucible in which the Jewish survival mechanism was developed and refined. None has focused upon the literature as a means of articulating the pattern of theological response formulated at this time and place, a pattern of response which strengthened the Jewish people and provided them with a rationale for continued survival.

A few prominent examples will suffice. Simon Bernfeld, in his Sefer ha-Demaot,[6] restricts his investigation of the persecutions of the Jews during the Crusades almost to purely

historical terms. In his extensive general introduction and in his introduction to the chapter on the Crusades, Bernfeld concentrates almost entirely on the details of the massacres and on the perpetrators, not on the reaction of the victims. Nowhere is there a systematic analysis of the nature of the theological response of the victims. What little analysis there is seems limited to a discussion of the concept of yesurim shel ahava ("afflictions of love"),[7] a significant response to be sure but clearly only one among several. Further, because of his 'tragic view' of Jewish history (an approach which emphasizes the continuity of Jewish suffering throughout the centuries) Bernfeld glosses over some specifics of time and place and thus comes to see the sufferings of the Crusades period, like those of many other periods of Jewish history, as "inevitable."[8] Finally Bernfeld, with this volume, appears to be engaged in the writing of apologetics. This significantly limits the value of this work. For example, he refers to the victims of the massacres as heroes and claims that they, unlike their attackers, never acted out of hate for their enemy. Clearly this was not always the case, as the many and varied curses directed against Christians and Christendom in the chronicles and poetry attest. Bernfeld seems also to overlook such typical Jewish responses as despair and anger against God. It seems reasonable, then, to say that Bernfeld is more concerned with enlightening the European Christian community and ameliorating its

attitude toward its Jews than with a systematic, dispassionate study of the persecutions associated with the Crusades and the Jewish responses to these persecutions.

Abraham Habermann's Sefer Gezerot Ashkenaz ve-Tzorfat[9] seems to suffer from similar limitations. Yitzhak Baer, in his introduction to this marvellous collection, addresses himself only to the literature itself and not to the totality of religious response. He duly notes certain important motifs in the literature, such as the chosenness of Israel and Israel's ultimate vindication at the end of days. He also notes the centrality of the kiddush ha-Shem theme in the literature. However, Baer's introduction is all too brief. Its concern is more with providing historical background than with a comprehensive examination of Jewish theological response. Habermann himself pens only a very brief introduction to his own work, an introduction of a purely literary and historical nature. In this introduction, Habermann concerns himself with such questions as: From whence came the chronicles and piyyutim? How did they manage to survive? How reliable are they as historical documents? Although each chronicle and each section of poetry is introduced by a short explanatory paragraph, these are primarily directed toward establishing the identity of their authors and determining the date of their writing. Never does Habermann attempt to provide important ideational background to the material. Never does he undertake to

to examine the totality of the Jewish theological response.

Finally, Leopold Zunz, in his The Sufferings of the Jews During the Middle Ages,[10] appears to direct himself more specifically to the problem of theodicy. However, this slim volume is little more than a pamphlet, which suffers from being too brief and superficial. Zunz does touch on such important themes as the notion of kiddush ha-Shem, the conception of yesurim shel ahava, the fact of Jewish resistance, the Jewish call for God to take vengeance upon the Christians, and the concern of the victims for attaining the olam ha-ba. Zunz does give a few examples for each theme but fails to place them within the context of a comprehensive theology and draws few conclusions from this literary material. His purpose, it would seem from the volume's introduction which addresses itself to the persecution of the Jews of Russia in the author's day, is to inspire these Jews with hope and confidence that they would be able to withstand their own sufferings as the medieval Jewish martyrs had done. This volume is intended, then, as inspirational literature and not as objective, dispassionate scholarly analysis.

Thus, there is still a need for a study that will examine the available literature in an effort to discern the theological responses contained therein--what they were, how they were conditioned by historical events, to what extent the authors were conscious of the specific theological nature of their responses and, most of all, how these responses blended

and combined to form a coherent theological world-view capable of providing meaning and purpose for a threatened and persecuted people.

Clearly the literature itself is not primarily--nor does it purport to be--theological in nature. Theological response is always implicit and not explicit in the piyyut literature. And although the chroniclers did take the first few tentative steps toward theological reflection, they did not attempt to weave these unconnected reflections into a consistent framework. Rather their work represents the attempt on the part of Jewish writers and historians to 'bear witness'[11] to the terrible suffering of their people and the almost unbelievable heroism of the victims in the face of torture and death. It represents the outpouring of the hearts of a people that has tasted almost more than it can bear from the bitter cup of pain and suffering. It gives voice to the cry of a suffering people to the God they believed had chosen them to be His own treasure among the nations. The reactions of the victims, as expressed by these Jewish chroniclers and poets, are immediate, spontaneous and bitter; they are reactions which arise out of profound agony and grief, generally unrefined by rational or intellectual considerations. The responses vary: anger, guilt, outrage, impassioned pleas, even a questioning of God's justice. Specific to a particular time and tradition, they are nevertheless characteristic

of all human beings facing tragedy, suffering and death.

It is because coping with the problem of suffering and death is a human dilemma and not specifically a Jewish one that I have been guided in my categories of investigation by Elisabeth Kubler-Ross's excellent volume, On Death and Dying.[12] These categories include such basic human responses as guilt, hope and despair.[13] It is not surprising that the Jewish responses to the pogroms associated with the Crusades should be approached through categories employed in the discussion of death and dying. The individual Jew who wrote in response to the destruction of his own or a neighboring Jewish community was responding both as a mourner and as one, who like the terminal patient, faces the seeming inevitability of his own demise, and seeks to make it meaningful and comprehensible. Thus the use of Ms. Kübler-Ross's categories is a helpful notion for analyzing the spontaneous, emotional response of the Hebrew poets and chroniclers.[14]

But such purely emotional responses could not fully satisfy the threatened European Jew at the time of the Crusades, as it cannot fully satisfy the terminal patient of today. For both, it was and is necessary to translate the emotional response into a larger framework of rational, theological discourse. This resultant comprehensive response to suffering provides a grounding for the emotional response, enabling it to become a tool in coping with a potentially unbearable situation. For the Jews of Europe in medieval times, with their traditional, unquestioned faith in a

benevolent and omnipotent God, it was particularly crucial that raw emotion be reformulated into a usable theological doctrine which could make the recurrent suffering more comprehensible and allow the individual to go on living in spite of unremitting horror and loss.

Such a reformulation of the immediate emotional human response into a comprehensive, theological framework is not, however, explicit in the literature under examination. In order to make the implicit more readily apparent in the piyyut literature, in order to integrate the unconnected reflections of the chroniclers, it is necessary to convert the spontaneous emotional response into patterns suggested by traditional Jewish theology. For each of the immediate human responses evinced by the Jewish poets and chroniclers may also be understood as a rendering of one of the traditional Jewish approaches to the dilemma of theodicy.[15]

In this thesis it will be necessary to focus on two types of primary sources. The first--medieval Hebrew poetry or 'piyyutim'--is represented by the Sefer Gezerot Ashkenaz ve-Tzorfat. This volume, published in 1945, consists of piyyutim--some as early as the tenth century and others as late as the thirteenth century--composed in response to violent attacks on the Jews of the poet's own community. It also includes prose accounts detailing the historical events of this same period, all collected and edited by Abraham Habermann. The second type of source material is

historical chronicles, written in prose. This is represented by the Hebrew Crusades Chronicles, a collection of five separate chronicles of the persecutions associated with the First and Second Crusades. There is extant a highly unreliable translation of the first three of these chronicles, a doctoral thesis by Irving Dwork entitled Jews and Crusader's in Europe: A Translation of the Three Hebrew Chronicles of the First Crusade. The author has used this translation only as a guide; all translations in this thesis are his own. Also certain source materials have been taken from Simon Bernfeld's historical record of the sufferings of the Jewish people through the ages, the Sefer ha-Demaot.

This thesis, then, will examine the emotional response of the Jews of the Rhineland to the evil of their own day, and will then seek to place this response in a framework of Jewish theology. Thus it may be possible better to discern how this tragic episode helped forge the Jewish survival mechanism which sustained the Jewish people through the centuries of suffering and persecution which followed. This particular historical instance of "Jewish theology in crisis" may both assume intrinsic meaning and also serve as a means for approaching the most significant religious dilemma of our own time.

1. PREVENTIVE MEASURES

Word of the approaching Crusader armies reached the Jews of the Rhineland before the armies themselves. Hearing of the violence and atrocities, the Jews dedicated their efforts to forestalling the Crusaders from reaching their towns and villages. This they attempted to accomplish through appeals to the authorities, both religious and secular, and through appeals to the final judge, God Himself.

Since the Crusades had been initiated by the Church for her own ends, the first avenue of approach for the threatened Jews was often the religious authorities. However it was not always clear who could control the anti-Jewish violence. The official Church attitude toward the Jews was one of neglect at best, or harassment and intimidation at worst, but never one of wanton violence. The upper echelons of the Church hierarchy advocated making the Jews' lives miserable so that they would come of their own accord to see the folly of their ways and convert to Christianity. The Jews were not, however, to be baptized against their will, since in this there was no testimony to the truth of the Christian faith. For this reason, the Jews often believed that they could successfully appeal to Church leaders to save them from Crusader violence, torture, and even death.

While there is no record of Jews approaching Pope Urban II at the onset of the First Crusade, there is no reason to suppose that they would have feared to appeal even to the

Pope himself. At other times, there is clear indication that they did so. In 1007, Rabbi Jacob bar Yekutiel travelled from Radom to Rome in order to petition the Pope to intervene on the side of the threatened Jews of Europe. According to this story, the Pope became so convinced of the necessity of his intervention that he actually issued an edict to all Christians, forbidding them to harm their Jewish neighbors.[1] The records also indicate that a number of French Jews successfully petitioned Pope Gregory for his aid and protection in the year 1239.[2]

However, the Popes were distant figures indeed, so the Jews sought protection from those more directly involved in the Crusades themselves. The chronicles contain the account of the Jewish appeal to Bernard of Clairvaux, one of the most significant of Crusades leaders and a Church figure of some importance. Bernard issed a statement to his followers that "anyone who injures a Jew is as one who injures Jesus himself."[3] But even such a commanding figure as Bernard was not in a position to control the actions of the vast mass of Crusaders under his ostensible control, although Jews suffered much less in this Second Crusade.

In desperation, the Jews of the Rhineland turned to local bishops, the individuals with whom they were used to dealing, asking them for sanctuary and protection. In the year 1096, the Jews of Speyer appealed to the local bishop, Johannsen, who hid them in his palace and later helped them when they

"defended themselves vigorously"[4] against the attacking Crusaders. In Worms, in that same year, the local bishop sheltered the elite elements of the Jewish community for a time. In Cologne, the bishop arranged for the Jews to escape to nearby towns where they were hidden in the homes of the local inhabitants.[5]

But not all appeals to bishops were equally efficacious. In Trèves, the Jewish community appealed to Bishop Egilbert who refused to assist them in any way. Faced with this refusal, the Jews felt that they had no choice but to convert en masse and then return to Judaism after the immediate threat had passed. This was clearly not an isolated incident. Worse still was the situation of the Jews of Mainz who were victimized by a certain archbishop Ruthard. Despite promises of aid and protection, this archbishop actually delivered the Jews into the hands of the Crusaders, whereupon they were all immediately massacred.[6]

Appeals to Church authorities were, then, not always successful. Certainly many Church officials were not in sympathy with the Jews and with the Jewish desire to survive as an entity apart from Christianity. Most important, they were not always able, even should they have desired to restrain the powerful forces and violent instincts which they had indirectly set in motion, to control the Crusaders under their ostensible control.

The Jewish communities of the Rhineland also appealed to the local secular authorities for protection. Although such appeals may have been galling, it was frequently one of the only viable alternatives to certain destruction. There are many documented cases of secular leaders providing assistance and protection to Jews under attack. In one such instance, Emperor Conrad guaranteed the security of the Jews of his realm, even providing cities of refuge during the violence of the Second Crusade. He also urged all the area's princes and prelates to protect their Jews against the violence of the mob. However, the Jews paid heavily for this protection and they were safe only as long as they remained within their appointed sanctuary. Furthermore, attempts to hide from the Crusader armies rarely met with success. Secure hiding places, despite the guarantees of the local authorities, were difficult to obtain. Moreover, the authorities were generally badly outnumbered by the attacking Crusaders and they risked alienating their own subjects by appearing to 'lack zeal' in the persecution of the 'enemies of Christ.' More important, the local townspeople, upon whom the Jews would depend under such circumstances, often proved to be unreliable protectors. Not infrequently they betrayed these hidden Jews, revealing their sanctuary to the marauding Crusaders. In Worms, where half of the Jews sought refuge in the homes of their Christian neighbors, the townspeople, erstwhile protectors of the Jews, actually turned upon them and killed them

themselves. And even in those cases where Christians sought to protect their Jewish friends, their efforts were often discovered and punished by the Crusaders. Such was the case in the city of Cologne. Thus, escaping through hiding, even with the assurances of the secular authorities, proved to be a less than viable option for Rhineland Jews during the Crusades.

There were even cases in which the secular authorities, like the Church authorities, conspired against the Jews of their realms with the assistance of the local townspeople. In the Sefer Hasidim we read:

> It was once decreed against the Jews that they must forsake the God of their fathers and adopt the alien faith. The Jews determined to flee from their places. Many of them had acquaintances among the princes and these pretended to be their friends and dissuaded them, saying: "Come to us. We will protect you from your enemies." But when the Jews came to them they killed them. (7)

Although the local secular authorities stood to gain most from the protection of the Jews--financial benefit derived from special Jewish taxes and from the economic stimulation of Jewish trade--their aid was not always forthcoming, nor was it always effective.

But, as Zinberg notes, "the Jews did not turn to the secular power alone in their need. Men of strong faith and profound religious sentiment, they also appealed in their time of trouble to the highest tribunal, the most powerful authority, the master of the universe, and God of their

fathers. From the constant and omnipotent helper, they begged aid."[8] Often their prayers to God possessed a sad and plaintive quality. Wrote one paytan: "Why will You hide Your face and forever be angry with us? God remember and see that we are all Your people."[9]

But more often their prayers were simple demands for justice. God was understood as having promised His protection to His people in return for continued loyalty to Him. Since the Jews had remained loyal through the generations, they demanded God's promised redemption. In this spirit, they reminded God of His special relationship with His people, of His many efforts on behalf of His people in the past, and of the need for saving miracles in the present. According to the anonymous chronicler of Mainz:

> And they cried to God and said: "You are God, the God of Israel. Yet You are wiping out Israel's remnant. Where are all Your miracles that our fathers told us of, saying, 'Surely, God, it was You who took us out of Egypt.' Now you are driving us into the hands of the nations, so that we may be destroyed." (10)

A paytan appeals to God:

> God, we ourselves heard our fathers tell us
> That You performed deeds in earlier times on our behalf.
> For every single generation You worked wonders for us.
> You have done remarkable things; you are God. Your miracles and Your concern have been for us. (11)

There was, then, complete conviction that God could act in history, that one's prayers, if offered with enough true conviction, could cause God to redirect the course of human history. Thus, for example, the Jews of Regensburg prayed for salvation, and viewed the arrival of the authorities,

armed and on horseback, as proof that God had indeed accepted their prayers.[12]

Jews also appealed to God to aid the Muslims in their struggle against the Christian invader; they even viewed the victories of the Muslims as the result of God's intervention on behalf of the Jews. Thus, with each new Muslim victory, Jews throughout Europe offered up prayers of thanksgiving to God for their 'redemption,' couching their prayers in the language of thanks for miraculous divine intervention.

There is even indication that Jews appealed to angels, begging that they intercede with God on behalf of the Jewish people. Zinberg quotes the following prayer:

> Compassionate angels, ye servants of the Most High, beseech God with heartfelt words. Perhaps He will have mercy on the unfortunate people. Perhaps He will have compassion on the last remnants of Joseph's children who are everywhere sold for a farthing, made a mockery and a scorn. Yet they offer their prayers and cry to God, their helper. Perhaps He will have compassion on those who languish in chains, who starve in solitude and misery, who are the object of awe of all the peoples and are mocked and spat upon by all of them...Perhaps He will have compassion on those whose sufferings are numberless and measureless, who in dens of lions and lairs of snakes still do not forget the holy word, God's eternal script. Perhaps He will have compassion on those who silently endure all sufferings and shame; they are silent and hope--for His help and mercy. Perhaps He will have compassion, listen to the cries, break the chains, free from slavery, heal the wounds, and quickly send the day of redemption. (13)

The dominant wisdom of the day, then, was that God could indeed come to the aid of His people, altering the course of historical events for Israel's benefit. Prayer, fasting, and repentance were seen as the proper way of achieving these ends. However, there was also a clear understanding that God's

decree, once decided upon, was inalterable. Thus, there was a certain quality of fatalism in these appeals since the worshippers were never certain whether God had already made His final decision, whether further appeals would be useless.

For those Jews who wished to remain alive and not die a martyr's death, there were still other alternatives in the face of Crusader attack. For some, there was the option of fleeing Europe altogether and travelling to the Holy Land. Although this phenomenon was relatively insignificant in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, mounting Christian hostility and recurrent violence became so unbearable for some, that there was a dramatic increase in the incidence of Jewish emigration to Palestine in the thirteenth century. As reports multiplied of terrible destruction of Jewish communities, many Jews began to see these events as the prophesied 'birthpangs of the Messiah,' the mass death and awesome destruction that would immediately precede the advent of the Redeemer. The notion that the end of history was approaching became widespread in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; some Jews began to prepare for their redemption by 'going up' to the Holy Land. According to Prawer: "With the exception of the sixteenth century (following the expulsion of the Jews from Spain) and in our times, Jewish immigration into the Holy Land never reached such dimensions as during the thirteenth century. Contemporary documents convey the impression that

all the long-repressed yearning of the nation for the Holy Land--kept alive by persecution, faith and daily prayer--suddenly found an outlet in a movement of return."[14]

Especially prominent among the emigrants were rabbis. Christian animosity toward Jews in general was, of course, particularly pointed with regard to Jewish religious leaders. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the rabbis were singled out as victims of Crusader violence; the most famous of these was Rabbenu Tam who was nearly murdered in the year 1147. So it was that a large number of rabbis left Europe for Palestine. Especially noteworthy was the mass emigration in 1211 of some 300 rabbis from Provence to Palestine, recorded in the Shevet Yehudah.[15] While the exact nature of this expedition is unclear, there can be little doubt that their desire to flee to the Holy Land testifies to the tenuous nature of Jewish existence in Europe at the time of the Crusades. Later in the thirteenth century, the famous Rabbi Meir of Rothenburg likewise came to find life under constant threat of violence intolerable. He fled with his entire family to live in the Holy Land.

There were, then, many instances of Jews--both rabbis and lay persons, individuals and groups--fleeing violence and travelling to Palestine. Certainly the numbers of those choosing this alternative was never great in absolute terms. However, the fact that some did actually undertake the difficult voyage only to face further uncertainty in Palestine

indicates the desperation of certain members of the Jewish communities of Europe in the face of the constant threat of anti-Jewish violence.

There was still another option available to such Jews--the alternative of armed resistance. Before and during the First Crusade, the Jews of the Rhineland still maintained the right to bear arms, and many availed themselves of this opportunity. However, there was a good deal of ambivalence in the Jewish attitude toward the use of violence even for the sake of self-defense. Jews increasingly held it a cardinal point that violence was to be avoided wherever this was possible. The time-honored Jewish response to overt physical threats was an attempt to mollify the enemy and an imploring of God's aid. Such was a very practical approach for a powerless minority, surrounded on all sides by violent enemies. But according to Michael Brown: "The rabbis were not pacifists. They did not feel that anyone had a right to look upon evil in the world and remain silent. It was not a virtue to die for one's ideals if there were a way to live to propogate them. And in order to live, one was fully entitled, indeed commanded, to protect himself, even if that meant engaging in violence."[16] The normative position was to seek to pacify one's enemies, but "if a man comes to kill you, rise early and kill him first."[17] In other words, "one must do what one must do in order to stay alive but no more."[18]

Sometimes passivity became intolerable and the impetus toward violence overwhelming. One paytan exhorted his co-religionists:

> We are abused, spat upon and treated like mire
> in the streets;
> We are speechless in the corner, like witnesses
> taken in a lie;
> We listen to provocation and answer nought. (19)

And on occasion, Jews did indeed respond with armed resistance. The chronicler relates the story of two young girls from Cologne who stabbed their guard to death in order to escape forced conversion. We are also told of a certain Rabbi Kalonymos and his attempt to kill the local bishop. According to the account, he took a knife and sought to kill him in his private chambers. But before he reached the bishop, the rabbi was discovered and killed.[20] A certain Rabbi Shneur was reported to have killed an attacking Crusader but was himself killed in the effort.[21] In Carenton, France, in the year 1147, according to Graetz, there was a "determined battle" between Jews and Christians in which the Jews, who had barricaded themselves in a house, were all massacred.[22] There is also the incident in which one Simha ha-Cohen stabbed the nephew of the bishop within the precincts of the Church, as they dragged him to be immersed in the baptismal waters. Simha's end was a bloody one--he was hacked to pieces by the bishop's men. There is also the case of the community of Mainz, which responded to the Crusaders with armed resistance under the leadership of Rabbi Kalonymos bar Meshullem.

According to the Chronicle of Solomon bar Simeon:

> Every single man of Israel took up his weapons in the bishop's inner courtyard, and [all] advanced to the gate to engage the infidels and the townspeople. They fought hand-to-hand in the gateway. The sinners slaughtered [them], the enemy captured them and captured the gate. The hand of God was heavy on His people. All the Gentiles mobbed the Jews in the courtyard to annihilate them there. Our people lost heart when they saw the hand of the evil Edomite beating them. (23)

Perhaps the most dramatic example of Jewish armed resistance occurred in one city whose identity is uncertain. Here "from among the Jews living in the city [came]...five hundred young swordsmen, men of war who would not turn away from the enemy. They came safely into the city and dealt the Crusaders and the townspeople a mighty blow. Of the Jews only six were killed."[24]

Generally, however, armed resistance was not very successful in sustaining Jewish life. Jews--inexperienced in the art of self-defense, ambivalent in their feelings toward employing violent means, hopelessly outnumbered by their enemies--rarely succeeded in saving their own lives in this way. Their isolated acts of violent resistance were less a means for self-preservation than a kind of final statement and an emotional outpouring.

Another avenue for the Jews of the Rhineland was that into which the Crusaders hoped to force their victims--the option of conversion to Christianity. Naturally, the Jews of the Rhineland were highly reluctant to accept this alternative. Conversion belied their every prayer, their every

belief, their entire way of life. According to Graetz, they considered eleventh-century Christianity a "terrible form of paganism. The worship of relics and pictures; the conduct of the head of the Church, who absolved nations from a sacred oath, and incted them to regicide; the immoral, dissipated life of the priesthood; the horrible practices of the Crusaders--all these things reminded them much more of the practices of idolators than of the followers of a holy God."[25]

Jews were further restrained from converting to Christianity by their awareness of the terrible hostility of other Jews against those who 'apostatized.' Such was the animosity that Rashi found it necessary to plead for greater sympathy toward those who converted and then sought to return to their ancestral faith.[26] He specifically spoke out against the popular notion that Jews should never marry those who had converted to save their lives and then returned to Judaism.[27] Finally, Jews feared that their conversion would bring punishment upon them in the world-to-come. Conversion was understood by most Jews as being one of the practical measures taken in this world to increase one's comfort and security, for which one would be severely punished in the hereafter.

In spite of this, there are a number of cases where Jews, individually and even as communities, converted to the dominant faith. In the Sefer Hasidim there appears the story of a community which decided to save itself by converting en masse

to Christianity with the intention of returning to Judaism once the immediate danger had passed.[28] The community of Trèves responded in similar fashion.[29]

Historical sources indicate a rise in the number of Jewish converts to Christianity at this time. Naturally, there are relatively few recorded instances of conversion in the medieval Jewish sources since the purpose of such writings was to bolster the sagging spirits of a suffering Jewry, to inspire Jewish readers to remain steadfast in their faith, and not to lead Jews astray into easy avenues of escape for which they would surely pay in the world-to-come. However, the relatively slight increase in converts at this time testifies to the fortitude and courage of the threatened Jews of the Rhineland.

2. ANGER

Unable to forestall or resist Crusader violence, the Jews of the Rhineland were forced to accept the inevitability of their bitter fate. Thousands were killed, violated or mutilated. Unsuccessful in averting disaster, they were now forced to face impending catastrophe or if they survived, to seek to comprehend it.

Not surprisingly, many responded with rage and indignation. Feeling impotent in the face of violence, their ever-increasing anger became a powerful and explosive force. According to Kübler-Ross, the anger of one who knows his situation to be hopeless is often "displaced in all directions and projected onto the environment at times almost at random."[1] So it was with the Jewish survivors of the Crusades. There was no single clear target for their terrible rage; instead there was a multiplicity of targets and a diffusion of anger into several different directions.

Jewish anger was first directed at those Jews who chose to convert to Christianity rather than suffer martyrdom for their ancestral faith. That those who did convert were compelled by brutal torture and terrifying threats meant nothing--they were still "apostates"[2] according to most Jews.

Venom was also directed at the perpetrators of the violence--the Crusaders and the Church they represented. Israel Abrahams claims that the Jews always responded to the Christian world in kind--with love to love and with hatred to

hostility and contempt.[3] With the inception of the Crusades, whatever had been positive in the Jewish orientation toward their Christian neighbors turned sour. The Jewish masses, he claims, were especially offended by what they understood as Christian race pride, exuded by the Crusaders. They began to interpret the term 'idolators' in the ritual law as applying to all Christians although the great Jewish authorities of the day unanimously decreed against this tendency. Finally, according to Abrahams, those laws which forebade Jews to eat Christian food and drink Christian wine may also have given these Jews an illusion of moral superiority. Whatever the reasons, Jews and Christians, at the time of the Crusades, descended into a vicious circle of mutual contempt.

While many Christians found easy expression of their anti-Jewish feelings in the excesses of Crusader violence, Jews were virtually impotent in expressing their hostility toward Christians. Outnumbered and inexperienced in warfare, Jews could expect little redress from armed resistance. Since violent behavior was impossible, the only avenue for emotional release, for consolation and for vindication, was violent language. Whenever Jewish writers and poets describe the Crusaders, the Church, and religious symbols and ritual objects of the Christian faith, they do so in the most pejorative of terms. For chronicler Solomon bar Simeon, the cross is an "impure sign," the Crusaders are "locusts" and Jesus is the "hanged bastard."[4] Later in the same chronicle,

the Pope is called "Satan"[5] and the fervent wish is expressed that the bones of Crusader Godfrey of Bouillon be crushed.[6] The Jewish writers and poets naturally reserved their greatest contempt and anger for the most sacred element of the Christian faith, the person of Jesus himself. Particularly venomous is the language of one chronicler who refers to Jesus as "the hanged one, the crucified one, the despised, abominable, detestable branch, bastard son of an impure and lecherous union."[7] Such language was, of course, never meant for Christian ears. It was not meant to challenge the enemy; rather it was intended to relieve the embittered Jews of the Rhineland of the pressure of their tremendous anger and rage. This was the harsh language of those who had suffered much together, who shared the same contempt for the enemy, who knew the same impotent rage. While such language achieved no tangible consequences whatever, it acted as a substitute for violent acts, allowing the release of much pent-up hostility.

Since the Jews of the Rhineland felt entirely powerless to alter their situation, and since they were reduced to flinging oaths at their powerful enemy, it was only natural that they should turn to their all-powerful God and demand that He take immediate action on their behalf. It was God's responsibility, they believed, to avenge their massive, tragic losses. The literature therefore is rife with demands

that God take immediate and violent revenge upon the Christians. God is appealed to as the "God of vengeance"[8] and the "avenger of the children of Israel."[9] War imagery and terminology employed by the Bible in describing "holy wars" abound. "Blast them with a mighty blast of the trumpet," exhorts one paytan, and take revenge upon the enemy so that not one soul remain alive.[10] Images of fire,[11] violent death and utter destruction of the enemy appear with frequency. One particularly angry passage exhorts God: "Spill our Your wrath on the nations that do not acknowledge You, and over the empires who do not invoke Your name! Spill our Your rage on them and let Your anger seize them and demand [of them] the blood of Your servants which has been shed upon the barren cliffs!"[12] The rage of many sufferers, then, knew no bounds. Their rage was such that it could be cooled only by liberal doses of revenge, and so they began to imagine that revenge was sure to follow.

Such expectations of revenge served several important purposes. They provided a much-need emotional release to an enraged people and helped to satisfy their instinctual desire for retribution. But these expectations also fulfilled several important functions in bolstering a foundering Jewish world-view. First, they showed faith that justice did indeed govern the universe, that the wicked would be punished and the righteous rewarded. They evinced a desire that God set matters right, proving to the nations that He did rule

over all creation, that He was indeed the "righteous judge." Understood thus, God's vengeance upon the enemy was as much for His own sake as for the sake of his suffering people.

God was therefore exhorted to take action not simply for the relief of His tortured people but also for "the sake of His name," that is, for the sake of His reputation among the nations of the world. "Give honor to Your [own] name--not for us, God, not for us," wrote paytan Eliezer bar Nathan.[13] Through vengeance, all nations would come to see God as the final arbiter of justice in the universe, requiting each individual in kind for the actions of his life. Punishment and vengeance were to be exacting but scrupulously fair. By setting matters aright in this way, God would assuage the Jewish sense of outrage and vindicate their faith that God, and not the Crusaders, was ultimately in control.

Second, God's vengeance was required to fulfil His promises to His people. According to Jewish tradition, God had long ago promised His protection to the Jewish people as long as they remained loyal to Him and steadfast in their performance of His commandments. Since the Jews had maintained their half of the agreement, it was incumbent upon God to uphold His. Thus, one paytan writes: "You swore to exact blood vengeance...Fulfil this oath and we will give thanks to You."[14] The evil Christians were to be properly punished and the Jews were to receive their just reward--in this world and in the next--so that they could continue

to value God's promises. Thus, according to another paytan: "Show Your fulfilment of their wishes and desires--let the righteous rejoice for he has seen [Your] vengeance."[15]

Not surprisingly, such notions of reward and punishment began to be expressed in terms of the final reward and punishment of the end of days. Despairing of the likelihood of seeing their enemies punished in the immediate future, the suffering Rhineland Jews developed the notion that the end was near, at which time every person would be requited with good or evil according to the nature of his deeds. Then, they felt, God would finally take full and proper revenge upon the Crusaders and reward His suffering servants with "robes of glory" and "crowns" upon their heads.[16] They would be ushered into the Garden of Eden where they would feast upon the delicious flesh of the Leviathan. At the same time, the evil ones would come to comprehend the justice and majesty of the one true God, to see the error of their ways and forsake them for righteous behavior. Chronicler Solomon bar Simeon expresses this notion as follows:

> And then they will realize and understand in their hearts that they have dashed our bodies to the ground for nothing, killed our pious ones for false things, spilled the blood of righteous women for a stinking corpse and the blood of babies and infants for the words of a misleader. (17)

This was the ultimate aim of their demand for vengeance--their own final redemption, the realization by the enemy of the falseness of his way, and the vindication of the God of Israel. Their more immediate purpose, however, was to

assuage their implacable anger. They had suffered enough; now it was to be the enemy's turn.

Despite the occasional, isolated instance in which God was understood as having wreaked vengeance upon the wicked,[18] it became increasingly evident to the Jews of the Rhineland that God was not consistently punishing the wicked and rewarding the righteous. They continued to witness the wicked Christians despoiling and destroying God's "treasure among the nations" with apparent impunity. The desperate question of one paytan mirrors well the anxiety and incredulity of a whole people: "The wicked exalts over the overburdened people. Do You not see what they are doing?"[19]

The poets and chroniclers unceasingly protested the innocence of their people. One paytan angrily demands: "Remember these...Search for wrongdoing and there is none, /search for/ sin and You will not find /it/."[20] As well, the deliberate pathos with which the poets and chroniclers described the gruesome deaths of the Jewish victims appears itself as a kind of challenge to God's justice and therefore to God Himself. Where was God when these innocents were slaughtered, they demanded to know. Did He close His eyes so that He would not have to see? Burning with indignation they appeal to the earth not to cover up the blood of the victims as though God did indeed need reminding of the suffering and sacrifices of the Jewish people.[21]

The line between incredulity and anger, even outright rebellion, became blurred as complaint mounted into challenge. "Who is like You among the blind?" taunts one paytan.[22] And according to the chronicler, one Jew about to suffer martyrdom exclaims: "I beseech You, Lord God, why have You abandoned Your people Israel to be scorned and despised, to be shamed and killed by the hand of the nations who are impure as the pig, who devour us, the nation You chose from all the nations to be Your treasure people?..."[23] Another writer, particularly bitter and sardonic, castigates God by contrasting the piety of the victims and the exceptional viciousness of their deaths. Counterposing their fervent, heartfelt prayers, their utter faith in the justice and mercy of God, with vivid descriptions of their torment, he calls into question the very utility of prayer and the ability or the will of God to act.[24] Intricately detailed descriptions of the deaths of martyrs--of how loved ones died in each other's arms in vast pools of blood--can also be read as bitter challenges hurled in the face of the God who stood by as these tragic events occurred.

Such challenges--whether implicit or explicit--represent an extreme form of anger at God for the injustice and the suffering of His universe. Outraged, they railed against God for His continued inactivity and for His excessive tolerance for human evil. However, such challenges, by their very nature, implied an acceptance of God's kingship over all

and His potential for intervention in human affairs. Assuming His power and His goodness, they demanded prompt action.

More radical even than these verbal challenges were those few cases where Jews actually altered established religious practice, diminishing their obedience to Jewish law and practice. Chronicler Eliezer bar Nathan cites an instance where some Jews ceased attending synagogue during the period of mourning known as aninut in direct contravention of established community custom.[25] This passage is indeed brief and ambiguous. However, it is certainly possible, in light of all we have said, that those who altered their religious practice in this manner did so in rebellion against what they perceived as the injustices of God's universe.

Whatever the specific form and content of Jewish anger, it is clear that the Jews of the Rhineland felt and expressed tremendous rage against 'weak-willed' Jewish converts, against the Christian perpetrators of violence, and even against God Himself, who had inexplicably allowed all of the death and destruction both to occur and to go unpunished.

3. DESPAIR

Not infrequently, anger developed into enervating despair as the feeling of having been abandoned by God intensified. As has already been suggested, the Jews of the Rhineland believed that it was possible to influence God's decisions through prayer and the faithful practice of mitzvot. But they also held that God's decree, once made, was irrevocable. From this, it was only a short step to the notion that God decided the course of human events without any reference whatsoever to the needs and prayers of His people. The more desperate, the more inconsolable among the Jews cited the countless instances of violence, suffering and death as proof that God had reached His final decision and that He had decided to abandon His people to its fate. Increasingly, the Rhineland Jews became convinced that their fate and the fate of their communities were sealed, and that there was nothing anyone could do to alter that fate. Of one threatened community the anonymous Mainz chronicler writes: "For they saw that God had issued the decree; there was no place to flee, neither forward nor behind."[1] No prayer, no cry, no challenge could alter God's merciless design, such fatalists complained. Ruled by so harsh a fate, they could only feel impotent, abused and dwarfed by forces much larger than themselves. They ceased to hope for saving miracles and, in despair, resigned themselves to continued suffering and

to death itself.

Such a despairing, fatalistic attitude posed some particularly prickly theological problems. Where was God in all this? Why was He allowing His people to suffer so? Surely He would not choose to repay them with suffering and death for their continued loyalty to Him and His mitzvot! How then to explain His role in the terrible, unremitting suffering? The most frequently invoked rationale for God's silence was that He had either consciously turned away from seeing or that His vision had been obscured and He was therefore unaware of the catastrophe experienced by His people, Israel. With reference to the attacking Crusaders one paytan piteously inquires of God: "Can you not see what they are doing?"[2] Another poet complains:

> You hid Your face from the sound of /Israel's/ crying
> You turned away completely from /her/ offering and /her/ lamentation. (3)

In terminology highly reminiscent of Buber's "eclipse of God"[4] chronicler Solomon bar Simeon suggests that a barrier--tangible and real--has been inexplicably erected between God and His people: "But the decree had been issued and it became like a barrier of iron between us and our heavenly Father."[5] Most despair-inducing of all was the notion that God had abandoned Israel to the devices of the enemy and then averted His gaze so that He would not have to witness the barbarism that was to ensue. A God who had thus withdrawn His protection was seen to be either irrelevant or threatening.

There could be no hope in such a God who had chosen either to be as impotent as His suffering servants or as malevolent as the vilest Crusader mob. Such a vision could not but lead to a bitter and immobilizing despair.

While some Rhineland Jews proved resilient enough to withstand this despair, others were less successful and succumbed to it, even if only momentarily. Recurrent instances of torture, rapine and death increasingly bolstered their sense of having been abandoned by God. The basic day-to-day security which had made life predictable, orderly and meaningful had been eroded away and all seemed hopeless. These desperate Jews had suffered blow after blow. They had seen their community life destroyed, their synagogues burned, and their sacred Torahs trampled in the mud. They had had their children torn from their sides and saw them forced, at the point of a sword, to accept the hated ways of the enemy. They had witnessed grisly mass-suicides and the terrible murder of child by parent, sister by brother, and wife by husband. They had witnessed unspeakable barbarism that undermined everything--every institution, every authority, every particle of faith--that they had once held sacred. Most destructive of all, they had had to endure the silence of their God--the God who had sworn to be their Rock and their Refuge--in times of most extreme urgency.

For more than a few, the suffering, the terror, the abuse and God's inexplicable silence became too much to bear.

In bitterness and agony, they cried out, seeking only an outpouring of their pent-up grief and despair. Unburdening their souls, they uttered that most immediate of prayers--the cry of the wounded. Life is unliveable, they despaired. "We are abused, spat upon and treated like mire in the streets..."[6] cried one Jewish poet. Complained another: "The days have fled, and my eyes have not seen any good since the day the enemy came to the gate of my fortress."[7]

What made the suffering particularly unbearable was its interminable nature. It extended back over the generations, new episodes of violence blending continuously into the old. One paytan phrased it thus:

> It is the fifth month [Av]; let no joy enter it,
> For it added grief upon grief, mourning and sorrow
> And lamenting for the dead... (8)

To many suffering Jews, it seemed one endless night of horror; there was no respite from the violence. For many, life had lost its joy and its meaning and the only conceivable response was tears of despair. In the words of one poet:

> My heart is terrified at the sound of those who cry
> because of the many troubles
> Which follow quickly one after the other,
> The vast number of decrees for all [our] sins.
> Shall I ever listen again to the voices of singers? (9)

A most poignant expression of this feeling of abandonment and bitter despair is the long litany of anguish penned by one particularly desperate paytan:

> I am pelted with stones, I am tripped up by him who
> crucifies me.
> I am set afire, I am beheaded by him who vilifies me.

I am slain...
I am strangled, I am suffocated by my enemy.
I am beaten, I am whipped upon my back.
I am put to death, I am thrown to the lion.
I am devastated...
I am hanged, I am disgraced, I am exiled...
I am slaughtered, I am destroyed... (10)

Especially demoralizing was the particular violence meted out against the sacred scrolls of the Torah. The sources attest to the special delight taken by rampaging Christians in tearing apart, burning and trampling into the mud this symbol of Jewish truth.[11] Pathetic, detailed descriptions of the desecration of the scrolls indicate the extreme despair experienced by these Jews at the loss of their Torahs. Solomon bar Simeon described one such instance in the following manner: "And they [the Crusaders] took the Torah and they trampled it in the mud and they tore it up and burned it. Thus they devoured Israel with a full mouth."[12] Just as an ensign taken in battle demoralizes an army, so the loss of the Torah scrolls came to be regarded as indicating the impotence of the people who so treasured it. The Torah, in fact, came increasingly to be viewed as a living entity, its fate conjoined with that of the people, Israel. When the people prospered, their Torah received its due honor. When the people suffered, the Torah suffered as well. Thus, the loss of the Torah scrolls was an occasion for mourning as much as the death of an individual Jew. Crying out as the holy books were consigned to the flames, one poet exclaimed:

"I shall cry out bitterly in tears and sighs for the holy texts which were not saved from the conflagration."[13] The sources even indicate that some Jewish communities, so shaken by the loss of their beloved Torah, submitted to all the ritual laws incumbent upon one who mourns a deceased family member. They are frequently pictured wearing sackcloth, covered in dust and ashes, composing eulogies over their shattering loss.[14]

Occasionally the degree of despair evinced over the desecration or loss of Torah scrolls appears somewhat exaggerated. The excessive grief seems more fitting for the loss of a parent, sibling or spouse. In this context, it is arguable that the Torah scrolls functioned for the survivors as a kind of surrogate for murdered family and friends. Since their loved ones had died for the sanctification of God's name, it was not considered seemly to mourn overmuch for them. There were, however, no similar restrictions with regard to mourning for Torah scrolls. Perhaps, then, much of the instinctual rage and despair experienced at the death of friend or spouse or sibling was projected into the more acceptable extreme mourning over lost Torahs. While this is only conjecture, the excessive horror and agony expressed in the sources at the loss of a Torah testify to its plausibility.

Be that as it may, it is difficult for the modern reader to comprehend the depth of Jewish despair at the desecration

of this central religious symbol. For the medieval Jews of the Rhineland, the Torah was more than a collection of accumulated wisdom; it was the symbol of Jewish truth and of God's special relationship with His people. Thus its loss meant more than the destruction of pieces of parchment. To many Jews its desecration was a concrete representation of God's abandonment of His people, and of the ephemeral nature of the covenant.

So the despairing Jew mourned--for the victims, for the Torah, and not least of all for himself since he saw in the deaths of those near to him his own approaching demise. Images of death and references to Jewish mourning customs occupy a prominent place in the sources. Over the victims of one outrage, a poet cried out: "Over these I will mourn in bitterness of heart, wailing and moaning."[15] Another mourned: "Send and call for the women mourners and let them come."[16] There is frequent reference to donning sackcloth, to covering oneself with dust and ashes, and to mourning the loss of a loved one.[17] One particularly desperate poet even expressed a desire to descend into the grave with the victims of the latest decree.[18] Such extreme grief was not purgative; it was only an expression of their bottomless despair at their apparent abandonment by God.

The Jews of the Rhineland had indeed suffered every outrage--the deaths of family and friends, forced conversion to what they considered to be "idolatrous worship" and even

desecration of the sacred symbol of the truth of their faith. Not surprisingly, the Jewish response was often inconsolable bitterness of heart, a wringing of tears from the daily fabric of death and destruction. Theirs was truly despair--naked and undeniable. For many Jews of the Rhineland, life under constant threat of Crusader violence had descended into a never-ending cycle of anxiety, terror and pain. Finally, if only for an instant, their wills broke. Forgetting about God's promises to His people, about vengeance, about their demands for a just universe, they instead sought catharsis, an outpouring of bitter grief, a baring of raw, desperate emotion. Sensing abandonment by God, surmising that their awful fate had already been decreed, they gave up their anger and sank back into black and bitter despair.

4. ACCEPTANCE OF DEATH

i. Introduction

Of ultimate concern for the Jews of the Rhineland was their survival, both physical and spiritual. They therefore sought a unified, consistent explanation which could enable them to continue the daily struggle in the face of abuse, degradation and even death. This was not always easy. Frequently the most immediate response was rage and rebellion. Some Jews, worn down by recurrent violence and destruction, sank into despair. But neither anger nor despair could provide much solace for the suffering Jew nor provide him with a purpose or meaning which could enable him to continue to live. Clearly, anger and despair had their limitations. Anger, with its implicit assumption that God could take action for the relief of His people should He so choose, implied a capricious God who needed incessant badgering to attend to the urgent needs of His people. And despair, with its assumption that God would no longer respond to Jewish prayers, implied a disinterested or even antagonistic Deity. That God could be evil or disinterested or limited in power was unthinkable for most Jews since it was only by their continued faith in a kind, loving and powerful God that they could find a rationale and a means to survive as a people. To find meaning in suffering and death without denying the power or the goodness of God became the principal Jewish task of the day.

Most Jews therefore resolved to die al kiddush ha-Shem, "for the sanctification of the Name" of God. They turned necessity into a virtue, proclaiming with their deaths God's power and oneness, their love for God and their submission to His will. Under such circumstances, death was not something to be endured as much as embraced. The martyrs of Mainz, for example, expressed their joy in dying thus: "Ours is not to question the nature of the Holy One, blessed be He and blessed be His Name, who gave us the Torah and commanded that we die and be killed for the unification of His holy Name. Happy are we if we do His will! Happy is everyone who is slain and slaughtered and who dies for the unification of His Name."[1]

For the Jews of the Rhineland, suffering of an almost unprecedented nature had become a terrible fact of life. They had witnessed the most vicious, the most gruesome of scenes and were at a loss to explain why they had occurred. Their suffering, they fervently believed, had to have a meaning--a meaning comprehensible to the sufferers and consistent with their conception of God's nature. They therefore interpreted their suffering as an attempt by God to test their fortitude or as punishment for unspecified, but nonetheless real wrongdoing. In this way, their pain and travail took on new meaning; through suffering they could prove their merit and also atone for their sins. Suffering therefore became a positive act to be fully experienced and

even welcomed for its efficacy.

It was not far from such an acceptance to the belief that the highest act to which the pious Jew could aspire was dying for the sanctification of God's name. Clearly, the ultimate indication of one's loyalty to God was a willingness to die in submission to what was felt to be God's will. If suffering was a positive act, how much the more so was a willingness to part with life itself. Martyrdom, therefore, became the supreme religious act for the Jews of the Rhineland. Through dying a martyr's death, the Jew demonstrated his submission to God, proclaimed the truth of his faith to a skeptical Christian world, proved his courage and his love for God, escaped an intolerable existence, and expiated his sins, without sacrificing the interrelated system of belief and practice which gave his life meaning and purpose.

Kiddush ha-Shem refers, then, to all instances in which Jews submitted to death with the conviction that this fate was desired by God and was done for His sake. It includes not only those instances in which Jews actually took their own lives, but also those cases where husbands slaughtered wives, parents sacrificed children and grooms killed their own brides, as well as those instances in which Jews willingly stretched forth their necks to be slaughtered by their enemies. It was an attempt to accept that which seemed an inevitable evil and turn it into a good. According to Brown: "As a

scattered minority...without the means or the know-how to engage in armed struggle with any chance of success, Jews, when threatened, frequently could do nothing except elect to die well."[2] Kiddush ha-Shem was the Jewish way of "dying well," a religious response which preserved them from despair, futility and fatalism, and maintained in them a sense of purpose.

The chronicles and piyyutim are a veritable treasure-trove of examples of Jews who died for the sanctification of the Name. In Speyer, Rabbenu Samuel bar Yehiel, a wizened, old man, cut his son's throat at the approach of the enemy; he concluded by successfully entreating his servant to run him through with his own sword.[3] R. Samuel bar R. Gedaliah, a comrade of the young victim, hearing of how his friend had assented to such a death, resolved to do likewise. He summoned the sexton of the synagogue who obliged him by dispatching him with his sword.[4] There is also the horrifying tale of one Mar Shemaryah of Worms who succeeded in taking the lives of his wife and children before the Crusaders could force them to convert. Unfortunately, the Crusaders intervened before Shemaryah could slay himself, and they then set about to convert him to the Christian faith. They buried him alive, dug him up and offered him the choice between conversion and returning to the grave. In a remarkable act of courage, Mar Shemaryah chose to die al kiddush ha-Shem, returning willingly to the grave. Solomon bar Simeon also

relates the tale of a certain R. Isaac the Levite who was baptized while unconscious. In an attempt to redeem himself from his shame and to proclaim his loyalty to his ancestral faith, R. Isaac threw himself to his death in the raging waters of the Rhine River in an act of submission to the will of God.[5]

Page after page of such deaths--each one more pathetic and terrible than the preceding one--appear throughout the sources. Account follows gruesome account until the reader is almost numbed by the unending parade of suffering and death. Perhaps the most disturbing and the most pathetic of all is the graphic description of the martyrdom of the Mainz community.

> And they stretched forth their necks for slaughtering and gave up their pure souls to their heavenly Father. So too the righteous and pious women, each one stretched forth her neck to her sister to be offered up for the unification of the Name. So a man did to his own son and brothers; so a brother did to his sister; so a woman did to her son and daughter; so a man did to his neighbor and friend; so a bridegroom did to his bride; so an engaged man did to his intended. This one sacrifices and is himself sacrificed, and another sacrifices and is himself sacrificed until blood mingles with blood, the blood of the men running together with that of their wives, the blood of fathers together with that of their children, the blood of brothers with that of their sisters, the blood of teachers with that of their students, the blood of bridegrooms with that of their brides, the blood of cantors with that of their scribes, the blood of babies and infants with that of their mothers. And so they were slain and sacrificed for the unification of the glorious and awesome Name. (6)

That martyrdom became the rule is particularly remark-

able in light of the Jewish attitude toward the taking of one's own life. According to traditional Judaism, suicide, like murder and idolatry, was a capital offence to be punished in the world-to-come.[7] According to historian Ben Sasson: "To kill oneself was never suggested in any place under any circumstances."[8] However, in cases involving murder, idolatry or sexual immorality, the principle was: yayhareg velo ya-avor, "he should allow himself to be killed rather than transgress."[9] Since these Jews of the Rhineland viewed Christianity as idolatry, the conviction developed that it was more meritorious to take one's own life than to be converted to this 'idolatrous' faith.

Kiddush ha-Shem was thus understood as the fulfilling of a ritual command. In contrast to suicide which was seen as implying a wanton disregard for God and His sacred gift of life, martyrdom was viewed as the supreme means of honoring and obeying the Eternal. So strong was this conviction that some Jews even believed that their lives had been granted them solely in order that they might sacrifice them to God through martyrdom.[10] In contrast to suicide, kiddush ha-Shem was seen as representing confidence in the purposiveness of God's universe and human life--a confidence almost incredible in the context of the terrible violence and destruction of their daily lives.

In addition to expressing confidence in God and His universe, kiddush ha-Shem was also intended to achieve

certain more tangible results. First, it was intended to save defenceless Jewish women and children from falling into the hands of the Crusaders. Perhaps the greatest fear of the Jewish males of the Rhineland was that their children would be seized and baptized, their wives taken by the hated enemy. Indicative of this concern are the words of Judah bar Abraham, who took the life of his son's wife-to-be rather than risk her sinking into the impurity of marriage to a Gentile. "My daughter," he says, "since I did not merit to see you married to my son, Abraham, I will not marry you to another, to a Gentile." Killing her in the sight of all, he proclaims: "Let all see that this is my daughter's bridal canopy which I make this day."[11]

Kiddush ha-Shem was also intended to save these Jews from the sin of conversion to what they regarded as a form of paganism. "May the All-Merciful," they prayed, "save us from the men of evil, from destruction, from pagan worship, from the impurity of the nations and their abominations."[12] Faced with the alternatives of conversion and death they said: "It is better for us to die here for His great Name and walk with the righteous in the Garden of Eden and that these uncircumcized ones do not get hold of us and foul us, against our wills, with their filthy water."[13] Dying for the sanctification of the Name was, then, a means of escaping the ultimate averah through the performance of the ultimate mitzvah.

Kiddush ha-Shem was also the means for physically defeated Jews to show their contempt and disdain for the faith of their Christian conquerors. The extent of this contempt was clearly indicated by those instances where Jews continued to taunt their captors and deprecate Christian faith, knowing full well that this would result in even more fearsome tortures prior to their deaths. In this way, they hoped to create a powerful impression of awe and respect in their enemies. Martyrdom, then, was the final opportunity for the doomed Jew to proclaim in the only way possible the truth and wisdom of his faith.

Perhaps the most astonishing of reasons for dying al kiddush ha-Shem was the imputed Jewish resolve to save even their bitterest enemies from the ultimate sin of murder. "It was the humane man's horror of bestiality," argues Lowenthal, "the fine resolve to keep a fellow-creature from the degradation of murder by taking the crime and blood upon one's own hands" that manifested itself in the concept of dying for the sanctification of the Name.[14] That such a concern intruded itself into the Jewish consciousness at a time when Jews were daily victimized by Christian violence is a tribute to the moral fibre of these Jewish martyrs.

Martyrdom was also intended to provide zekhut, or "merit," for other Jews--be they contemporary Jews in other communities of even future generations of Jews. Solomon bar Simeon, for example, requests that the willing deaths of

the martyrs obviate the need for further sacrifices: "And let their merit and the merit of the others slain...stand for us as an advocate before the most high God."[15] In another place, he argues: "And let the blood of His pious ones stand for merit and for atonement for the generations after us, for our children's children forever..."[16] Many of the chroniclers and poets, then, evinced a concern that the victims atone, through their deaths, for the sins of the larger community. Should this not be possible, they sought to have this zekhut deferred to future generations of Jewish sufferers.

Clearly, however, the primary motivating factor, the single greatest practical result to be gained from this acceptance of one's death was the expectation of reward in the next world. Assured that their deaths would be rewarded in the world-to-come by entry into the Garden of Eden and companionship with Rabbi Akiba and the other martyrs of Jewish history, many Rhineland Jews were moved to embrace martyrdom. "We shall offer ourselves as a sacrifice to the Eternal," one group of martyrs states, "as a whole offering... so that we shall enter upon that other world which is all day, in Eden, where one sees as through a clear glass, where we shall behold His glory and majesty face-to-face. He will give to each of us a golden crown for the head, set with precious stones and pearls. There we will sit amidst the pillars of the world; we shall feast in the company of the

righteous in the Garden of Eden, in the company of Rabbi Akiba and his companions. And we shall sit on a golden throne in the shade of the tree of life..."[17] There is also the instance of the proselyte, concerned for his fate in the next world should he consent to die al kiddush ha-Shem. His rabbi assures him: "You shall dwell in the company of the other righteous proselytes and be with our father Abraham..."[18]

Such promises constituted strong incentive for individuals who found their earthly lives so harsh and difficult. Death, under such circumstances, was actually an occasion for great joy and celebration. According to one martyr: "Happy are we if we do His will. Happy is everyone who is slain, slaughtered and killed for the unity of His Name. He has been chosen for the world-to-come and shall dwell in the company of the righteous, with Rabbi Akiba and his companions, the pillars of the universe, who let themselves be slain for the Name of God. Not only this, but he exchanges the world of darkness for the world of light, the world of suffering for the world of happiness, the ephemeral world for the eternal world."[19]

Death, as the portal to eternal reward, was to be desired, not feared. One father asked his children as the enemy approached: "At this hour, Gehinnom and Gan Eden are open... Through which do you desire to enter now?" Receiving their assurances that they fervently desired Gan Eden, he bade them stretch forth their necks for slaughtering. The chronicler

concludes: "May their souls be in Gan Eden in the light of life."[20] Of another group of would-be martyrs one poet exclaimed: "In happiness and joy they enter into the palace of the King."[21]

Viewing death in this way--as the means for gaining the reward of Gan Eden--many martyrs did not go to their deaths in resignation to ineluctable fate but rather saw their deaths as a unique opportunity graciously provided them by a loving God. Far from being a sad and desperate option, death al kiddush ha-Shem was seen as a consummation of Israel's love for her God. So it was that some Jews actually went singing and dancing to their deaths. In praise of the martyrs of Nordhausen, George Kohut writes: "These truly pious and righteous people encountered death with the greatest fortitude; they even begged that their musicians and singers be allowed to lead them on to death, as to a merry dance."[22] Similarly, in one piyyut, a "joyous song of praise went forth from [the] lips" of another Jewish martyr.[23] And finally, brothers who had the honor of being slaughtered together were eulogized with the biblical verse: "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together."[24]

Death for the sanctification of the Name came to be understood as the ultimate expression of the love of the martyr for his God; it is for this reason that marriage and wedding imagery abounds in the sources. For example, one Abraham ha-Ger is described as going to his death "like a

groom to his bride."[25] According to one poet, Jews who went forth to the slaughter attended "joyous nuptials."[26] These same martyrs died proclaiming: "To Him our troth is pledged."[27] Another scene of martyrdom, ostensibly a sad and tragic occasion, is similarly described: "And they decided to lead them into the charnal house. Together they rejoiced as at the welcoming of the bride to the canopy."[28] In this context, it is not surprising that the strong love imagery is often phrased in language borrowed from the Song of Songs. Just as the new bridegroom would praise his beloved as he entered the marriage canopy, so the martyr praised his God as he entered into the mystical love union of martyrdom. Thus one martyr exclaimed: "Behold how lovely is my beloved, behold how lovely," in conscious evocation of the poetry of the Song of Songs as he went to his death.[29]

Dying al kiddush ha-Shem was, then, the highest religious act to which the suffering Jew could aspire. For him, it was the greatest of the mitzvot, the ultimate expression of his love for his Creator. It is because of this that these Rhineland Jews did not go to their deaths in despair or even in resignation, as we today might suppose. Instead, they went--most of them--joyously, celebrating the glorious moment of complete self-fulfilment and union with God.

ii. Trial

In order to turn inevitable, tragic loss into positive indication of God's love, a certain measure of explanation and rationalization was required. One such explanation, frequently invoked, was the notion that God was testing the Jewish people, trying their strength and fortitude through physical pain and mental anguish. If Jews suffered, if they were defeated by hated enemies, if they were dying on an almost unprecedented scale, all of this had a simple explanation: God was trying the mettle of His people. Solomon bar Simeon expressed this conviction in the following terms: "How the mighty pillar, the noble staff, the holy community has been broken! It is the will of the Eternal to test whether those who fear Him can bear the yoke..."[30] God brought suffering and death to the Jews of the Rhineland in order to determine the extent of their loyalty and perseverance.

The awesome choice between conversion and certain physical torment, culminating in death, was God's trial for Rhineland Jewry. Just as once He had tested His servant Job, God now tested this generation in order to determine whether it would remain true to Him or symbolically "curse" Him like Job by converting to an 'idolatrous' faith. Every threatened Jew was therefore on trial--either he kept his faith in God through terrible torment or he bought release from suffering by betraying his dearest principles and beliefs.

It is important to distinguish this conception from the notion (which follows) that God was punishing Israel for her sins. According to this conception, God was not punishing His people through physical anguish; rather, He was allowing Israel a singular opportunity to prove her merit. It was simply in order that she might prove herself and gain the promised reward that God caused her to endure such a trial. "God came to try this generation," wrote Solomon bar Simeon, "to make their steadfast love known to all, even the hosts of heaven."[31] Accordingly, this generation of martyrs could feel honored by the terrible exigencies of their lives: "And this generation has been chosen by Him to become His, for it possesses the force and the strength to stand in His temple, to fulfil His word and to sanctify His great Name in His world."[32] Their anguish, they felt, was surely an indication of God's special regard for their strength and courage, for God, they believed, tried only the strong and not the weak, only the beloved and not the despised, only the faithful and not the weak-willed.

If suffering was God's test of Israel's strength and loyalty to her Creator, it was necessary to prove her merit by being strong and resolute, even to the point of death. If endurance through suffering was the proof of one's mettle, clearly the willingness to accept even one's own death was the ultimate passing of God's test. If suffering had been engineered by God with the sole intention of providing Israel

with an opportunity to prove herself, then opportunities for martyrdom were the greatest of God's gifts. Thus, faithful to the words of Rashi, in his commentary on Deuteronomy 6:4, they resolved to show their love for God with all their souls, even if He should take their souls.[33]

Though perceived in such terms, perseverance through trial was no easy matter for the Jews of the Rhineland. Buffeted by wave after wave of marauding Crusaders, many Jews began to long for peace and security at almost any price. Increasingly, they saw in conversion a tantalizing escape from their torments. And because of the Christian conviction that converting non-believers was superior to murdering them, conversion to Christianity was an ever-present option for the suffering Jews of the Rhineland. Ordinarily, the alternative of conversion would have proved attractive only to an insignificant number of Jews. However, the period of the Crusades was no 'ordinary' time for European Jewry. For some Jews, the continuing fear of violent death lent a new urgency to the option of conversion. For some, unremitting suffering made loyalty to one's ancestral faith appear an indefensible luxury. At the point of a sword, some were capable of denying their allegiance to the Jewish God and the Jewish faith simply in order to save their own lives and the lives of those dear to them.

But those who did choose this alternative became the objects of Jewish scorn and derision, for they had obviously

"failed God's test." They had been given, it was felt, a unique opportunity to prove their merit and gain God's reward, but they had proven themselves weak-willed and cowardly. They had been offered, it was believed, a chance to rise above the degradation of their earthly lives and achieve some deeper meaning, but they had shown themselves unworthy of God's confidence. God was understood to have given them a critical choice of alternatives--personal integrity at the cost of pain and death, or self-denial and relief from momentary pain--and they had been guilty of making the inferior choice, the short-sighted decision. In thus failing the test, they had abandoned their reward in the world-to-come and had also undermined the confidence of their neighbors in the efficacy of martyrdom.

So it was that the chroniclers and paytanim made frequent reference to the martyrs of Jewish history--those individuals who had shown their willingness to sacrifice comfort in this world for reward in the next, who had proven themselves capable of withstanding physical torments for the sake of spiritual reward. In an attempt to inspire their readers with the strength to resist the enticement of conversion, these writers cited those instances where Jews had proven themselves willing to die for the sanctification of the Name of God. Specifically, reference was made to Rabbi Akiba who had remained loyal to his God and his faith, enduring the most fearsome of Roman tortures to expire with the words of the

Shema on his lips.

Similarly, the poets and historians cited as models the three young men who were thrown into Nebuchadnezzar's furnace--Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah. Although, according to the account in the biblical Book of Daniel, their faith in God saved them from fiery death, they clearly stood prepared to die in order to remain true to their most cherished beliefs. Of one group of martyrs, it is therefore said: "Like Rabbi Akiba and his comrades, they successfully passed the trial, like Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah..."[34] Comparison with such heroes of the faith was great praise for the Jewish martyrs of a later day.

More than any other individual, Abraham, father of the Jewish people, was invoked as a model for emulation; tradition understood the patriarch as the one who proved himself through ten trials. Comparisons with Abraham, the paradigmatic Jewish sufferer, were therefore inevitable. Thus, of the martyred Mar Shemaryah, it is said: "He endured through his trial like Abraham our Father."[35]

Significantly, Abraham showed his mettle in his greatest trial not by his willingness to die himself but by his readiness to take the life of his beloved son, Isaac, in obedience to God's command. Reference to Abraham's binding of Isaac spoke with special force to those Jews who had to bear the tragic loss of their own children. According to Spiegel: "With grief, but no less with pride, the chroniclers were

conscious of the uniqueness of their generation, which more than all previous generations since the days of Adam had to endure what is required in order to sanctify His Great Name in the world." It is therefore not surprising that "the pattern of the original Akedah never ceased to hover before the mind's eye..."[36] as a source of comparison for their own brave trials. It is true, as Spiegel points out, that "the victims themselves constantly set before their own eyes the example of the Patriarchs' behavior on Mount Moriah, and yearned to act their own parts in the image and likeness of the earlier dramatis personae"[37] but it is also true that they employed comparisons between their trials and the tenth trial of Abraham specifically in order to proclaim their own special merit, even their own supposed superiority to the patriarchs.

For several reasons they imagined that their own sacrifices might even be superior to those of Abraham and Isaac. First, both the victims and the sacrificers showed a special concern for the ritual purity of the act of sacrifice. It was not sufficient merely to slaughter; the slaughtering had to be performed according to the strict rules of purity which had once governed the offering of sacrifices in the ancient temple. Thus, R. Eliezer bar Nathan testifies:

> The mother binds her son lest by flailing he render [the offering] unfit,
> The father makes a blessing [before] slaughtering the sacrifice. (38)

Second, while Abraham stood prepared to sacrifice but one of his children, albeit his "beloved son," the Rhineland Jews were called upon to dispatch their entire families at one terrible stroke. And whereas Isaac had remained silent throughout the ordeal, many of the young victims of the Rhineland screamed and cried, doubtless rendering an already trying task infinitely more heart-wrenching for loving parents.[39]

Further, many medieval Jewish writers claimed that their trial was more difficult than the original akedah since theirs involved large numbers of victims while Abraham's involved but one. Writes Solomon bar Simeon in this regard: "And Zion's precious sons, the people of Mainz, were put through ten trials like Abraham our father...They too offered up their sons, exactly as Abraham offered up his son, Isaac...Were there ever 1,100 victims in one day, every one of them like the binding of Isaac, son of Abraham?"[40] In the same vein we read: "On the merit of the akedah at Moriah we once could lean...Now one /akedah/ follows another until they cannot be counted."[41] Because the numbers of those sacrificed were much larger, they felt that their trial was harsher than was Abraham's.

Finally, they felt that their trial was more difficult in qualitative terms, for they had been required to complete the act of slaying while Abraham had had his hand restrained. For the Jews of the Rhineland, no angel intervened to save

these defenceless victims. Abraham, these Jews claimed, had only to show intention in order to pass God's awesome test, whereas they had been called upon to complete the blood-curdling act. Vaunting themselves at Abraham's expense, they cried out: "Yours was a trial; mine was an accomplished fact."[42]

If the medieval Jews of the Rhineland felt themselves superior to Abraham as executioners, they also felt themselves superior to Isaac as victim. As willing victims, they considered themselves unsurpassed. Victims of all ages and of both sexes submitted equally to the sword as to a joyful duty--no one was spared. "Men, women and children, bridegrooms and brides, old men and old women, for the sanctification of the singular Name, killed themselves, offered their throats to be cut, their heads to be severed," reads one account.[43]

More important than this was the awareness of the victims and their willingness to endure their fate in order to prove themselves to their God. Of one group of young victims (called ne'ekadim, "the bound ones," in conscious evocation of Isaac) Eliezer bar Nathan wrote:

> Quick! Hurry to do our Creator's will...
> /Isaac's/ father tied him who was offered on Mount Moriah,
> In order that he should not kick and disqualify the slaughter.
> But we without being tied are slain for His love. (44)

Playing on Isaac's biblical utterance--"Here is the fire and here is the wood but where is the lamb for the burnt offering"[45]--

one self-aware young victim exclaimed: "Here is the fire and here is the wood and I am the lamb for the burnt offering!"[46] Another child, the son of R. Samuel bar Yehiel, actually responded "Amen" to his father's sacrificial benediction.[47] Both as victims and executioners, the Jews of the Rhineland felt themselves to be especially worthy, perhaps even superior to the original patriarchs. Although they did occasionally express a desire to be delivered from this fate[48] their usual response was acceptance of the inevitability--even the benefit--of their trial and deferral of reward until the world-to-come.

Like Abraham, these Jews of the Rhineland passed God's fearsome test, proving their loyalty and courage through the successful completion of their demanding trial; like Isaac, they did not resist their fate. But superior to both of them, they showed an almost joyful delight in dying for the sanctification of the Name of God. The recurrent use of akedah imagery was intended to remind God of the unique merit of this generation of suffering Jews, of how they had been willing and even happy to die and to kill their loved ones for the sanctification of His Name. Comparisons with the original patriarchs reveal a fierce pride in their having endured a trial they felt to be even more demanding than the akedah, the paradigmatic biblical trial.

iii. Guilt

A second major explanation for Jewish suffering and death was employed: all suffering could be regarded as punishment for Israel's sins. Just as their biblical ancestors had done, the Jews of the Rhineland had rebelled against the word of God and were now reaping the bitter harvest of the sinful seeds they had sown. God was not acting out of spite but rather in an effort to set the balance right. The Rhineland Jews were thus able to reaffirm their faith in those ideas which had proven themselves essential to Jewish survival--that God was just and good, that His was the power to punish and reward, that Jewish suffering was a manifestation of God's love and concern for His wayward people. The notion that God was with them both in triumph and in desolation allowed them to find meaning and purpose in a life which might otherwise have proven intolerable. God was still conceived of as being loving and just. He was still intimately involved in the fate of the Jewish people. Jewish suffering was not, as the Church had claimed, a sign that God had abandoned them. Rather God's people had sinned and was now receiving its due punishment from a just but compassionate God. In this way, the Jews of the Rhineland could maintain intact the entire pattern of belief and practice which had always infused their lives with meaning and purpose.

This attitude was clearly articulated by Solomon bar Simeon. Witnessing the destruction of many Jewish communities,

he wrote: "No prophet nor seer, no sage nor scholar can comprehend the reason why the sins of the many communities were judged so weighty and why the holy congregations had to pay with their lives as if they had shed blood. Yet He is a just judge; ours must have been the wrongdoing."[49] One poet said of the Jews of his own day: "The generation is guilty."[50] Another, overwhelmed by the suffering, exclaimed: "Our sins... must grievous be!"[51] Reasoning inductively, these poets and chroniclers found it necessary to posit terrible wrongdoing as the sole conceivable cause for their suffering. If the Jewish people was unable to resist the attacks of her enemies, this could only be because God was punishing her for her sins. The anonymous chronicler of Mainz insisted that Jewish efforts at resistance did not avail since Jewish sinning had caused all of the burghers in the city to attack them along with the Crusaders.[52] If Jews could not be given proper burial, this indicated some deficiency on the part of the Jewish people, not on the part of God Himself. Chronicler Ephraim bar Jacob claimed that it was "on account of their sins that they were not given proper burial, but rather [remained] on the spot where they were burned, at the foot of the mountain."[53]

In language reminiscent of the Yom Kippur liturgy, the Jews of the Rhineland composed a literature of confession and self-castigation. "Woe unto us for we have sinned...Woe unto us for we have been cast out and become a conflagration,"

wrote one poet.[54] They were guilty and therefore deserving of punishment. One particularly poignant piyyut reads:

> Our complaints are not directed at you, O God,
> For it is we ourselves who have done evil.
> Woe unto us for we have sinned.
> Therefore we have expired and perished,
> And before the children of iniquity we have fallen...
> What, then, shall we say and how shall we justify ourselves
> Since God has found out our iniquity? (55)

Confessing their sinfulness, the much-buffeted Rhineland Jews asked God that the deaths of the victims act as atonement for the sins of the survivors. Thus, after witnessing the deaths of many defenceless Jews, one poet wrote:

> Let remission and atonement be inscribed for Yeshurun in /Your/ book.
> This day is Yom Kippur to make atonement /for us/.
> Let their merit stand for their people,
> Let it turn away /Your/ anger.
> For the priest and all the people, let the congregation make atonement. (56)

Curiously, there is scant indication of the exact nature of the sins for which they were suffering punishment. How do we explain this lack of specification in matters of such great import? It is conceivable that there was hesitation to examine and question too deeply the ways of God. Perhaps, the writers imagined, Jews might begin to compare the specific sins and the resultant punishments and find God's justice wanting. The writers themselves may also have been uncertain of the truth of their conception--that Israel's suffering was merely justifiable punishment for sins--and may have been unwilling to dwell on potentially unconvincing explanations.

While the specific nature of the wrongdoing may have been uncertain, its existence was axiomatic. Embittered by the seemingly endless rounds of violence, rapine and destruction, they were inclined to accept their own guilt since they desperately sought to maintain three beliefs which had enabled them to survive adversity and defeat--that God was just, that events were subject to His control and that He did indeed love His people, Israel.

This, however, left several perplexing theological problems to be faced. First, it was readily apparent that not all of the victims of Crusader outrage were guilty of serious wrongdoing. Certainly, no infant could be guilty of so heinous a crime as to be punished by being impaled on a Crusader sword. Certainly no mental deficient ought to be held responsible for deeds over which he had little or no control. And why, they wondered, should the pious suffer along with the evildoers? Second, even among apparent sinners, it was clear that all victims had not sinned equally. There was no careful accounting apparent, according to which those who had sinned in minor matters suffered only moderate discomfort and those who had engaged in real iniquity suffered torture and death. Such a meting out of justice wherein the "punishment fit the crime" was obviously not in effect.

To cope with these troubling questions, the Jews of the Rhineland developed the notion of shared communal guilt. God, they believed, regarded His people as a totality,

holding each individual accountable for the deeds and actions of the whole. Every person was responsible not only for his own conduct but also for the conduct of the entire community. So it was that no single person--neither the saintly elder nor the mental incompetent nor the innocent baby--could expect personal salvation while God vented His anger upon the entire community. This notion of shared guilt was expressed by one paytan who wrote: "Precious dear ones were taken on account of my sins," the "my" referring either to himself or to the total community.[57] Clearer still is the comment of Ephraim bar Jacob who mourned over the death of a particularly saintly man: "And the people cried greatly over the dear soul which was lost and cut off from the land of the living on account of the sin of my people."[58] And even when the community was known for its special righteousness, a kind of reverse zekhut avot ("merit of the fathers") was invoked to explain the suffering. Even when the community felt that they had acted in a meritorious fashion, they could not always be so sure of the quality of their ancestors. Just as they expected to receive the benefit of their ancestors' righteousness, so they had also to expect that they would suffer for their ancestors' sins. All of these mental and ideological gymnastics were necessary in order to retain unsullied the image of a perfectly just God, unerring in His distribution of reward and punishment, acting always to preserve justice in the universe.

Equally important, the notion that Jewish suffering was punishment for sins enabled the Jews of the Rhineland to deny the seemingly evident power of the Crusaders and to proclaim that God was ultimately in control of events. It enabled them to claim, despite appearances to the contrary, that the Crusaders were proving neither their own strength nor their special relationship with God by their destruction of the Jewish communities of the Rhineland. Rather, they claimed, the Crusaders were simply unwitting instruments of God's will. Echoing the style of the biblical prophets, the poets and chroniclers declared that God was employing the military might of an enemy nation to punish wicked Israel for her sinful ways. Reference was made to previous periods in Israel's history when God had seen fit to humble His people for their sins. Solomon bar Simeon compared the destruction of the European Jewish communities to the destruction of the shrine at Shiloh. "And God did as He had spoken," the chronicler writes,"for we had sinned against Him. He destroyed the shrine of Shiloh...and trampled it underfoot."[59] One paytan invoked the precedent of the destruction of the first and second temples as a means toward comprehending the suffering and destruction of his own day. "Nebuchadnezzar swallowed us, devoured us and confounded us. Titus, Vespasian, Hadrian and Trajan uprooted us."[60] Just as God had directed the destruction of the temples, so now He controlled the events of the poet's own day. According to this vision, the Crusaders were only a convenient tool employed by God for His

own ends. They were a scourging rod, important not in and of themselves but only as a means for repaying Israel--the central character in the drama--for her iniquity.

Finally, the notion that Israel's suffering was punishment for sins confirmed the Jewish belief that God still loved His "treasure among the nations." God's relationship with the Jewish people was understood as being like that of a stern but loving parent to his children, generously rewarding obedience but severely punishing deviations from the parental standard. Like the parent who claims in punishing his children that it hurts him more than them, God was pictured as suffering along with His children. God punished Israel not in anger but in sorrow, aware that such harsh measures were necessary for the moral improvement of the people. This conception came to be known as yesure ahavah, as "afflictions of love." According to this view, suffering was seen as possessing purgative value, as being a kind of refining process in which the evil dross was purged away and only the pure elements were retained. Suffering was, then, the crucible from which Israel would emerge clean and pure. Through suffering, guilt was expiated, the sinner cleansed and made ready for his reward in the world-to-come. Wrote one paytan:

> A race that has been tested
> And tried through fire and water
> Is surely prized by Thee
> And purified from sin. (61)

Suffering, then, was a loving means to an end, purging the victim of his iniquity, preparing him for entry into his eternal reward. Finally, suffering was also an opportunity for Israel to prove her loyalty to God's law and God's justice. Thus, the mutual love of God and Israel--a love manifested by God in purifying His people through torments, and by Israel in her willingness to remain loyal to God through the ordeal--was actually cemented by the suffering the Rhineland Jews were forced to endure. Suffering was an opportunity, an expression of love. Perhaps more than any other single concept, this notion of yesure ahavah made possible Jewish acceptance of their bitter fate.

This acceptance found its ultimate expression in the doctrine of kiddush ha-Shem, as discussed above. If suffering had a purgative effect, surely the extremity of death would prove the most cleansing of all. In order to be absolutely certain that they were cleansed of their sins and fully worthy of receiving their reward in Gan Eden, the Jews of the Rhineland resolved to submit voluntarily to death al kiddush ha-Shem.

Such a concern for atonement and purification through voluntary submission to death was frequently articulated in symbolism borrowed from the ancient temple cultus and from the practice of ritual slaughter. In one piyyut the victims are described as being 'unblemished one year-old lambs," and thus ritually fit for slaughter.[62] Human sacrifices are

called voluntary burnt offerings[63] and meal offerings.[64] Of one group of sacrifices the poet says: "All of them offered a fire, a pleasing smell to the Lord."[65] And another piyyut, with particularly dramatic effect, concludes each stanza with the ominous phrase: "This is the teaching of the burnt offering, the burnt offering which is on the altar."[66]

Children and their mothers are described as shelamim, or "peace offerings." Thus we read:

> They prepared the sons and their mothers for the altar.
> They offered up the offerings, their flesh and skin.
> For the sake of His great Name, they gave up their lives.
> (67)

Self-extinction was understood as the purest act. There was therefore a desire that God indicate that complete atonement had been granted by sending fire down from heaven to devour those sacrifices utterly. As with the offerings of Cain and Abel, and again with those of Elijah and the priests of Baal, the total holocaust of the sacrifice indicated heavenly acceptance of the offering. Thus, the stanza of the above-mentioned piyyut concludes with the assurance that the sacrifices of these pitiful mothers and children had been accepted. According to the paytan: "the fire went forth from God and devoured [the sacrifices]."[68]

Alongside this conception the notion also developed that just as the community was perceived as having erred communally, so God would redeem the entire community for the willing sacrifice of some few of its members. In one moving incident, Mar Isaac the Righteous sacrificed his children in

the expectation that this would be rewarded by the redemption of the entire community. "And he, Mar Isaac the Righteous, took his two children--his son and his daughter--and led them through the courtyard at the midnight hour. And he brought them to the synagogue before the holy ark and he slaughtered them there for the sanctification of the great Name of the high and exalted God who has commanded us not to apostatize and to cling to His holy Torah with all our hearts and with all our souls. And he spread some of their blood on the posts of the holy ark in order that it should serve as a reminder before the unique and eternal King, before the throne of His glory. And this blood," concludes the chronicler, "shall be my atonement for all of my sins," where "my" again is most likely a reference to the entire community.[69] Here, then, is a striking evocation of the imagery of the temple cultus. The synagogue, as substitute for the temple, is the scene of the sacrifice. The ark replaces the ancient altar. In clear parallel of levitical practice, blood is spread in a ritually-determined fashion. Finally, the human victim replaces the animal as the means through which atonement is achieved. With the temple long destroyed and the possibility of atonement through animal sacrifice confined to the past, "the latter generations applied the law in practice to themselves and offered up the sacrifice of their own souls."[70]

Like the animals that graced the table of the pious Jew,

the human sacrifices who graced God's holy altar had to be pure and unblemished. Throughout the sources (and most particularly in the piyyutim) there is evinced an abiding concern that all the requirements of ritual slaughter be carefully and punctiliously met. Care was taken to check the knife for notches and nicks, lest it be rendered pagum, or "ritually unfit." The poets and chroniclers took pains to point out the special purity of those to be sacrificed. Wrote one paytan: "Pure, without blemish, were these desolate ones."[71] Much concern was also voiced that the victims not struggle at the moment of death lest they sustain a blemish from the knife and the sacrifice go for nought. The paytan paints a stark tableau of the mother who "binds the son lest by flailing he render [the offering] unfit."[72] Not infrequently special mention is made of the benediction recited at the sacrifice of a human victim--a prayer intended to sanctify the life of the victim to God.[73]

Such evocation of shehitah ("ritual slaughter") imagery could not be more conscious and intentional. Here was a device employed by the medieval Jewish writers in order to show their loyalty to God, their love of Him even through suffering and death, and their special purity. Above all, this conscious use of shehitah symbolism and terminology was intended to win God's sympathy and understanding so that He might take pity on His people and grant them pardon for their sins.

iv. Summary

For a people who treasured life as a gift from God, acceptance of death and resignation to it were clearly a last resort. Every avenue of escape was attempted until finally a reckoning with the inevitable became necessary. Kiddush ha-Shem, the notion of dying for the sanctification of God's Name, whether it was perceived as the ultimate form of atonement or the greatest triumph through God's trial, became the principal vehicle for this reckoning. First and foremost, kiddush ha-Shem was a potent way for defenceless Jews to testify to the truth of their religion in the face of an insurmountable foe. Through it, these ravaged Jews showed their contempt for the faith of their Christian conquerors. Martyrdom was the last opportunity for the doomed Jew to prove his courage and affirm God's providence. The Jew of the Rhineland literally perceived his death as a way of fighting God's battle, for through his death he denied the proclaimed 'truth' of the victorious enemy and refuted his assertion that God was now acting on behalf of this new "Israel of the spirit." According to one medieval Jewish writer: "All of us wanted to die in the battle for the unification of His Name, except not all of us merited this. But each one who died...is like one who died in...battle."[74] Kiddush ha-Shem was a kind of weapon for the weaponless. Unable to defend themselves from attacks, the Jews chose to resist in the only way available

to them--by imbuing their deaths with their own special significance, and by removing their deaths from the hands of their hated enemy and placing them in the hands of God.

Dying in this manner was therefore very much an active and not at all a passive act. The sources attest to the fact that the Jews of the Rhineland did not go thoughtlessly, unreflectively, resignedly to their deaths "like sheep to the slaughter."[75] Had they simply been killed and not invested their deaths with deeper meaning, had they allowed themselves to be killed and not articulated an entire philosophy of martyrdom through which their deaths were seen as part of a comprehensive and comprehensible universe, perhaps then they could be described as passive.[76] Instead, these desperate Jews succeeded in the ultimate act of creativity, literally constructing a fabric of meaning and value out of a moral vaccuum. Thus, they met their deaths not as passive victims but as conscious, aware and active participants.

Finally, and most important, kiddush ha-Shem allowed a hopeless, suffering people to maintain intact those ideas and beliefs which they had always held dear--that the universe was orderly, rational and comprehensible, that God rewarded the righteous and punished the wicked (if not in this world then in the next), that Israel enjoyed a special relationship with God, that God ruled His universe with justice and mercy, and that, petty and insignificant as their lives and deaths might seem, they partook of a larger meaning

through their association with the Eternal God of the universe. This act of dying al kiddush ha-Shem--the supreme gesture of a powerless but pious Jewish community--was unique and imaginative as well as absolutely necessary. Through it, the Jews of the Rhineland managed to salvage some kind of meaning from lives of utter desperation. Turning sad necessity into positive action, his chosen act gave the Jew hope--hope that his people could resist the hated Christians and their despised religion, hope that through his death love and compassion could be renewed, hope that he could emerge from his ordeal purified and purged, worthy of entrance into his eternal reward in Gan Eden. It is no exaggeration to claim that it was this idea of kiddush ha-Shem which enabled the desperate Jews of the Rhineland to continue to find meaning in lives which should otherwise have proven intolerable.

CONCLUSIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS

Although almost universally literate and with a modicum of education in matters of Jewish law and lore, the Jews of the Rhineland were clearly not philosophers. Their response to suffering and the death of loved ones was, therefore, immediate and volatile, not rational and dispassionate. They did not stop to carefully weigh theological alternatives before responding to their torment. Instead they reacted with the immediacy of a wounded animal--with anger and despair.

It was not long, however, before they began to sense the dangers implicit in such responses. By their very nature, their rage and despair were wild and uncontrollable. Taken to the extreme, these violent emotions could undermine everything in which these Jews believed--that God was good, that He was loving and powerful, that the universe was purposive and that their lives and deaths possessed a transcendent meaning.

In order to maintain these basic assumptions intact, the Jews of the Rhineland resorted to the time-honored Jewish explanations for suffering. Either, it was assumed, they were being tried and tested by God, or they were atoning, through their suffering, for their many sins. Such ancient conceptions, uttered first by the biblical prophets, were reflective, rational and comprehensible. Their purpose was to answer and resolve the gnawing doubt whether the universe was indeed orderly and just, whether there was any

purpose at all in the martyr's death.

To this end, the chroniclers and paytanim wove explanatory formulae into all their accounts of martyrdom. In this way, they could contend that their tragic losses did indeed possess a greater meaning and that they were all part of God's plan for the world. While their suffering and their deaths could not be stopped, they remained free to interpret these as they chose. This they did through the notion of dying al kiddush ha-Shem. Out of fear that their anger and despair would lead inexorably to a paralyzing sense of the absurdity of the universe, they came to find solace in the idea that they died "for the sanctification of the Name." Thus, their suffering became a mitzvah and martyrdom became the ultimate religious act for the troubled Jews of the Rhineland.

Until now we have been describing what has seemed to be a straightforward, predictable pattern of religious response to Crusader outrage--emotional outbursts calmed and channeled into acceptable theological rationalizations. While this is certainly true, there are two important qualifications to the pattern.

First, it seems clear that the paytanim participated in this pattern to a lesser degree than did the chroniclers. Although moved by the same desire to discover meaning in the deaths of the victims, the paytanim showed a greater readiness

to vent their full grief, anger, outrage and rebellion. There is, in the piyyutim, less effort to resolve these volatile emotions into the joyful acceptance of kiddush ha-Shem. Perhaps this is attributable to the elite nature of the paytan's audience--an audience more intellectual than the Jewish norm, and thus more willing to grapple with religious doubts and challenges to traditional Jewish thought. It is equally conceivable that this tendency is due to the greater immediacy and emotionality of poetry as opposed to prose. As a rule, poetry is less concerned with articulating a formal philosophy than with expressing strongly-felt emotion. Whatever the reason, the piyyutim represent less of an attempt to resolve anger, outrage and despair.

Second, the explanations--wherever they appear in the piyyutim or chronicles--were only partially effective in salving the wounds of the Rhineland Jews. Even after all the explanations, all the invocations of prophetic rationale, the anger and despair continued to fester beneath the surface. Despite the attempts to dissolve them, they were never--indeed could never be--totally washed away. There can be no doubting the word of the medieval Jewish writers that many Jews did express joy at the prospect of certain death, as though going forth to meet their beloved beneath the wedding canopy. Others simply acquiesced in their deaths, resolving to go quietly in the confidence that they died for the sanctification of the Name. The careful reader,

however, cannot help but note the underlying tension between bitterness and acceptance, between outrage and resignation, between rebellion and joy. He cannot help but note, beneath the ostensible delight in the martyr's death, an unmistakable residue of unresolved anger and despair.

All of this is apparent from a close examination of the sources--both language and style. The paytanim and chroniclers employed only the most graphic, violent, heart-rending language in describing the deaths of the martyrs, switching to the dispassionate detachment of the philosopher only when appending the necessary explanation. In sheer volume, too, the recounting of the deaths themselves consistently outweighed the theological resolution. Thus, by the time he is warned to resolve his rage and dismay into the acceptance of kiddush ha-Shem, the intricate descriptions of senseless slaughter have already produced in him emotions too strong to be silenced. Some examples from the sources will prove this contention.

Chronicler Solomon bar Simeon, for example, writes: God "became angered and drew His sword against them [the Jews] so that only a few remained as a beacon on the mountain top, and as an ensign upon the hill. He gave His strength into captivity and trod them underfoot. See, O Eternal, and behold to whom You have done this. Is not Israel a people robbed and despised, a plaything of fate?" This is strong language indeed. The author is obviously furious and

anguished. He cannot comprehend the necessity for such suffering and destruction. He gropes for--indeed demands--a divine response. Finally, in his desperation, he asserts: "It was the will of the Eternal to test whether those who fear him can bear the yoke..."[1]

In another passage we read: "When we heard these words we fell upon our faces and cried: 'You, O Eternal! Are You going to make an end of the remnant of Israel?' They went and told their adventure to their brothers...recognized that it was the will of God, wept loudly and submitted themselves to the divine decree, saying: 'You are righteous, O Lord, and Your judgments are upright.'"[2] First despair, then resolution, but always the original emotion overpowers the imposed 'solution.'

Finally, we read: "Three successive days they fasted... They raised a loud and bitter cry, but their Father did not answer them. He was cut off from their prayers, hidden by a cloud through which no prayer could penetrate. He rejected the tents [of Israel] and turned them away from His face." Yet the passage concludes: "For it was His decree from 'In the day when I visit.' And this generation has been chosen by Him to become His for it possesses the force and strength to stand in His temple, to fulfil His word and to sanctify His great Name in His world."[3] Even after the assertion that their suffering is rational, explicable and comprehensible, the "loud and bitter cry" continues to ring

in the ears of the sensitive reader.

This, then, appears to be the hidden truth of the medevial sources. Despite the seemingly satisfactory nature of the idea of dying for the sanctification of the Name, the rage, the rebellion and despair of a tormented Jewry were very real. Not fleeting reactions, dispelled in an instant by the invocation of the traditional religious formulae, the doubts, fears and powerful emotions lingered on, only partially concealed by the fervent language extolling martyrdom.

Making a virtue out of stark necessity, the notion of dying al kiddush ha-Shem provided a tenuous grip on meaning, rationality, order and hope. Through it, the victims managed to clutch by teeth and nails at those beliefs which had sustained the Jewish people through centuries of suffering and martyrdom, in the desperate hope that these same beliefs could help the present generation of victims to withstand the onslaught of undermining doubts and fears.

Kiddush ha-Shem--the joyful acceptance of the martyr's death--was formulated as much because it was absolutely necessary as because it was truly and fervently believed. After all else had failed, it was the sole remaining means for asserting all of those things which gave this tortured people hope--that God was good, that He cared deeply for His people, that the wicked were punished and the righteous rewarded, and that there was finally a transcendent meaning to their deaths as well as their lives.

ABBREVIATIONS

JPS--Jewish Publication Society of America
JQR--Jewish Quarterly Review
PAAJR--Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research
REJ--Revue des Etudes Juives

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

1. Simon Bernfeld, The History of the Crusades (Hebrew), I, (Warsaw: 1899), p. 19.

2. Guiberti of Novigento, De Vita Sua, 11.5, in Bouquet, Recueil, XII, 240 quoted in Salo Baron, A Social and Religious History of the Jews, IV, (Philadelphia: 1957), p. 290.

3. Irving C. Dwork, "Jews and Crusaders in Europe--A Translation of the Three Hebrew Chronicles of the First Crusade" (doctoral diss., University of Southern California, 1941), p. ix.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid.,p. x.

6. Simon Bernfeld, The Book of Tears (Hebrew), I, (Berlin: 1923).

7. Ibid., p. 5.

8. Ibid., p. 33.

9. A. M. Habermann, The Book of the Persecutions in Germany and France (Hebrew), (Jerusalem: 1945).

10. Leopold Zunz, The Sufferings of the Jews During the Middle Ages, trans. A. Löwy, (New York: 1907).

11. A notion popularized by author Elie Wiesel.

12. Elisabeth Kübler-Ross, On Death and Dying, (New York: 1969).

13. Ibid., table of contents.

14. It must be noted, however, that there are certain limitations to the use of these categories for this thesis. First, it is clear that the Hebrew poets and chroniclers would never have employed such terminology as does Ms. Kübler-Ross. Her language--that of the present-day social scientist--is, of course, beyond the frame of reference of the medieval Jewish writers.

    Second, there is no direct one-to-one correspondence between the responses of terminal patients and the responses found in our medieval Jewish sources. It has,

therefore, not been possible to employ each chapter heading exactly as it appears in the Kübler-Ross volume. Some of the responses of the terminal patients find no parallel in the poetry or chronicles. Thus, the chapter entitled, "Third Stage: Bargaining" is omitted entirely. Other chapter headings need simply to be re-focused to make them more applicable. Thus the chapter, "Fourth Stage: Depression" becomes the more theologically-oriented "Despair."

Finally, there is no intent to claim, as does Ms. Kübler-Ross, that there is a consistent, progressive chronology to the various reactions, that one reaction follows another in a fairly predictable pattern. While the Jewish writers frequently express more than one single response to suffering and death, there is no consistent sequence to this response.

15. It would also be possible, although this is not the intent of this thesis, to analyze the Jewish response to suffering in the framework of traditional Western approaches to the problem of theodicy. Although their approaches differed radically, the Hebrew writers, who themselves were in contact with suffering, and the philosophers of religion, who may not have experienced massive evil directly themselves, were faced with the same problem--how to reconcile an omnipotent and benevolent deity with the existence of radical evil in the universe.

Of all the problems faced by religious thinkers, this problem of theodicy has seemed to be one of the most difficult and pressing. More ingenuity and energy have been expended in attempting to resolve this issue than any other. Any investigation of the traditional treatment of the problem reveals that it is incapable of solution without a willingness to deny one of the three cardinal religious assumptions--that God is good (according to the human definition of the term), that He is all-powerful, or that evil exists. Jewish theology, too, must deal with this same problem.

Some theologians have declared that God is not wholly good--that there is an evil dimension to His character, or that He can be a kind of 'infernal jokester' stirring up trouble for His own terrible amusement. When the Jews of the Rhineland expressed rage or incredulity they seemed to imply, if only indirectly, that God was not wholly good.

Other non-Jewish theologians responded by claiming that, properly understood, there was no real evil in the universe, that evil was merely a means toward greater good, that man's freedom and moral responsibility

depended upon the existence of evil in the universe, or that evils could be understood as punishment for human sin. The notion of kiddush ha-Shem, as articulated by the Jews of the Rhineland at the time of the violence associated with the Crusades, seems to imply that what appeared to be evil was simply God's means for trying or punishing His people in preparation for the reward of the world-to-come.

PREVENTIVE MEASURES

1. Habermann, pp. 20-1.

2. Robert Chazan, Medieval Jewry in Northern France, (Baltimore: 1973), p. 135.

3. הנוגע ביהודי לקחת נפשו כנוגע בישו עצמו.

A. Neubauer and M. Stern, Hebraïsche Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen während der Kreuzzüge, (Berlin: 1892), p. 59.

4. Heinrich Graetz, The History of the Jews, III (Philadelphia: 1956), pp. 300-1.

5. Neubauer and Stern, p. 17.

6. Graetz, p. 303.

7. Cited in Israel Zinberg, A History of Jewish Literature, II (Cleveland: 1972), p. 41.

8. Ibid., p. 24.

9. למה פניך תסתיר ולעד תאנף בנו...
ה' זכר והבט כי עמך כלנו.

Habermann, p. 178.

10. ויצעקו אל ה' ויאמרו אתה ה' אלהי ישראל אתה עושה כלה את שארית ישראל איה נפלאותיך אשר ספרו לנו אבותינו לאמר הלא ממצרים העליתנו ה' ועתה נתשת לתת אותנו ביד האומות להשמידינו.

Neubauer and Stern, p. 51.

11. אלהים בעזנינו שמענו אבותינו ספרו לנו
פעל פעלת בימי קדם למענינו
בכל-דור ודור נוראות שמת בעבורנו
רבות עשית אתה ה' נפלאותיך ומחשבותיך אלינו.

Habermann, p. 82.

12. Neubauer and Stern, p. 28.

13. Zinberg, pp. 27-8.

14. Joshua Prawer, The Crusaders' Kingdom, (New York: 1972), p. 244.

15. Samuel Krauss, "L'émigration de 300 Rabbins en Palestine en l'an 1211," REJ, LXXXII (1926), pp. 33-4.

16. Michael Brown, "Is There a Jewish Way to Fight?" Judaism, XXIV, 4 (Fall 1975), p. 466.

17. Reuven Kimmelman, "Non-violence in the Talmud," Judaism, XVII, 3 (Summer 1968), p. 323.

18. Brown, p. 471.

    Note, however, that alongside this attitude favoring self-preservation in times of extremity, was also an undercurrent of pacifism. A significant strain of rabbinic thought held that, given the choice, it was better to be the sufferer than the inflicter of suffering, the victim rather than the victor. Such passive response, the rabbis felt, betokened a kind of moral superiority since violence of any sort involved sin. By responding to violence with further violence, the Jew would only lower himself to the level of his hated attacker. But by restraining himself and his violent inclinations, by seeking to transform the attacker's hostility into friendship, the Jew could rise to a higher level of sanctity. Such a notion rested on the assumption that "God is always on the side of the persecuted even though he be pursued for his wickedness." It was thus that the option of kiddush ha-Shem became the dominant Jewish response to the violence of the Crusades and that instances of armed resistance were relatively rare.

19. Zunz, p. 22.

20. Neubauer and Stern, pp. 15-6.

21. Ibid., p. 16.

22. Graetz, p. 355.

23. ואיש ישראל חלצו איש כלי זיינו בחצר הפנימי של הנמרן
ויקרבו כולם אל השער להלחם עם התועים ועם העירונים
וילחמו אילו נגד אילו אל תוך השער וגרמו העונות
ונצחום האויבים ולכדו את השער ותכבן יד ה' על עמו

ויאספו כל הגוים על היהודים שבחצר להכרית סהם
שם ורפו יד עמינו כראותם יד אדומי הרשעה
תקפה עליהם.

Neubauer and Stern, p. 6.

24. מבני יהודה הגרים בעיר...חמש מאות איש בחור
שלופי חרב אנשי מלחמה אשר [לא] יסובו פניהם
אחור מפני אויב ויבואו על העיר בסח ויכום בהם
מכה גדולה מן התועים ובני עירם ומן היהודים לא
נהרגו כי אם ששה.

Ibid., pp. 28-9.

25. Graetz, p. 301.

26. Yitzhak Baer, "Rashi and the Historical Reality of His Time" (Hebrew), Tarbiz, XX (1949), p. 324.

27. Moses A. Shulvass, Between the Rhine and the Bospurus--Studies and Essays in European Jewish History, (Chicago: 1964), p. 11.

28. Zinberg, p. 39.

29. See note #14.

ANGER

1. Kübler-Ross, p. 50.

2. Habermann, p. 3.

3. Abrahams, p. 410.

4. Neubauer and Stern, p. 1.

5. Ibid., p. 3.

6. Ibid., p. 5.

7. תלוי נצלב נצר נסחב ונתעב ומסוקץ סדודו מסזר
בן הנידה ובן הזימה.

Ibid., p. 7.

8. אל נקמות.

Ibid., p. 140.

9. נקם נקמת בני ישראל.

Ibid.

10. תקרא עליהם קול שופר חזק.

Habermann, p. 105.

11. Ibid., p. 202.

12. שפוך חמתך על הגוים אשר לא ידעוך ועל הממלכות
וכו' שפוך עליהם זעמך וכו' ותדרוש מהם דם
עבדיך אשר על צחית סלע...

Neubauer and Stern, p. 17.

Note that this theme is repeated in the Passover Haggadah in identical language. This 'prayer' was inserted in the Haggadah in direct response to the horrors of the Crusades, the blood libel accusations and the well-poisoning charges.

13. תן כבוד לשמך ולא לנו לא לנו.

Habermann, p. 88.

14. נשבעת להשיב נקם מדם...
מלא שבועה זאת ונתנה לך הודיה.

Ibid., p. 173.

15. הראה חוכיך מאלותם וחשקם
ישמח צדיק--כי-חזה נקם.

Habermann, p. 151.

16. Ibid., p. 97.

17. ואז יסכילו ויבינו ויסיבו ללבותם כי על הכל
הפילו פגרינו ארצה ועל דברי תעתועים הרגו
חסידינו ועל פגר מובאש שפכו דם צדקניות
ועל דברי מסית ומדיח שפכו דם עולל ויונק.

Neubauer and Stern, p. 17.

18. For example, the fact that the vast bulk of the Crusader army was eliminated en route to the Holy Land, and that the Muslims were successful in blunting the Christian attack were seen as God's vengeance on the Christians on behalf of the Jewish people.

19. עם סגולה

Neubauer and Stern, p. 27.

20. רשע מתגאה על עם-העמוסים
האינך רואה המה עושים?

Habermann, p. 9.

21. זכר אלה...בקש עון ואיננה וחטאת לא תמצאנה.

Ibid., p. 188.

22. ארץ ארץ אל תכסי דמינו.

Ibid., p. 178.

23. מי כמכה באלמים?

Ibid., p. 148.

24. למה עזבת את עמך ישראל ללעג ולביזה ולהרפה
ולאבדינו ביד העמים המאים כחזיר טאוכלים
אותנו העם שבחרת בם להיות לך לעם סגולה
מכל העמים?

Neubauer and Stern, p. 27.

25. cf. Habermann, p. 113, the piyyut "Eyn kamoha ba-elemim."

26. מכאן אני רואה דמה שנוהג האונן ליטב
במנחה בשבת בפני בית הכנסת ואינו נכנס
בכנסת שאינו מנהג דכיון דחייב במצות צריך
ליכנס. ואני שמעתי מפי הזקנים שלא היו
נוהגים כן במגענצא לפני הגזירה.

Eliezer bar Nathan, Even ha-Ezer, ש"ע, פד, א
quoted in Joseph Hacker, "On the Persecution of Tatnu" (Hebrew), Zion, XXXI (1966)

DESPAIR

1. כי ראו כי נגזרה גזרה מן השמים ואין מקום
לנוס לא לפנים ולא לאחור.

Neubauer and Stern, p. 48.

2. האינך רואה מה המה עושים?

Habermann, p. 9.

3. פנ'ך הסתרת לקול זעקתה
פנותך מאין עוד למנחתה ולאנחתה.

Ibid., p. 92.

4. Martin Buber, The Eclipse of God, (New York: 1952)

5. אבל נגזרה גזירה ונעשית כמין מחבת נחושת ביניהו לאביהו שבשמים.

Neubauer and Stern, p. 21.

6. Zunz, p. 22.

7. ימים ברחו וטובה לא ראו עיני מיום בא אויב לשערי ארמונ'.
Habermann, p. 172.

8. החדש החמישי אל תבא בו רננה
כי הוסיף לי יגון על-יגון אבל ואניגה
להתאבל אבלות חדשה עם ישנה.

Ibid., p. 226.

9. יפחד לבי לקול בוכים מרב צרות
תכופות זו אחר זו ממהרות
רבוי גזירות מכל עברות
האשמע עוד לקול שרים ושרות?

Ibid., p. 200.

10. אני נסקל אני נתקל להצליבי
אני נשרף אני נערף להלעיבי
אני נהרג...
אני נחנק אני נשנק למריבי
אני מכה אני לוקה בגוי
אני מומת אני מצמת ללביא
אני מאבד...
אני נתלה אני נקלה וגולה...
אני נדרס אני נהרס...

Ibid., pp. 135-6.

11. Edward Peters, The First Crusade: the Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and other Source Materials, (Philadelphia: 1971), p. 101ff.

12. ויקח את התורה ורמסוה בטיט ויקרעוה וישרפוה
ויאכלו את בני ישראל בכל פה.

13. ואזעק מר בבכי ובאנקה על-כתבי הקדש אשר לא נצלו מן-הדלקה.

Habermann, p. 181.

14. cf. Ibid., p. 184.

15. עליהם אקונן בכר בנם בילדה ובנהיגה.

Ibid., p. 222.

16. שלחו דקראו לסקונגות ותבאינה.

Ibid., p. 224.

17. cf. Ibid., p. 120.

18. cf. Ibid., p. 227.

ACCEPTANCE OF DEATH

1. אין להרהר אחר מידת הק'ב'ה' וברוך שמו שנתן לנו תורתו וציוני להמיתנו ולהרג אותנו על יחוד שמו הקדוש אשרינו אם נעשה רצונו ואשרי כל מי שנהרג ונשחט ויתות על יחוד שמו.

Neubauer and Stern, p. 7.

2. Brown, p. 466.

3. Neubauer and Stern, pp. 41-2.

4. Ibid., p. 19.

5. Ibid., p. 18.

6. ופשטו צוארם לשחט והשלימו נפשם הנקיה לאהיהם שבשמים, והנשים צדקניות החסידות אשה אל אמותה פשטה צוארה לעקוד על יחוד השם ואיש בבנו ובאחיו ואח באחותו ואשה בבנה ובבתה ושכן בשכינו וריעו וחתן בכלתו וארוס בארוסתו זה עוקד ונעקד וזה עוקד ונעקד עד שנגעו דמים בדמים ונתערבו דמי אנשים בנשותיהם ודמי אחים באחיותיהם ודמי רבנים בתלמידיהם ודמי חתנים בכלותיהם ודמי חזנים בסופריהם ודמי עוללים ויונקים באימותיהם ונהרגו ונשחטו על יחוד שם הנכבד והנורא.

Ibid., pp. 7-8.

7. דין הוא עצלנו שהמאבד את עצמו לדעת אין לו חלק בעולם הבא. בתלמוד נאמר שרק על שלשה דברים ייהרג אדם ואל יעבור: על גילוי עריות שפיכת דמים ועבודה זרה. נאמר אמנם ש..."יהרג ואל יעבור."

H. H. Ben-Sasson, Chapters in the History of the Jews in the Middle Ages (Hebrew), (Tel-Aviv: 1969), p. 176.

8. להרוג את עצמו לא נאמר בשום מקום ובשום מצב.

Ibid.

9. **Ibid.**

10. יש גם ליחידים ההרגשה שחייהם ניתנו להם כדי שיקדשו למשהו.

Ibid.

11. בתי מאחר שלא היתי זוכה לינשא לבני אברהם לא תתנשאי לאחר אל הנכרי...ראו כולכם זאת חופת בתי...שאעשה היום הזה.

Neubauer and Stern, p. 20.

12. הרחמן הוא יצילנו מאנסי רשע ומשמד ומעבודה זרה ומטומאת העמים ומפיגוליהם.

Ibid., p. 22.

13. מוטב לנו למות בכאן על שמו הגדול ונמייל עם הצדיקים בגן עדן ולא יתפסו אותנו הערלים הטמאים הללו ויטמאו אותנו בעל ברחינו בסים הזדונים שלהם.

Ibid., p. 19.

14. **Marvin Lowenthal, The Jews of Germany, p. 46 quoted in Irving C. Dwork, pp. 9-10.**

15. וזכותם וזכות האחרים הנשחטים...יעמוד לנו למליץ יושר פני אל עליון.

Neubauer and Stern, p. 23.

16. ויעמוד לנו דם חסידיו לזכות ולכפרת לדורותינו אחרינו ולבני בנינו עד עולם.

Ibid., p. 17.

17. נקריב עצמינו את קרבן ה' בעולות כליל...ונהיה בעולם שכולו יום בגן עדן באיספקלריה המאירה ונראתו עין בעין בכבודו ובגודלו ויתן לכל אחד ואחד עטרה של זהב בראשו ובה קבועות אבנים טובות ומרגליות ונשבה שם בין יסודי עולם ונסעוד בחבורת הצדיקים בגן עדן

ונהיה מחבורת ר' עקיבא וחביריו ונשב על כסא של זהב
תחת עץ החיים.

Ibid., p. 22.

18. ותשב עם שאר צדיקים גירי צדק במחיצתן ותהיה עם
אברהם אבינו.

Ibid.

19. אשרינו אם נעשה רצונו ואשרי כל מי שנהרג ונשחט
ויסות על יחוד שמו ויהא מזומן לעולם הבא וישב במחיצת
עם הצדיקים ר' עקיבא וחביריו יסודי עולם הנהרגים
על שמו ולא עוד אלא שנתחלף עולם חושך בעולם
אורה ועולם של צרה בעולם שמחה ועולם עובר בעולם
בעולם קיים לעד ולנצח.

Ibid., p. 7.

20. בזו הסעה גיהנום וגן עדן פתוח. באיזה מהם
רצונכם ליכנס עתה...נשמתם תהא בגן עדן באור החיים.

Ibid., p. 10.

21. בשמחות וגיל תבאינה בהיכל מלך.

Habermann, p. 138.

22. Introduction to Zunz, pp. 8-9.

23. רנה יצאה מפיו ותהילה.

Habermann, p. 190.

24. Psalms 133:1.

25. כחתן לכלתו

Habermann, p. 138.

26. Zunz, p. 39.

27. Ibid., p. 40.

28. ויאמרו להוציא אותם לבית השרפה
יחדיו שמחו בהכנסת כלה לחפה.

Habermann, p. 138.

29. Song of Songs 1:15, 4:1.

30. איכה נשבר מטה עוז מקל תפארה עדת קדושה...
היתה סיבה מעם ה' למען נסות בם את יריאיו לסבול
עול...

Neubauer and Stern, p. 4.

31. כי לנסות את הדור בא האל להודיע לכל חיבתם ובפסליה של מעלה.

Ibid., p. 21.

32. וזה הדור הוא נבחר לפניו להיות לו למנה כי היה בהם כח וגבורה לעסוד בהיכלו ולעשות דברו ולקדש שמו הגדול בעולמו.

Ibid., p. 2.

33. ובכל נפשך: אפילו הוא נוטל את נפשך.

Rashi to Deut. 6:4.

34. ...כר' עקיבא וחבריו ועמדו בנסיון כחנינה מישאל ועזריה.

Neubauer and Stern, p. 14.

35. ...עמד בנסיונו כאברהם אבינו.

Ibid., p. 24.

36. Shalom Spiegel, The Last Trial, trans. Judah Goldin, (New York: 1969), pp. 23-4.

37. Ibid., p. 24.

38. האם קושרת בנה פן בפרכוס יחללה והאב מברך על-הסחיטה לכללה.

Habermann, p. 62.

39. צעקת ילדים אין גדלה. רואים אחיהם נשחטים בחלחלה.

Ibid.

40. ובני ציון היקרים בני מעגנצא נתנסו בנסיונות עשר כאברהם אבינו...עקדן בניהם כאשר עקד אברהם ליצחק בנו...האם היו אלף ומאה בקידות ביום אחד כולם כעקידת יצחק בן אברהם?

Neubauer and Stern, pp. 7-8.

41. קדם מענגו ותעמד עקדת הר סר... נתוספו אלה וכאלה עד מתי לאטר.

Habermann, p. 71.

42. Spiegel, p. 15.

43. Ibid., p. 22.

44. שהרו וחרסו עשות רצון קונגו...
נעקד בהר מור אביו כפתו
גם שלא יבעט ויפגל שחיטתו
נחנו בלי עקד נשחט מאהבתו.

Habermann, p. 86.

45. Genesis 22:7.

46. הנה האש והעצים ואני השה לעולה.

Habermann, p. 187.

47. Neubauer and Stern, p. 41.

48. עתה שלח העז.

Habermann, p. 189.

49. וכל נביא וחוזה וכל חכם לב ונבון דעת לא יכול
לעמוד על העיקר היאך כבר חטאת עדת מי מנה וחיבלו
נפשות קהילות הקדושות כאילו היו סופכים דמים.
זולתי...הנה הוא סופס צדק ולנו הדיבה.

Neubauer and Stern, p. 3.

50. הדור אשם

Habermann, p. 147.

51. Zunz, p. 65.

52. Neubauer and Stern, pp. 47-8.

53. בעוונות לא נתנו לקבורה אך במקום שנשרפו תחת ההר.

Ibid., p. 68.

54. אוי-נא לנו כי חטאנו...
אוי לנו כי שדרנו והיתה לטרפה.

Habermann, p. 133.

55. ולא עליך ה' תלונותינו
כי אנחנו לעצמנו הרעונו
אוי נא לנו כי חטאנו
על-כן גועגו כלנו אבדנו
ולפני בני עולה נפלנו...
מה נדבר ונצטדק וה' מצא עונגו.

Ibid., p. 220.

56. פדות וכפרה יחקקו ליסרון בספר
היום הזה יום כפור לכפר
יעמד זכותם לעמם כעס להפר
על הכהנים ועל-כל-עם הקהל יכפר.

Ibid., p. 139.

57. ידידים נחמדים נלקחו בעוני.

Ibid., p. 173.

58. ונם בכו העם הרבה בכי על נפש היקרה אשר נאבדה
ונגזרה מארץ החיים מפשע עמי.

Neubauer and Stern, p. 59.

59. ויעש ה' כאשר דבר כי חטאנו לו ויסס מסכן סילה...
וירמסהו ברגלים.

Ibid., p. 4.

60. נבוכדנצר בלענו אכלנו המתנו
טיטוס ואספסינוס ואדריגוס וסרגינוס עקרונו.

Habermann, p. 133.

61. Zunz, p. 31.

62. כבשים בני-שנה תמימים

Habermann, p. 70.

63. עולות נדבות

Ibid., p. 200.

64. מנחה

Ibid., p. 173.

65. כלן הקטירו אשה ריח ניחוח לאדוני.

Ibid., p. 200.

66. זאת תורת העולה היא העולה על מוקדה.

Ibid., p. 133.

67. והכינו מזבח הבנים ואמותם
וזבחו זבחי שלמים בשרם ועורותם
למען שמו הגדול מסרו נויתם.

Ibid., p. 214.

68. ותצא אש מלפני ה' ותאכל אותם.

Ibid.

69. ויקח סר יצחק הצדיק את שני בניו בנו ובתו
ויוליכם דרך החצר בחצי הלילה ויביאם אל בית
הכנסת לפני ארון הקדש וישחטום שם על קידוש
השם הגדול אל רם ונשא ציונו בלי להסיר יראתו התורה
ולידבק בתורתו הקדושה בכל לבביגו ובכל נפשינו ויז מדמם
על עמודי ארון הקדש כדי שיבואו לזכרון לפני מלך יחיד
חי העולמים ולפני כסא כבודו וחדם הזה יהי לי
לכפרה על כל עוונותי.

Neubauer and Stern, p. 12.

70. כך דנו הדורות האחרונות בעצמם הלכה למעשה
והקריבו קרבן נפשם.

Habermann, p. 4.

71. תמימים בלי מומים היו שוממים.

Ibid., p. 63.

72. האם קושרת בנה פן בפרכוס יחללה.

Ibid., p. 62.

73. It is more than likely that this martyr's prayer read: "Blessed be Thou, O Lord, who sanctified us with His commandments and commanded us to sanctify His Name publicly."
cf. Alexander Guttmann, "Some Responsa Dealing with Halacha in Holocaust Cases," Hebrew Union College Annual, XLVI (1975), p. 442.

74. כולנו היינו רוצים למות במלחמה על יחוד שמו אלא שלא כולנו זוכים בכך. אך כל המת...הרי כאילו מת במלחמה...

Ben-Sasson, p. 177.

75. Ibid., p. 176.

76. Even anger may be understood, in this context, as passive.

CONCLUSION

1. ויחר אפו והריק אחריהם חרב עד נותרו כתורן בראש ההר וכנס על הגבעה ויתן לשבי עוזו וירמסהו ברגלים ראה ה' והבט למי עוללת בה הלא ישראל עם בזוי ושסוי חבל גורלך...היתה סיבה מעם ה' למען נסות בם את יריאיו לסבול עול...

Neubauer and Stern, p. 4.

2. ויהי כאשר שמענו אילו דברים ונפלנו על פנינו ואמרנו אתה ה' אלהים האתה עושה את שארית ישראל כלה. וילכו ויגידו קורותם לאחיהם...וידעו כי היתה גזירה מאת ה' ויבכו הם בכי גדולה והצדיקו עליהם את הדין ואמרו צדיק אתה ה' וישר משפטיך.

Ibid., p. 5.

3. וצמאו שלשה ימים...וצעקו והשמיעו צעקה גדולה ומרה ולא ענם אביהם ושתם תפילתם ויסך בענן לא מעבור תפלתם ונמאס אהל וישירם מעל פניו כי היית גזירה מלפניו מניום פקדי וזה הדור הוא נבחר לפניו להיות לו למנה כי היה בהם כח וגבורה לעמוד בהיכלו ולעשות דברו ולקדש שמו הגדול בעולמו...

Ibid., pp. 1-2.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrahams, Israel. By-Paths in Hebraic Bookland. Philadelphia: JPS, 1920

_____. Jewish Life in the Middle Ages. Philadelphia: JPS, 1920

Agus, Irving A. Rabbi Meir of Rothenburg. New York: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1970

Albeck, S. "The Attitude of Rabbenu Tam to the Problems of His Time" (Hebrew). Zion, XIX (1954), 104-141

Baer, Yitzhak. "The Decree of Tatnu" (Hebrew). Sefer Assaf. Jerusalem, 1953, 126-140

_____. "Rashi and the Historical Reality of His Time" (Hebrew). Tarbiz, XX (1949), 320-332

_____. "Towards an Examination of the Disputations of Rabbi Yehiel of Paris and Ramban" (Hebrew). Tarbiz, II, 2 (1931), 172-187

Barish, Louis and Rebecca. Basic Jewish Beliefs. New York: Jonathan David, 1961

Baron, Salo W. A Social and Religious History of the Jews, IV. Philadelphia: JPS, 1957

Ben-Sasson, H. H. Chapters in the History of the Jews in the Middle Ages (Hebrew). Tel-Aviv: Am Oved Publishers, Ltd., 1969

Bernfeld, Simon. The Book of Tears (Hebrew), I. Berlin: Eshkol Press, 1923

_____. The History of the Crusades (Hebrew), I. Warsaw: Toshia Press, 1899

Brown, Michael. "Is There a Jewish Way to Fight?" Judaism, XXIV, 4 (Fall 1975), 466-475

Buber, Martin. The Eclipse of God. New York: Harper and Bros. Publishing, 1952

Chazan, Robert. Medieval Jewry in Northern France. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973

_____. "The Blois Incident of 1171: A Study in Jewish Inter-communal Organization." PAAJR, XXXVI (1968), 13-32

_____. "The Bray Incident of 1192: Realpolitik and Folk Slander." PAAJR, XXXVII (1969), 1-18

_____. "The Persecution of 992." REJ, CXXIX, 2-3-4 (Apr.-Dec. 1970), 217-8

_____. "Rabbi Ephraim of Bonn's 'Sefer Zechirah'." REJ, CXXXII, 1-2 (Jan.-June 1973), 119-126

_____. "A Twelfth-Century Communal History of Spires Jewry." REJ, CXXVIII, 1 (Jan.-Mar. 1969), 253-7

Cohen, Gerson D. Messianic Postures of Ashkenazim and Sephardim. New York: Leo Baeck Institute, 1967

Cohn, Norman. The Pursuit of the Millenium. New York: Harper and Row, 1961

Dan, J. "Rabbi Eleazar of Worm's 'Sefer ha-Hochkma' ("Book of Wisdom") and its Significance for the History of the Doctrines and Literature of the Ashkenazic Hassidim" (Hebrew). Zion, XXIX (1964), 168-181

Davidson, Israel. "Researches in Medieval Hebrew Poetry." JQR, XXIX, 4 (1939)

Dwork, Irving C. Jews and Crusaders in Europe: A Translation of the Three Hebrew Chronicles of the First Crusade. A doctoral thesis done at the University of Southern California, 1941

Eidelberg, Shlomo. "The Solomon bar Simeon Chronicle as a Source of the History of the First Crusade." JQR, XLIX, 4 (April 1959), 282-7

Fackenheim, Emil L. God's Presence in History. New York: Harper and Row, 1970

The First Crusade: the chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and other Source Materials, ed. Edward Peters. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971

God and Evil, ed. Nelson Pike. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964

Golb, Norman. "New Light on the Persecution of French Jews at the Time of the First Crusade." PAAJR, XXXIV (1966), 1-63

Graetz, Heinrich. The History of the Jews, III. Philadelphia: JPS, 1956

Grayzel, Solomon. The Church and the Jews in the Thirteenth Century. Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1953

Habermann, A. M. The Book of the Persecutions in Germany and France (Hebrew). Jerusalem: Tarshish Books, 1945

Hacker, Joseph. "On the Persecution of Tatnu" (Hebrew). Zion, XXXI (1966), 3-4

Hailperin, Herman. Rashi and the Christian Scholars. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1963

Heilperin, S. The Book of the Order of the Generations (Hebrew). Warsaw: Isaac Goldman Press, 1882

Joad, C. E. M. God and Evil. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1942

Kimmelman, Reuven. "Non-violence in the Talmud." Judaism, XVII, 3 (Summer 1968), 316-334

Kober, Adolf. Cologne. Trans. Solomon Grayzel. Philadelphia: JPS, 1940

Krauss, Samuel. "L'émigration de 300 Rabbins en Palestine en l'an 1211." REJ, LXXXII (1926), 333-352

Kroloff, Charles. The Effect of Suffering on the Concept of God in Lamentations Rabbah. Rabbinical thesis, Hebrew Union College, 1960

Kübler-Ross, Elisabeth. On Death and Dying. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1969

Landau, Sol. Christian-Jewish Relations. New York: Pageant Press, Inc., 1959

Lesourd, Paul and Jean Marie Ramiz. On the Path of the Crusaders. Israel: Masada Press, 1961

Mann, Jacob. "Messianic Movements in the days of the First Crusade" (Hebrew). Ha-Tekufah, XXIII (1926), 335-358

Meyer, Michael A. Ideas of Jewish History. New York: Behrman House, Inc., 1974

Millgram, Abraham E. An Anthology of Medieval Hebrew Literature. Philadelphia: Associated Talmud Torahs, 1935

Neubauer, Adolf and M. Stern. Hebräische Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen während der Kreuzzüge. Berlin: L. Simion, 1892

Parkes, James. The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue. Cleveland and New York: World Publishing Co., 1961

Philosophers Speak of God, ed. Charles Hartshorne and William L. Reese. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953

Plotkin, Frederick S. Judaism and Tragic Theology. New York: Schocken Books, Inc., 1973

Prawer, Joshua. The Crusaders' Kingdom. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972

_____. The World of the Crusaders. New York: Quadrangle Books, 1972

Rabinowitz, Louis. The Social Life of the Jews of Northern France in the Twelfth to the Fourteenth Centuries. London: Edward Goldston, Ltd., 1938

Rosenthal, Ludwig. How Was it Possible? Trans. Regina Eis. Berkeley: Judah L. Magnes Memorial Museum, 1971

Rubenstein, Richard L. The Religious Imagination. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968

Salfeld, Siegmund. Das Martyrologium des Nürnberger Memorbuches. Berlin: L. Simion, 1898

Shapiro, A. "Jews and Christians in the Period of the Crusades--A Commentary on the First Holocaust." Journal of Ecumenical Studies, IX, 4 (Fall 1972), 725-749

Shulvass, Moses A. Between the Rhine and the Bosporus--Studies and Essays in European Jewish History. Chicago: The College of Jewish Studies Press, 1964

Sonne, I. "Nouvel Examen des trois Relations Hébraïques sur les persécutions de 1096, suivi d'un fragment de version Judéo-allemande inédite de la première Relation." REJ, XCVI (1933), 113-156

_____. "Which is the Earlier Account of the Persecutions During the First Crusade?" (Hebrew). Zion, XII (1947-8), 74-81

Spiegel, Shalom. The Last Trial. Trans. Judah Goldin. New York: Schocken Books, Inc., 1969

_____. "From the Discussion of the Akedah: The Victims of Bray and the Renewal of the Blood Libel" (Hebrew). Sefer ha-Yovel lihvod Mordecai Menahem Kaplan. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1953, 267-284

Strack, Hermann. The Jew and Human Sacrifice. Trans. Henry F. E. Blanchamp. London: Cope and Fenwick, 1909

Wells, Donald A. God, Man and the Thinker. New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc.,1962

Zimmerman, Sheldon. "Confronting the Halakhah on Military Service." Judaism, XX, 2 (Spring 1971), 204-212

Zinberg, Israel. A History of Jewish Literature, II. Cleveland: The Press of Case Western Reserve University, 1972

Zunz, Leopold. The Sufferings of the Jews During the Middle Ages. Trans. A. Löwy. New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1907