

JEWISH CULTURE AND CONTEXTS

Published in association with the Center for Advanced Judaic Studies  
of the University of Pennsylvania

David B. Ruderman, Series Editor

*Advisory Board*

Richard I. Cohen

Moshe Idel

Deborah Dash Moore

Ada Rapoport-Albert

David Stern

A complete list of books in the series is available from the publisher.

Sanctifying the Name  
of God

Jewish Martyrs and Jewish Memories  
of the First Crusade

Jeremy Cohen

PENN

University of Pennsylvania Press  
Philadelphia



Chapter 1

*To Sanctify the Name of God*

Unquestionably the most striking aspect of the 1096 persecutions and their Hebrew chronicles is the slaughter of Ashkenazic Jews by their own hands.

Not wishing to deny their beliefs and to give up the fear of our king . . . , they held out their necks to be slaughtered and offered their untainted souls to their father in heaven. . . . Each one in turn sacrificed and was sacrificed, until the blood of one touched the blood of another: The blood of husbands mixed with that of their wives, the blood of fathers and their children, the blood of brothers and their sisters, the blood of rabbis and their disciples, the blood of bridegrooms and their brides . . . , the blood of children and nursing infants and their mothers. They were killed and slaughtered for the unity of God's glorious and awesome name.<sup>1</sup>

The three Hebrew chronicles of the First Crusade and most subsequent Jewish memories have considered such martyrdom awe-inspiring, the ultimate expression of religious self-sacrifice, outstripping in its piety even a willingness to undergo a violent death at the hands of one's enemy.

From the perspective of traditional Judaism, however, this phenomenon proves no less problematic than impressive. The law of the Talmud indeed considered the obligation to sanctify God's name in martyrdom—especially to avoid engaging in idolatry, and above all in times of violent anti-Jewish persecution—a divine commandment. Nevertheless, *submitting to death* to avoid transgression was one thing; *inflicting death*, upon oneself or upon someone else, was very much another. Biblical law condemned homicide; acknowledging the Torah's affirmation of the value of life, talmudic rabbis included suicide in this prohibition. Even if one could find precedents for justifying suicide in extenuating circumstances, how could one condone the presumption involved in slaying another person?

And yet, here were not the excessive reactions of extremists or marginal types in the Jewish community, nor can one write off this pattern of Jewish behavior, which Christian sources document as well, as a fantasy of

those who remembered 1096. Self-wrought acts of *kiddush ha-Shem*, as Jews traditionally have referred to Jewish martyrdom, loom large in the collective memory of scrupulously observant German-Jewish communities as the dominant, most praiseworthy response to the violence. How could they idealize such patently sinful behavior? How can we best seek to understand the cultural logic and significance of Ashkenazic *kiddush ha-Shem* during the First Crusade?

Modern scholars have generally approached this problem with one of two strategies, which are hardly mutually exclusive. One strategy explains the behavior of the martyrs as expressing the distinguishing characteristics of early medieval German Jewry. Ashkenazic Jews attributed considerable authority to *aggadah*, rabbinic lore, including the tale of the suicide pact at Masada found in the tenth-century Hebrew history book *Josippon*, and they gave weight to such stories in defining *halakhah*, or legal norms, too. Ashkenazic Jews, some have claimed, had inherited rabbinic traditions of the land of Israel that cherished memories of ancient Jewish martyrdom but did not generate active involvement in messianic and political movements. Messianic expectations ran high among Jews and Christians alike late in the eleventh century, but northern European Jewry looked forward to an otherworldly redemption, outside the realm of history as we know it; an act of sanctifying God's name might secure salvation for the martyr not in this world but in the next. (By contrast, the Marranos of Spain, runs this argument, drew inspiration from Babylonian rabbinic traditions that placed higher value on redemption in this world, such that one might endeavor to remain alive at all costs.) These Jewish communities hated the church intensely, and such hatred militated against conversion—however insincere or temporary—to Christianity. No less important, some have claimed, German Jews nurtured a collective self-image of piety. Again, Jewish traditions of the land of Israel and Italy bequeathed to them an ideal of righteousness that emphasized the exemplary morality and spirituality of their communities at large, not the grandeur of a small rabbinic elite. Early Italian-Ashkenazic tradition hallowed the memories of voluntary Jewish martyrs before the First Crusade. Ashkenazic Jews displayed remarkable self-confidence as to the validity of their local ritual customs; intuition may thus have led them to identify their own inclinations with the mandates of the law, such that they even modified the codified law, or *halakhah*, to reflect their local customs. While debate on this supposition ensues, many would agree that the distinctive Ashkenazic ideology of *kiddush ha-Shem* was firmly in place before the violence began. Our chroniclers surely wrote for specific didactic

purposes, but they pursued those objectives by faithfully recording the beliefs and behavior of those who sacrificed themselves.<sup>2</sup>

An alternative, though not incompatible, strategy for making sense of self-inflicted Jewish martyrdom in 1096 focuses on the ideological climate of the First Crusade. The Crusade undertook to mobilize the forces of Christian Europe under the banner of the church, to redeem the beleaguered Byzantine Empire from Turkish attack, to liberate the Holy Land in which Jesus lived and died from the rule of the infidel—and all this to avenge the wrong that was done to Jesus, the most exemplary martyr of all. Those who attacked the Jews found their mandate within this general understanding of the Crusade. Here were the most accessible enemies of Christ, those who had forfeited their covenant with God in their overt hostility toward his son. What more noble an undertaking than to baptize or destroy them! In his renowned call to engage in holy war, Pope Urban II promised crusaders a heavenly reward. Popular opinion, in turn, assigned those who fell in battle against the infidel the most direct access to paradise; they achieved the status of martyr in a genuine act of *imitatio Christi*, the imitation of Christ.

Attacked on these terms, it appears, the Jews of the Rhineland tried unsuccessfully to defend themselves, to bribe the local potentates, usually the bishops, to defend them, and to secure immediate divine assistance. When all else failed, there remained only the options offered by the crusaders: Christianity or death. Within such a context, self-inflicted martyrdom perhaps offered a different, more meaningful alternative. For the Jew thereby took the initiative in his or her own hands, actively determining his or her own destiny, not permitting the enemy to seal his or her fate. Moreover, in acts of self-determined martyrdom, the Jews challenged the very hostile ideology of the Crusade that precipitated their woes: The ultimate self-sacrifice was not that of the crusaders or of Jesus before them but that of the Ashkenazic Jew.<sup>3</sup>

To understand Jewish reactions to the persecutions of 1096 we must surely acknowledge the unique Ashkenazic Jewish experience as well as the climate of the Crusade, and we have much to learn from both these interpretive strategies. Perhaps a social and religious profile that predisposed Jews to martyrdom, coupled with the external stimulus of the Crusade and its hostile ideology, contributes the only sensible explanation for the acts of suicide and homicide committed by the Jewish martyrs. Nonetheless, when they ground the martyrs' behavior in the perspective on martyrdom that infuses the three Hebrew chronicles of 1096, I believe that both scholarly

approaches stand in need of correction. As I shall explain in Chapter 3 and seek to demonstrate in Part 2 of this book, we must evaluate the written records of *kiddush ha-Shem* in 1096 on a qualitatively different basis. Laying the groundwork for such a reassessment of the Hebrew chronicles, this chapter offers a brief overview of Jewish and Christian traditions of martyrdom and self-sacrifice as they developed in late antiquity, were transmitted to the early Middle Ages, and resonated during the period of the Crusades.

#### "I Shall Be Sanctified in the Midst of the Israelite People"

The painfully rich history of martyrdom in Jewish experience, from the biblical period and into modernity, merits thorough investigation unto itself.<sup>4</sup> Here we can offer only a general picture of early developments, highlighting landmarks that may inform the events of 1096 and/or the memories of these events among their survivors.

The willingness of heroic Israelites to offer their own lives and those of their loved ones out of devotion to God or for the greater good of their people appears in the earliest layers of Jewish tradition: from Abraham's binding of Isaac to the suicide of Samson and the self-induced slaying of King Saul; and from the attempted executions of Daniel and his three friends to the self-endangering refusal of Mordecai and Esther to yield before the evil designs of Haman. Yet martyrdom and the figure of the martyr assumed especial significance in Jewish society and religion beginning with the persecution of Judaism by the Hellenistic emperor Antiochus Epiphanes in the second century B.C.E. The Second Book of the Maccabees recounts the fate of those Jews who refused to violate their ancestral laws. "For instance, two women who had had their children circumcised were brought to trial; then, with their babies hanging at their breasts, they were paraded through the city and hurled headlong from the ramparts" (6:9-10). An elderly Jew named Eleazar was "forced to open his mouth and eat pork; but preferring death with honor to life with impiety, he spat it out and voluntarily submitted to the torture" (6:18-19). Even when his captors suggested that he publicly taste of kosher meat simply to give the impression to others that he was eating pork, he refused, fearing that "many of the young might believe that at the age of ninety Eleazar had turned apostate. If I practiced deceit for the sake of a brief moment of life, I should lead them astray and stain my old age with dishonor. I might, for the present,

avoid man's punishment, but alive or dead I should never escape the hand of the Almighty" (6:24-26).

Tortured to the brink of death, Eleazar exclaimed: "To the Lord belongs all holy knowledge; he knows what terrible agony I endure in my body from this flogging, though I could have escaped death; yet he knows also that in my soul I suffer gladly, because I stand in awe of him" (6:30). More horrifically still, 2 Maccabees relates that the king brutally tortured a mother and her seven sons, killing them in succession as the others watched, once again for not eating pork. Refusing even to address the king in Greek, the brothers gave no heed to his entreaties and threats and suffered most terribly as a result. Yet

the mother was the most remarkable of all, and she deserves to be remembered with special honor. She watched her seven sons perish within the space of a single day; yet she bore it bravely, for she trusted in the Lord. She encouraged each in turn in her native language; filled with noble resolution, her woman's thoughts fired by a manly spirit, she said to them: "You appeared in my womb, I know not how; it was not I who gave you life and breath, not I who set in order the elements of your being. The creator of the universe, who designed the beginning of mankind and devised the origin of all, will in his mercy give you back again breath and life, since now you put his laws above every thought of self." (7:20-23)

Identifying mother and sons with the ever-victorious goodness of reason—and transforming 2 Maccabees' tale of a single chapter into an epic of twelve chapters—the pseudepigraphic Fourth Book of the Maccabees added lavishly to this ode of praise.

O mother with the seven sons, who broke down the violence of the tyrant and thwarted his wicked devices and exhibited the nobility of faith! Nobly set like a roof upon the pillars of your children, you sustained, without yielding, the earthquake of your tortures. Be of good cheer, therefore, mother of holy soul, whose hope of endurance is secure with God. Not so majestic stands the moon in heaven as you stand, lighting the way to piety for your seven starlike sons, honored by God and firmly set with them in heaven. For your childbearing was from our father Abraham. (17:2-6)<sup>5</sup>

Other Judaic texts of late antiquity resound with similar themes. According to Philo the Jew of Alexandria in the first century C.E., the Jews who protested when the Roman Emperor Caligula sought to erect a statue of himself in their temple stood ready to die—and kill themselves—rather than have their shrine violated.

We gladly put our throats at your disposal. Let them slaughter, butcher, carve our flesh without a blow struck or blood drawn by us and do all the deeds that conquerors commit. But what need of an army! Our selves will conduct the sacrifices, priests of a noble order: wives will be brought to the altar by wife-slayers, brothers and sisters by fratricides, boys and girls in the innocence of their years by child-murderers. . . . Then, standing in the midst of our kinsfolk after bathing ourselves in their blood . . . , we mingle our blood with theirs by the crowning slaughter of ourselves.<sup>6</sup>

The first-century Jewish historian Josephus likewise left us his well-known account of the suicide pact of the Jewish zealots at Masada, urged upon them by their leader, Eleazar ben Yair, following the Romans' destruction of Jerusalem and the temple.

Unenslaved by the foe let us die, as free men with our children and wives let us quit this life together! This our laws enjoin, this our wives and children implore of us. The need for this is of God's sending, the reverse of this is the Romans' desire, and their fear is lest a single one of us should die before capture.<sup>7</sup>

Josephus recounted yet another Jewish suicide pact at Yodfat, from which only he and one comrade escaped with their lives; yet not only did he fail to explain the justification for such suicide in Jewish law, but he reportedly sought to convince his comrades that God opposed it.<sup>8</sup>

The destruction of the temple, the Bar Kokhba rebellion of the 130s, and the anti-Jewish decrees of the Roman emperor Hadrian also gave rise to numerous tales of martyrdom and self-sacrifice in the Talmud and midrash. These tales relate how four hundred young Jewish captives en route to Rome threw themselves into the sea rather than submit to sexual slavery. They retell the story of the mother and her seven sons.<sup>9</sup> And they recount the willingness of individual sages—Rabbi Akiba and Rabbi Chaninah ben Teradyon perhaps the best known among them—to martyr themselves for God and the Torah. As the period of the Talmud drew to a close, the acclaimed story of the ten martyrs wove various traditions concerning such heroes into an ornate narrative that still fills an important place in Jewish liturgy today.<sup>10</sup>

Yet the talmudic sages' concern for martyrdom did not rest with memories and tales of specific martyrs. As with virtually every other aspect of human experience, these rabbis strove to define the particulars of a Jew's obligation to sacrifice his or her life under the law. Several factors bore directly on their conclusions. On the one hand, the rabbis accorded fundamental value to human life, and they had no doubt that their God con-

curred. In the divine commandment of Leviticus 18:5, "You shall keep my laws and my rules, by which one shall live," the rabbinic preacher emphasized "*by which one shall live*, not by which one shall die," and reasoned that "the commandments were given only to Israel for the purpose of living by them," not for leading Jews to their deaths.<sup>11</sup> On the other hand, believing the fulfillment of divine law the purpose of human life, the rabbis demanded that the Jew submit to death sooner than violate three of the most cardinal *mitzvot*, or commandments, of the Torah. The Talmud reports the consensus of a second-century deliberation that reportedly transpired in an attic in the Judean town of Lod. "Regarding all the transgressions enumerated in the Torah, if they [presumably idolatrous pagans] say to a person, 'transgress and you shall not be killed,' he should transgress rather than be killed—except those of idolatry, incest, and homicide." Subsequent rabbis added important qualifications to these basic guidelines: During an outright persecution of Judaism, one must forfeit one's life sooner than violate what seems the most trivial of regulations. In any event, never may a Jew sin in public to save his or her life, only in private, except if the Jew's oppressor clearly has only his own personal gain in mind and intends no public disparagement of Judaism.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, although the martyrs remembered in the ancient Jewish sources that we have mentioned include both suicides and those killed—or willing to be killed—by their oppressors, the rabbis of the Talmud eventually began to distinguish between the two types. In those instances where the halakhah mandated that one "should be killed rather than transgress," the rabbinic formulation always employs the passive "should be killed," never an active voice that might suggest a self-inflicted death. And when Rabbi Chanina ben Teradyon, wrapped in a Torah scroll and bundles of vine-shoots (to prolong his immolation and suffering) and then set afire by the Romans, was prompted by his students to open his mouth and thereby die more quickly, he replied: "Better that he who gave life should take it away, and one should not bring physical harm upon oneself."<sup>13</sup> Still, outright rabbinic prohibition of suicide took quite some time to crystallize.<sup>14</sup>

Beyond spelling out these guidelines for self-sacrifice on behalf of the faith, classical rabbinic texts eventually defined such martyrdom as the optimal fulfillment of God's command in Leviticus 22:32: "You shall not profane my holy name, that I may be sanctified (*ve-nikdashiti*) amidst the Israelite people—I the Lord who sanctify you." While the rabbis like Akiba and Chanina who reportedly suffered during the second-century Hadrianic persecutions evidently did not draw a connection between this verse and

martyrdom, later tradition attributed it to them, and they served in subsequent Jewish memory as exemplars of *kiddush ha-Shem*, the sanctification of the name of God. In its new martyr-oriented conception, the injunction of the Torah not to profane the divine name, thus facilitating the sanctification of God, gave a rationale to the laws of self-sacrifice that we have just considered, especially those requiring martyrdom of a Jew, even when homicide, incest, and idolatry did not come into play.<sup>15</sup> The *Sifra* (a legal midrash on the Book of Leviticus) and the Babylonian Talmud attribute such an association to Rabbi Ishmael, also one of the famed ten martyrs, despite his disagreement with the consensus that his colleagues reached concerning one of the three cardinal transgressions in the attic in Lod.

Rabbi Ishmael used to say: How do you establish that if they tell a man in private, "Engage in idolatry and you will not be killed," he should transgress and not be killed? Scripture states: "by which one shall live," not by which one shall die. Would this mean that he should obey them even in public? Scripture states: "You shall not profane my holy name, that I may be sanctified." If you sanctify my name, I too will sanctify my name by your agency.<sup>16</sup>

Although Ishmael ruled that one might perform an idolatrous act (in private) to save one's life, his understanding that the commandment of *kiddush ha-Shem* mandated martyrdom to avoid any public transgression of the law lived on in rabbinic traditions. Other sources confirm the linkage of sanctification with martyrdom and with martyrdom's decisively public nature—as in the case of Daniel's friends Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, who "delivered themselves to the furnace in sanctification of the [divine] name." The Talmud explained:

They drew an *a fortiori* [*kal va-homer*] inference from the frogs [of the ten plagues in Egypt]. Of these frogs, who were not bound by the commandment of sanctifying God's name, it is written in Scripture that "they shall enter your house . . . , your ovens, and your kneading bowls." And when are kneading bowls next to the oven? When the oven is hot [so as to result in the frogs' death]. Therefore, [if the frogs were willing to risk death in the service of God,] how much the more so should we, who are bound by the commandment of sanctifying God's name [suffer the fire]!<sup>17</sup>

Acknowledging the heroic motivations of the biblical Daniel's three friends, rabbinic midrash ruled that the prohibition against suicide did not apply to Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, just as it did not apply to King Saul, who ordered his own squire to kill him rather than fall captive to the Philistines.<sup>18</sup> Early in the post-talmudic, geonic period, the Babylonian *She'iltot*

reviewed the laws of *kiddush ha-Shem* binding the Jew as its author understood them.

In cases of idolatry, incest, and homicide, even in private he must be killed and not transgress; in the case of other prohibitions [committed] in public he must likewise be killed and not transgress; if it is for the [oppressor's] personal gain [rather than the humiliation of Judaism], even in public and even in case of an idolatrous act he must transgress and not be killed; in time of persecution, even in the case of prohibitions other [than idolatry, incest, and homicide] and even in private he must be killed and not transgress.<sup>19</sup>

Incidents and written records of medieval Jewish martyrdom prior to the Crusades do not abound, but the little evidence that remains suggests that the biblical and rabbinic sources we have considered made their mark on both the lore and the law of early medieval Jews. On the one hand, rabbinic homilies and other popular traditions continued to offer precedents for the distinctive behavior attributed to Ashkenazic Jews in 1096 by the Hebrew Crusade chronicles.<sup>20</sup> Several late midrashim lavish praise on suicides with indisputably noble intentions.<sup>21</sup> *Josippon*, the tenth-century Hebrew adaptation of the histories of Josephus by an anonymous Italian Jew, recounts the collective suicides of Jews at Gamla and Masada during the rebellion against Rome.<sup>22</sup> A document from the Cairo genizah nearly contemporaneous with *Josippon* reports that three Jewish sages in Italy took their own lives at a time of persecution, one of them "slaughtered like a lamb sacrificed in the courtyard of the temple."<sup>23</sup> And a handful of additional Jewish and Christian documents, whose reliability and authenticity might be questionable, relate instances of self-inflicted martyrdom among French and German Jews late in the tenth and early in the eleventh century.<sup>24</sup>

On the other hand, Jewish legal sources composed within several generations of our Hebrew Crusade chronicles cast a different picture on the records of 1096. In summarizing the basic guidelines for compliance with the commandment of *kiddush ha-Shem*, the dean of medieval rabbinic jurists, the Spanish-born Moses Maimonides, unhesitatingly condemned acts of martyrdom beyond the limits of these stipulations. "Anyone of whom it is stated that he should transgress and not be killed, and who then lets himself be killed without having transgressed—such a person is culpable for having taken his own life."<sup>25</sup> Yet some Ashkenazic rabbis, perhaps with the martyrs of 1096 in mind, displayed greater understanding for those who exceeded the demands of the law. The northern European Tosafists of the

twelfth and thirteenth centuries permitted Jews to sacrifice their lives rather than violate any of the commandments, even when not in public or at a time of persecution.<sup>26</sup> Reacting to Rabbi Chanina ben Teradyon's principle that "one should not bring physical harm upon oneself," some defended the actions of the four hundred captive youths who drowned themselves, arguing that "when people fear that idolaters will use unbearable torture to make them commit a [heinous] sin, then it is obligatory to bring physical harm upon oneself."<sup>27</sup> In this view, one understood the same midrash that excluded King Saul and Daniel's three friends from the ban of suicide to mean that "at a time of persecution, one can deliver oneself to death and even kill oneself," particularly if one fears irresistible tortures. So, too, did those Jews of Ashkenaz in 1096 "who slaughtered the children at the time of forced conversion find their justification."<sup>28</sup>

When crusaders offered Ashkenazic Jews a choice between conversion and death in 1096, those Jews who submitted to martyrdom certainly acted in compliance with rabbinic understandings of *kiddush ha-Shem*: Christianity in their eyes constituted an idolatrous religion; this was a time of persecution; and most of those martyred met their deaths in public. Moreover, the Hebrew Crusade chronicles accentuate patterns of behavior that assumed prominence in earlier tales of Jewish martyrdom: a zealous commitment to the faith, the valor of men and women alike, concern for the punishment that they would suffer were they to live—not to mention the motif of self-inflicted death itself. Still, those Jews who killed themselves and their loved ones during the period of the Crusades had acted outside the strictly defined limits of halakhah as it was generally understood in their day. Though absolutely confident that these martyrs had sanctified God's name in the optimal fashion, the Tosafists recognized the need retroactively to provide justification for their behavior, and they responded accordingly.<sup>29</sup>

#### Christian Martyrdom and Crusading

Common wisdom has it that when given a choice between conversion and death, medieval Sefardic and Near Eastern Jews typically opted for conversion, while many more of their Ashkenazic coreligionists in northern Europe chose martyrdom. Although challenged on a variety of grounds, this generalization does have some truth to it, and a number of historians have linked these opposite tendencies to differences in belief and culture between

Muslim and Christian worlds. Medieval Christendom, they have suggested, produced more Jewish martyrs than the world of Islam because martyrdom as an ideal had greater prominence in Christianity than in mainstream Muslim tradition.<sup>30</sup> As earlier studies have established, Christian ideas of martyrdom influenced Jewish patterns of thought and behavior from the earliest stages of Christian history, just as Christian martyrs and stories of martyrdom drew on earlier Jewish models for inspiration.<sup>31</sup> These Christian traditions, too, must therefore figure in an understanding of the martyrs of 1096 as well as the Hebrew Crusade chronicles that memorialize them.

From Jesus to some of his disciples to the numerous Christian victims of Roman persecution, early Christianity presented its adherents with an array of esteemed and idealized martyrs.<sup>32</sup> In his Epistle to the Galatians, the apostle Paul had called upon Christians to participate, albeit metaphorically, in the crucifixion of Jesus; Jesus' disciples Stephen and Peter, as recounted in the Acts of the Apostles, offered additional models of readiness to submit to violent death on behalf of the new faith; and there is no question that the zeal of Christian martyrs contributed to the remarkable speed with which the church grew and flourished in the Roman Empire. "Acts," or accounts, of such martyrdom quickly assumed a place in the liturgy of Christian communities, inspiring the living as they commemorated the slain, usually on the anniversaries of their deaths.<sup>33</sup>

A willingness to suffer became a hallmark of Christian devotion, and apologists like the second-century church father Tertullian downplayed the loss of bodily life in the greater scheme of things.

Certainly, we are willing to suffer, but in the way that a soldier endures war. No one actually has a liking for suffering, since that inevitably involves anxiety and danger. However, a man fights a battle with all his strength and, though he complain about there being a battle, he finds delight in conquering in battle, because he is attaining glory and reward. There is a battle for us, because we are called to trial in court so that we may fight there for the truth while our life hangs in the balance. And the victory is to hold fast to that for which we have fought. This victory has attached to it the glory of pleasing God and the reward of eternal life.

Tertullian here redefined the notions of victory and defeat so that the former, which entails the reward of eternal life, depends not on overcoming the enemy in armed combat but on holding fast to the faith in the face of his violence. Accordingly, a martyr's death serves as *prima facie* evidence of triumphant success and, by extension, of everlasting reward. "We have

won the victory when we are killed; we escape at last when we are led forth. So you may call us 'faggot fellows' and 'half-axle men,' because we are bound to a half-axle post and burned in a circle of faggots. This is the garb of our victory . . . ; in such a chariot do we celebrate our triumph."<sup>34</sup>

Early Christian literature offers numerous examples of the martyr's victory over God's enemies, of the martyr's spiritual reward, and of the solidarity of the martyr's community. While Tertullian may have disavowed any outright desire to suffer, his words help to explain the enthusiasm with which many Christians of the Roman Empire hastened to sacrifice their lives, seeking—and perhaps provoking—opportunities to prove themselves in such a fashion. The acts of the martyrs record several accounts of actual suicides,<sup>35</sup> and many more of those who actively volunteered to die a martyr's death, even if they did not inflict the fatal blow upon themselves. Such voluntary martyrs played an important role in the imperial persecutions, as we learn from the vociferous protests against their behavior on the part of various church fathers, both before and after Tertullian.<sup>36</sup> Significantly, their objections hint at no meaningful distinction between these two kinds of voluntary death: suicide versus slaughter actively provoked by the martyr but not self-inflicted. In the second century, for instance, Clement of Alexandria contended that "those who have rushed on death (for there are some, not belonging to us, but sharing the name [of Christians] merely, who are in haste to give themselves up, the poor wretches dying through hatred to the Creator)—these, we say, banish themselves without being martyrs, even though they are punished publicly."<sup>37</sup> Though he eventually died a martyr's death, the third-century Cyprian of Carthage likewise admonished his followers, "Let no one among you . . . offer himself up to the pagans of his own volition."<sup>38</sup> Several generations later, his successor Mensurius forbade the veneration of Christians who "gave themselves up of their own accord and [knowing that this would result in their execution] volunteered the information that they possessed Scriptures which they would not hand over, when no one had asked them to do so."<sup>39</sup> Not only did Augustine of Hippo prohibit suicide in all cases except those when God explicitly commands it; he also did not distinguish between suicide and other expressions of voluntary martyrdom—"willful death," "rushing toward death," and "willful demise"—when condemning the excessively eager Donatist martyrs of his own generation.<sup>40</sup>

Even without direct reference to the acts of the Christian martyrs themselves, one can discern a zealous inclination to martyrdom in the early church that shares much with the outlook and actions attributed to the

Jewish martyrs of 1096. The Hebrew Crusade chronicles portray death in sanctification of God's name as ideal proof of one's faith in God. Though routed and slaughtered by the crusaders, the Jewish martyrs of Ashkenaz emerge victorious in this contest. Their faith is vindicated; they, not their attackers, merit the ultimate reward of eternal life after death. The Hebrew chronicles lavish praise on the valorous self-sacrifice of women with no less enthusiasm than they muster for men, just as women figured prominently in Christian martyrology.<sup>41</sup> The poems and chronicles lamenting the persecutions of 1096 draw no qualitative distinction between a Jewish martyr's wholehearted submission to death in sanctification of God's name and death actively inflicted by the martyr on himself or his loved ones.

Interesting confirmation of this parity appears in *Sefer Hasidim* (The Book of the Pious), a collection of Jewish pietistic teachings composed in Germany during the century after our chronicles.

There were two who slaughtered themselves but were not able to end their lives, and the Gentiles thought that they were dead even though they were not. Years later they died, and a certain Jew dreamt that those who were actually slain said to them [in paradise], "You shall not enter our company, since you were not killed in sanctification of the name as we were." They proceeded to show that their necks were cut, but the others responded, "Still, you did not die." Then an elderly man approached and said: "Because you wounded yourselves with intention to kill and because you were not baptized in their water, it is appropriate for us to be with you." And they brought them into their company.<sup>42</sup>

The crux of this pietistic tale is not whether Jewish martyrs were killed by themselves or by others but whether they in fact were killed, just as the acts of the Christian martyrs blur the distinction between acts of suicide and other examples of self-sacrifice more broadly construed.

Significantly, recent investigators of religious martyrdom in late antiquity have similarly—and consciously—refrained from such a categorical distinction. Avoiding the term "suicide" altogether, one pair of scholars has chosen to study the phenomenon of "voluntary death": "the act resulting from an individual's intentional decision to die, either by his own agency, by another's, or by contriving the circumstances in which death is the known, ineluctable result."<sup>43</sup> In a similar vein, others have broadened their definition of suicide to include, as Emile Durkheim proposed, "any case of death which results, directly or indirectly, from an act, positive or negative, accomplished by the victim himself and in the knowledge that it would necessarily produce this result."<sup>44</sup>



Augustine of Hippo's condemnations of suicide may well have become the norm in Christian law and doctrine, but their vehemence testifies no less to the strength of the popular sentiment that they seek to overcome. An inclination to martyrdom remained rooted in Christianity, as evidenced in two chapters in early medieval European history that also shed light on our own investigation. The first of these transpired during the 850s, when some fifty Christians in Muslim Cordoba sacrificed their lives in testimony to their faith. Remarkably, these "martyrs of Cordoba" precipitated their own demise, deliberately insulting Muhammad and Islam precisely with the intention of provoking their Muslim overlords. Modern scholarship has proposed a variety of explanations for their behavior, recorded by two contemporary Christian writers: a bishop named Eulogius, himself one of those slain, and Paulus Alvarus.<sup>45</sup> Yet the fact remains, as one historian has observed, that this episode was unique in the history of the church. These martyrs died at the hands of monotheists, not pagans; their deaths did not result from the persecution of Christianity but may have caused it; and, unlike the Christian martyrs of late antiquity, they worked no miracles.<sup>46</sup>

Again, one finds that the German Jews slain by the crusaders in 1096 shared much with these Christian martyrs of Cordoba, at least insofar as the two groups were portrayed by their respective martyrologists. In both instances, martyrdom and its memories served to assert a distinctive identity, that of the individual victim as well as that of the entire minority community, defiantly resisting any tendency—or temptation—to assimilate gradually or to convert outright to the culture of the majority. In either case, the narratives that memorialize the martyrs draw heavily on exemplary martyrs of old, biblical and postbiblical, in testifying to the glory of their subjects. Like their ancient Christian predecessors and the Jewish martyrs portrayed in the Hebrew Crusade chronicles, the martyrs of Cordoba viewed their public declaration of faith as guaranteeing them everlasting life in the next world immediately upon their deaths.

Most telling of all, however, the indisputably voluntary nature of their martyrdom as a group surpassed that of ancient martyrs. In the debate that they sparked in the Christian communities of southern Spain, any distinction between their actions (which stopped short of physically taking their own lives) and suicide figured little, if at all. Both Eulogius and Paulus Alvarus felt impelled to respond repeatedly to the challenges of their contemporaries that "this was not a time of persecution"; how, then, could those slain truly qualify as martyrs?<sup>47</sup> The martyrs' critics said, moreover, that "those who are not drawn violently to their death but proceed of their

own free will should not rank as martyrs nor be considered like them."<sup>48</sup> The question was not, technically speaking, whose hands actually wielded the fatal weapon at the moment of death. The problem lay in the claim of some Christians, including members of the local clergy, that official violence neither compelled those slain to deny their faith nor removed them from the practice of their holy, pious religion. Rather, they died of their own free choice, submitting themselves to harm on account of their pride, which constitutes the source of all sin. In a word, they became the murderers of their own souls.<sup>49</sup> *Mutatis mutandis*, one could conceivably make the same argument with regard to some of the Jewish martyrs of the First Crusade.

The second chapter of medieval Christian history shedding light on the Jewish martyrs and martyrologies of 1096 is that of the First Crusade itself. Jewish scholars of the last several generations already acknowledged its importance in this regard, citing such groundbreaking studies as Carl Erdmann's *Origin of the Idea of Crusade* to shed light on the Jewish zeal for martyrdom in 1096. First published in German in 1935, Erdmann's work has determined the agenda for most discussion of the roots, substance, and evolution of the crusading ideal ever since. In brief, Erdmann contended that the idea of the crusade stemmed from an age-old Christian concept of holy war; mid-eleventh-century popes had recently revitalized this concept in the spirit of the Cluniac monastic reform movement, articulated most forcefully by Pope Gregory VII. When Pope Urban II delivered his fateful address to the Council of Clermont in November 1095, launching the First Crusade, the essential crusading idea had already taken shape. Although Urban successfully blended this concept with popular notions of the soldier of Christ (*miles Christi*), his guiding idea was basically a notion of world order; the crusade comprised a means for establishing a thoroughly Christian society subject to the authority of the papacy. According to Erdmann, Urban's primary goal lay not in the redemption of Jerusalem but the defense of the Byzantine Empire from attack by the Muslims. The pope displayed little interest in promoting popular piety in general or pilgrimage among laypersons in particular. Contrary to what many subsequently understood, the "indulgence" that he granted crusaders offered them only a reduction in the penance due for their sins, hardly a blanket remission of guilt.<sup>50</sup>

Although Yitzhak Baer and other Jewish scholars may have looked to Erdmann's foundational thesis for support in rationalizing the responses of Ashkenazic Jews to the First Crusade,<sup>51</sup> it seems that critical responses to



Erdmann among Crusade historians of the last decades might prove even more helpful. If Erdmann specified ideas of holy war and the army of Christ as the core of crusading ideology, others have stressed the value that it placed on pilgrimage and penance. Where Erdmann identified Byzantium and the defense of eastern Christendom as the chief objective of the Crusade, others have focused on the sanctity of Jerusalem and the attraction of its holy places. While Erdmann viewed the Crusade as a papal power play of sorts, others have discerned its foundations in popular piety, in mystically grounded calls for repentance, and in heightened anticipation of the last days.<sup>52</sup> Finally, some scholars have challenged Erdmann's insistence that the ideology of crusading antedated the Crusade itself. Perhaps it materialized only as the crusaders made their way eastward, or, perhaps, it jelled in the formulations of Christian chroniclers who looked backward after the fact, especially writers who gave accounts of the Crusade from a distinctly monastic point of view. For our present purposes, this last issue of chronology assumes particular importance insofar as it concerns the crusading ideal of martyrdom, the widespread popular belief that death in battle guaranteed the crusader's soul entry into paradise: Did this promise induce the Christian combatants of the First Crusade to take up the cross, or did it begin to circulate only later?<sup>53</sup> More generally, this issue also sharpens the question of the distance between the events of the Crusade and Christendom's discourse of crusading. Without recognizing such a gap, how, for example, might one rationalize the title of Crusade historian Jonathan Riley-Smith's valuable article "Crusading as an Act of Love"?<sup>54</sup>

We shall see below that precisely these dimensions of the crusading ideal highlighted by Erdmann's critics inform the mentality of the Hebrew chronicles of 1096: Jerusalem and its sacred sites, collective popular piety, atonement for sin, expectations of the end of days, and the like. Granted, one might logically expect a degree of similarity between Christian and Jewish ideals of religious martyrdom at the time of the Crusade. Still, we cannot justify postulating a direct line from the ideology of monastic and papal reform in the tenth and eleventh centuries to that of the Crusade, as Carl Erdmann would have it, and from crusading ideology to the mentality of the Jewish martyrs, as proposed by Yitzhak Baer. Moreover, although Baer and his school have sought to minimize the distance or gap—chronological and otherwise—between the events of 1096 and the descriptions of Jewish martyrdom recorded in the chronicles, this too is hardly self-evident.

Jonathan Riley-Smith has argued cogently that, in the wake of partici-

pants' and eyewitnesses' narratives of the First Crusade, monastic writers in Europe composed a "second generation" of more stylized, "finished" chronicles; only in these later texts, he maintains, did the full-blown idea of the Crusade take shape for the first time. Crusading ideology of the early twelfth century, therefore, was far more developed and nuanced than that which had existed on the eve of the First Crusade. According to Riley-Smith, the monastic origin of these second-generation chronicles resulted in their perception of the crusaders as temporary members of monastic orders, "professed into what looked to them like a military monastery on the move."<sup>55</sup> These monastic chronicles bequeathed to posterity the classic Christian ideals of crusading: (1) a holy war of untold cosmic and historical significance; (2) a Christian society of the elect, imbued with the values of monastic reform (penance, prayer, and desire to find favor in the eyes of God); (3) the emulation of biblical models by that very elect group, especially in the conquest of the promised land; and (4) a commitment to martyrdom as a preferred means for the imitation of Christ. Reacting to Riley-Smith, French scholar Jean Flori has since compiled statistical tabulations of references to martyrdom and death in combat in both eyewitness accounts and the later, monastic chronicles of the First Crusade. A pronounced hope for a martyr's death, he has concluded, must have pervaded the ranks of the crusaders from the very outset of their expeditions eastward.<sup>56</sup> Though ostensibly contradictory, the findings of Riley-Smith and Flori naturally militate toward a middle ground. No doubt the martyr's zeal imbued the crusading spirit from the outset, but a more mature, refined expression of the crusading ideal of martyrdom awaited the monastic chronicles (and calls for additional Crusades) of the twelfth century.

What, then, might the prior history of Christian martyrdom contribute to our appreciation of the Hebrew chronicles of the First Crusade? First, helpful examples of the manner in which martyrs and their idealization by their survivors serve to fortify a religious community in crisis. Second, precedents for the zeal that could lead prospective martyrs not only to provoke their demise but even to commit suicide. (To be sure, ancient Jewish martyrs must have inspired Ashkenazic Jewry during the Crusade and its aftermath; yet, owing to the physical and ideological threat with which the Crusade confronted the Jews, Christian models might well have offered a standard for emulation and competition.) Third, as Shmuel Shepkaru has noted insightfully, a basis for the Hebrew chronicles' confidence that those who sanctified God's name made their way, immediately

and directly, to heavenly paradise. Against the background of medieval Christian tradition,

voluntary death [now] served medieval Jews as an avenue through which to ascend to God and personally benefit from their altruism. These new characteristics were added to the martyrological narrative because of the new living reality [of crusading] in the Latin West and the veneration of martyrdom and its blissful reward. The Christian leaders of the crusades ensured the appeal of the crusades through martyrdom and by granting a subsequent celestial reward in heavenly Jerusalem. Ashkenazic Jews could not fall behind and produced their own system of reward. The new characteristics of this celestial system were thus uniquely Ashkenazic, yet not exclusively Jewish.<sup>57</sup>

Finally, the Christian narratives of the First Crusade offer a model for appreciating how, inspired by memories of self-sacrifice that surely occurred, our Hebrew texts gave a mature formulation to their own brand of crusading ideal—that of death in the sanctification of God's name (*'al kiddush ha-Shem*)—only during the decades that followed the Crusade. In the first instance, therefore, they serve as testimony to the historical experience of that later generation. We shall see not only that the processes and products of Jewish collective memory in twelfth-century Ashkenaz mirrored those of Christian records of the Crusade, but that they utilized symbols, traditions, and literary devices similarly shared by the two religious communities. And this they did to an astounding extent.

## Chapter 2

### *The First Crusade and Its Historians*

The anti-Jewish violence of 1096 has received little attention in general works on the history of the Crusades. Most such histories make do with passing mention of the persecutions; several offer brief reviews of the major events; but, apart from occasional consideration of the attackers' motives, few undertake any extensive investigation or analysis.<sup>1</sup>

All this is understandable. The attacks on Jewish communities were a diversion for the crusaders rather than a primary objective; in relation to other anti-Jewish hostilities of the Christian Middle Ages, they inflicted relatively little physical damage of lasting consequence, despite the tragic loss of life that they entailed. The size, economic prosperity, and cultural achievement of northern European Jewish communities typically rose throughout the twelfth century, notwithstanding the pogroms. If anything, one should wonder at the prominence accorded the persecutions of 1096 in Jewish memory and historical writing, compared, for example, with the relatively unknown "Rintfleisch" and "Armleder" massacres in Germany in 1298 and 1336–38, bloodshed sparked by anti-Jewish slander and social stasis that claimed thousands more casualties.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, twelfth-century Hebrew chroniclers of the First Crusade committed their stories to writing out of the conviction that Jews of the Diaspora had never before suffered nor valiantly withstood the trials of suffering as the Jews of the Rhineland did in 1096. For the chronicle attributed to Solomon bar Samson, not only did the Jewish martyrs of 1096 outshine those who had preceded them, but never "has there been anyone like them again."<sup>3</sup>

Following the lead of their medieval predecessors, modern historians of medieval Jews have commonly viewed the persecutions of 1096 as a critical turning point in medieval Jewish history. Until the First Crusade, runs this argument, Jews fared relatively well in the Latin West. They lived alongside their Christian neighbors with minimal interference from church or state, and they suffered physical persecution in only a few, isolated instances. After the violence of 1096, however, the status of medieval Jews

Chapter 6  
 'Mistress Rachel of Mainz

My critics have accused me of transforming acts of Jewish martyrdom into tales of events that never occurred; instead of treating the Hebrew Crusade chronicles as works of history, so they claim, I have mistreated them as literature, mining them for symbols and codes while overlooking the facts. While I have no doubt that the acts of the martyrs directly inspired those who told their stories and those who collected these stories in the chronicles, this hardly proves that in their specific episodes the chronicles preserve an accurate, play-by-play account of what *in fact happened in the Rhineland in 1096*. Without corroboration in other sources—which, in almost every case, does not exist—we have no way of knowing whether they do or do not. Rather, the richness of their symbolism, the narrative games at play in their reporting, and their origin among those who survived the massacres are all part of the historical truth that the stories do embody and express. Particularly in our post-Holocaust age, we must wrestle with collective memory as evidence of “fact,” or as historical data unto itself. Furthermore, if elements in the martyrs’ tales of 1096 seem more characteristic of works of literature than historical writing—such that one might more appropriately classify our sources as fiction, not chronicles, as Ivan Marcus suggested some twenty years ago<sup>1</sup>—this should hardly devalue them for students of the past. From ancient times until the nineteenth century, most Western intellectuals would have followed the lead of Aristotle in maintaining the opposite: Poetry, drama, and literature in general have a universal relevance; history bears only on particular times, places, and individuals.<sup>2</sup> One should hardly wonder if those who told and edited the stories making their way into the Crusade chronicles had priorities in mind other than those of the modern “scientific” historian.

With such reflections in mind, we return to the narratives of the chronicles, to the tale of medieval Jewish martyrdom that many remember as the most grizzly and horrendous of all, that of Mistress Rachel of Mainz.

The Sources

Like the account of the martyrs of Xanten and that of Isaac the *parnas*, Rachel’s story appears in two of the three Hebrew Crusade chronicles; moreover, several prominent motifs in these versions of her tale are echoed in a piyyut, a liturgical poem, by an Ashkenazic Jew who survived the persecutions. Despite their length, we must have these sources before us in order to proceed systematically.

“Mainz Anonymous” Chronicle

The “Account of the Persecutions of Old” (the “Mainz Anonymous” chronicle) includes the following scene in its report of the carnage in Mainz:<sup>3</sup>

There there was a distinguished woman, the young Mistress Rachel,	i
daughter of R. Isaac b. R. Asher. She said to her companion, “I have	ii
four children. Even on them have no mercy, lest these uncircumcised	iii
ones come and take them alive and they be maintained in their error.	iv
Sanctify [God’s] holy name in them, too.” One of her companions	v
came and took the knife, and when [Rachel] saw the knife she burst	vi
into wild and bitter sobbing [Genesis 27:34], and she struck her face,	vii
shouting out, “O Lord, where is your steadfast love.” She took her	viii
younger son Isaac—he was most pleasant—and slaughtered him, and	ix
she stretched out her arms [or sleeves] between the two brothers and said	x
to her companion: “By your life, do not slay Isaac in front of Aaron.” <sup>4</sup>	xi
As for the lad Aaron, upon seeing that his brother had been slain he	xii
shouted, “My mother, my mother, do not slay me”; and he went and	xiii
hid under a box. [Rachel] then took her two daughters Bella and	xiv
Madrona and sacrificed them to the Lord, God of hosts, who	xv
commanded us not to compromise our untainted fear of him and to be	xvi
totally wholehearted with him. When the righteous woman finished	xvii
sacrificing her three children to our creator, she raised her voice and	xviii
called out to her son, “Aaron, Aaron, where are you? I shall not have	xix
mercy nor spare you either.” She pulled him by his leg out from under	xx
the box where he had hidden and sacrificed him to God the powerful	xxi
and the exalted. She then placed them on her lap in her two arms, two	xxii
on one side and two on the other, and they were writhing on her	xxiii
until the crusaders took the room, and they found her sitting and	xxiv
lamenting over them. They said to her, “Show us the treasure that you	xxv
have in your arms.” When they saw that the children were slaughtered	xxvi
they beat her and killed her. Of them and of her it is written in	xxvii
Scripture [Hosea 10:14], “Mothers and babes were dashed to death	xxviii

together." For she died along with them just as that other righteous woman died with her seven sons; of her it is written in Scripture [Psalm 113:9], "a happy mother of children."

xxix  
xxx  
xxxi

Here we have a heartrending account of a Jewish woman mustering the courage to sacrifice the fruit of her womb so that they would not fall captive to the crusaders and be raised as Christians in Christian homes. In the version of the Mainz Anonymous, the story of Rachel has recently figured prominently in scholarly debates as to the chronological order of the various chronicles,<sup>5</sup> and a good number of investigators have argued that this is the earliest recollection of Mistress Rachel that we have. Yet two other sources deserve mention.

### Solomon bar Samson Chronicle

As in previous chapters, the longer narrative in the chronicle attributed to Solomon bar Samson proves to be much more fertile ground for our method of analysis, and we need to quote its story of Rachel in full.

Who ever witnessed the like of this? Who ever heard of something like the deed of this righteous, pious woman, the young Mistress Rachel, daughter of R. Isaac b. R. Asher, wife of R. Judah. She said to her companions, "I have four children. Even on them have no mercy, lest these uncircumcised ones come and take them alive and they be maintained in their error. Sanctify the name of the holy God in them, too." One of her companions came and took the knife to slay her son, and when the children's mother saw the knife she burst into wild and bitter sobbing, and she struck her face and her breast, saying, "O Lord, where is your steadfast love." The woman [Rachel] said to her companions in her misery: "Do not slay Isaac in front of his brother Aaron, so that he [Aaron] should not witness his brother's death and run away from us." The [other] woman took the lad, small and very pleasant as he was, and slaughtered him, and the mother stretched out her arms to receive their blood, and she received the blood in her sleeves instead of in the cultic chalice of blood. Upon seeing that his brother had been slain, the lad Aaron shouted, "My mother, do not slay me"; and he went and hid under a box. She still had two daughters, Bella and Madrona, stately and beautiful virgins, daughters of her husband R. Judah, and the girls took the knife and sharpened it so it would have no blemish. [Rachel] then extended their necks and sacrificed them to the Lord, God of hosts, who commanded us not to compromise our untainted fear of him and to be totally forthcoming with him, as it is written in Scripture, "You must be wholehearted with the Lord your God."

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

When the righteous woman finished sacrificing her three children to their creator, she raised her voice and called out to her son, "Aaron, Aaron, where are you? I shall not have mercy nor spare you either." She pulled him by his leg out from under the box where he had hidden and sacrificed him to God the powerful and the exalted. She then placed them on her lap in her two arms, two on one side and two on the other, and they were writhing on her until the enemy took the room, and they found her sitting and lamenting over them. They said to her, "Show us the treasure that you have in your arms." When they saw the children and that they were slaughtered, they beat her and killed her along with them; her soul expired, and she died. Of her it is written in Scripture, "Mothers and babes were dashed to death together," as was she along with her four children, just as the righteous woman died with her seven sons; and of them it is written in Scripture, "a happy mother of children." The father, well-built and handsome, screamed, crying and wailing, when he beheld the death of his four children. He went and threw himself on the sword in his own hand; his entrails came out, and he lay in the middle of the road, drenched in blood.<sup>6</sup>

25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### "I said, 'Look away from me'"

Finally, we must quote from "I said, 'Look away from me,'" a *piyyut* written by Kalonymos bar Judah, who belonged to one of the most distinguished rabbinic families of the Rhineland, who witnessed the events of 1096, and whose memories inspired several noteworthy liturgical laments. Describing the heroism of the Jewish martyrs in his poem, he wrote more generally of the horrors of parents slaughtering their children to prevent their capture and baptism.

The father subdued his compassion, brought his children to sacrifice like lambs to the slaughter; indeed, he prepared the slaughterhouse for his own children. When the women set aside the children of their own tender care for the slaughter, and dragged them to the shambles, they said to their mothers: "Behold, we are being slaughtered and massacred." Who can hear the father proclaim his faith in the words of the *Shema* while his son is being slaughtered and refrain from shedding tears? Who has seen or heard the like? The stately, beautiful virgin, daughter of Judah, did whet and sharpen the knife and stretched out her neck; the all-observing eye saw it and did bear witness. The mother was afflicted and breathed forth her soul, when she reconciled herself to the sacrifice, as a happy mother prepares a meal for her children. Betrothed maidens and wedded daughters did exult as they danced joyfully to meet the scourging sword, that their blood be shed upon the bare rock, never to be covered. The father turned away

a  
b  
c  
d  
e  
f  
g  
h  
i  
j  
k  
l  
m  
n  
o