

JEWES AND CHRISTIANS IN
MEDIEVAL EUROPE:
THE HISTORIOGRAPHICAL LEGACY
OF BERNHARD BLUMENKRANZ

Edited by
Philippe Buc, Martha Keil and John Tolan

BREPOLS

Relmin is supported by the European Research Council, under the EU 7th Framework Programme.

Relmin est financé par le Conseil Européen de la Recherche, sous le 7ème Programme Cadre de l'Union Européenne.

© 2016, **Brepols Publishers n.v.**, Turnhout, Belgium.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

D/2015/0095/194

ISBN 978-2-503-56516-3

ISBN 978-2-503-56559-0

DOI 10.1484/M.RELMIN-EB.5.108025

Printed on acid-free paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Philippe Buc, Martha Keil and John Tolan</i> , Foreword	7
<i>Robert Chazan</i> , Medieval Christian–Jewish Relations in the Writings of Bernhard Blumenkranz	11
I. THE MEDIEVAL CHURCH AND THE JEWS	21
<i>Capucine Nemo-Pekelman</i> , The Ambiguous Notions of Jewish Legal ‘Statutes’ and ‘Status’ in Blumenkranz’s Work	23
<i>Anna Sapir Abulafia</i> , Engagement with Judaism and Islam in Gratian’s <i>Causa 23</i>	35
<i>Birgit Wiedl</i> , Sacred Objects in Jewish Hands. Two Case Studies	57
<i>Eveline Brugger</i> , Smoke in the Chapel: Jews and Ecclesiastical Institutions in and around Vienna during the Fourteenth Century	79
II. CONVERSION AND PROSELYTISM	95
<i>Martha Keil</i> , What Happened to the ‘New Christians’? The ‘Viennese Geserah’ of 1420/21 and the Forced Baptism of the Jews	97
<i>Danièle Iancu-Agou</i> , Nostradamus’ Maternal Great-Grandfather from Marseilles: Neophyte Networks and Matrimonial Strategies (1460–1496)	115
<i>Claire Soussen</i> , The Epistle of Rabbi Samuel de Fez, What Kind of a New Strategy against Judaism?	131

III. ART AND MATERIAL CULTURE	147
<i>Debra Higgs Strickland</i> , Gazing into Bernhard Blumenkranz's <i>Mirror of Christian Art</i> : The Fourteenth-Century Tring Tiles and the Jewishness of Jesus in Post-Expulsion England	149
<i>Eva Haverkamp</i> , Jewish Images on Christian Coins: Economy and Symbolism in Medieval Germany	189
<i>Katrin Kogman-Appel</i> , Eschatology in the Catalan <i>Mappamundi</i>	227
IV. PLACES AND ENCOUNTER	253
<i>Gerard Nahon</i> , L'Athènes des juifs : sources hébraïques sur les juifs de Paris au Moyen Âge	255
<i>Ram Ben Shalom</i> , Isaac Nathan: The Last Jewish Intellectual in Provence	293
<i>Javier Castaño</i> , The Peninsula as a Borderless Space: Towards a Mobility 'Turn' in the Study of Fifteenth-Century Iberian Jewries	315
<i>Judith Olszowy-Schlanger</i> , 'Meet you in court': Legal Practices and Christian–Jewish Relations in the Middle Ages	333
<i>Claude Denjean et Juliette Sibon</i> , Être historien des juifs médiévaux en France après Bernhard Blumenkranz	349
INDEX	367
Opus	369
Subjects	371
Person	373
Geo	381

SMOKE IN THE CHAPEL: JEWS AND ECCLESIASTICAL INSTITUTIONS IN AND AROUND VIENNA DURING THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY*

Eveline Brugger

Institute for Jewish History in Austria

The theological stance of the Austrian clergy towards the Jews has been a topic of research for a long time; more recently, the number of studies on economic contacts between Jews and ecclesiastical institutions (especially in the context of moneylending) has also increased.¹ This article will therefore focus on another, less frequently addressed perspective on the relations between Viennese Jews and members of the clergy, namely on those interactions that were the result of everyday situations and during which matters of religion were not necessarily the primary concern of the involved parties. Thus, it will attempt to add another aspect to the information drawn from theological treatises and historiographic texts written by members of the clergy – because those sources tell us very little about the ‘normality’ of everyday life, especially during a time when the Jews in and around the city of Vienna were living in relative peace among the Christian majority.

Based on a generous privilege by Duke Friedrich II which defined their legal status in 1244, the Austrian Jews had enjoyed peace and growing prosperity during most of the thirteenth century.² The first half of the fourteenth century

* Research for this article was funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF): P24404-G18.

1 Fritz Peter Knapp, ‘Christlich-theologische Auseinandersetzungen mit dem Judentum im spätmittelalterlichen Österreich’, in *Ein Thema – zwei Perspektiven: Juden und Christen in Mittelalter und Frühneuzeit*, ed. by Eveline Brugger and Birgit Wiedl (Innsbruck-Wien-Bozen: StudienVerlag, 2007), pp. 269–86; Fritz Peter Knapp, ‘In Frieden höre ein Bruder den anderen an. Geistige Auseinandersetzungen der Christen mit jüdischem Gedankengut im mittelalterlichen Herzogtum Österreich’, *Arye Maimon-Institut für Geschichte der Juden: Studien und Texte*, 6 (2012), pp. 9–50 (pp. 22–38); Eveline Brugger, ‘Von der Ansiedlung bis zur Vertreibung. Juden in Österreich im Mittelalter’, in *Geschichte der Juden in Österreich*, by Eveline Brugger, Martha Keil, Albert Lichtblau, Christoph Lind, and Barbara Staudinger (Wien: Ueberreuter, 2nd ed. 2013), pp. 123–227, 585–96 (pp. 164–65).

2 Eveline Brugger and Birgit Wiedl, *Regesten zur Geschichte der Juden in Österreich im Mittelalter*, vols I–III (Innsbruck-Wien-Bozen: StudienVerlag, 2005–2015), vol. I (2005), pp. 35–38, no. 25; Robert Chazan, *The Jews of Medieval Western Christendom 1000–1500* (Cambridge and others: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 188–90; Robert Chazan, *Reassessing Jewish Life in Medieval Europe* (Cambridge and others: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 123–25; Klaus Lohrmann, *Judenrecht und Judenpolitik*

brought about the first major persecutions of Jews in the duchy of Austria – first on a local scale, for instance the murder of ten Jews after an alleged host desecration in the town of Korneuburg near Vienna in 1305.³ In 1338, another accusation of host desecration in the small Lower Austrian town of Pulkau triggered the first persecution that went beyond the local scope; it affected Jews in several dozen towns of Lower Austria as well as in the neighbouring countries of Bohemia and Moravia. None of these persecutions were instigated by a higher secular or ecclesiastical authority, even though the alleged host desecrations led to a significant amount of theological debate and the creation of several pilgrimage sites.⁴ The Jewish community of Vienna – the biggest and most important community in the duchy of Austria – remained safe from the Pulkau persecution, but at a price: the citizenry of Vienna forced the Jewish community to accept a severe reduction of interest rates on Jewish loans for Viennese citizens in return for protection.⁵

For the rest of the fourteenth century, the Jews of Vienna remained mostly safe from violent persecution, even though economic pressure on them was growing. While the Habsburg dukes did not (yet) go back on their promise of protection, they increasingly regarded their Jewish subjects as a source of income that

im mittelalterlichen Österreich (Wien-Köln: Böhlau, 1990), pp. 53–84. On the beginning of Jewish settlement in Austria during the thirteenth century in general, see Brugger, 'Von der Ansiedlung bis zur Vertreibung', pp. 127–29; on Vienna in particular see *ibid.*, pp. 169–71; Klaus Lohrmann, *Die Wiener Juden im Mittelalter* (Berlin-Wien: Philo, 2000), pp. 22–32, 110–13.

3 Eveline Brugger, 'Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Rulers, Cities, and 'their' Jews in Austria during the Persecutions of the Fourteenth Century', in *Slay Them Not: Jews in Medieval Christendom*, ed. by Merrall Price and Kristine Utterback (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2013), pp. 189–200 (pp. 189–93). On the Korneuburg persecution, see Brugger, 'Von der Ansiedlung bis zur Vertreibung', pp. 211–16; *Germania Judaica II/1,2. Von 1238 bis zur Mitte des 14. Jahrhunderts*, ed. by Zvi Avneri (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1968), vol. II/1, p. 450, vol. II/2, p. 894; Miri Rubin, *Gentile Tales. The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews* (New Haven-London: Yale University Press, 1999), pp. 57–65; Winfried Stelzer, 'Am Beispiel Korneuburg: Der angebliche Hostienfrel österreichischer Juden von 1305 und seine Quellen', in *Österreich im Mittelalter. Bausteine zu einer revidierten Gesamtdarstellung. Studien und Forschungen aus dem Niederösterreichischen Institut für Landeskunde*, 26, ed. by Willibald Rosner (St. Pölten: Niederösterreichisches Institut für Landeskunde, 1999), pp. 309–48 (pp. 313–14, 328–40); Birgit Wiedl, 'The Host on the Doorstep: Perpetrators, Victims, and Bystanders in an Alleged Host Desecration in Fourteenth-Century Austria', in *Crime and Punishment in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times*, Fundamentals of Medieval and Early Modern Culture, 7, ed. by Albrecht Classen and Connie L. Scarborough (Berlin-Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2012), pp. 299–346.

4 Brugger, 'Between a Rock and a Hard Place', pp. 193–96; Jonathan Elukin, *Living Together, Living Apart. Rethinking Jewish-Christian Relations in the Middle Ages* (Princeton-Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2007), p. 107; Mitchell B. Merback, *Pilgrimage & Pogrom. Violence, Memory, and Visual Culture at the Host-Miracle Shrines of Germany and Austria* (Chicago-London: University of Chicago Press, 2012), pp. 76–78; Birgit Wiedl, 'Die angebliche Hostienschändung in Pulkau 1338 und ihre Rezeption in der christlichen und jüdischen Geschichtsschreibung', *medaon. Magazin für jüdisches Leben in Forschung und Bildung*, 6 (2010), pp. 1–14 (http://medaon.de/pdf/A_Wiedl-6-2010.pdf).

5 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, I, pp. 336–38, no. 439–40; Lohrmann, *Die Wiener Juden im Mittelalter*, pp. 71–74.

could be exploited at will.⁶ At the same time, municipal authorities tried to gain greater influence over 'their' Jews, although the strong ducal authority made sure that these attempts never went very far in Austria.⁷ Municipal legal texts from the second half of the fourteenth century sometimes contain open hostility towards Jews. The most frequently quoted example is the *Wiener Stadtbuch*, a private Viennese collection of municipal legal customs, which commented the Statute of the Market (granted to the Austrian Jews by the aforementioned ducal privilege in 1244 to protect Jewish pawnbrokers in case they unknowingly accepted stolen goods as pledges) with the complaint that 'die verfluchten juden vil pezzet recht habent gegen den christen denn die christen gegen den juden' ('the accursed Jews have much better rights towards the Christians than the Christians have towards the Jews').⁸

However, neither these developments nor the increase in ecclesiastical anti-Jewish rhetoric seem to have had much immediate impact on Jewish-Christian relations in Vienna. Jewish settlement was concentrated in the Jewish quarter around today's Judenplatz, but Jewish house ownership can be traced in other parts of the city as well, and sources on Jewish business transactions are more numerous than ever before during the last decades of the fourteenth century.⁹ This type of sources also provides a considerable part of our information on everyday Jewish-Christian interaction, although in order to analyse the relations between Jews and Christians in general, and between Jews and the clergy in particular,

6 Eveline Brugger, 'Minem herren dem hertzogen sein juden – die Beziehung der Habsburger zu "ihren" Juden im spätmittelalterlichen Österreich', in 25. *Österreichischer Historikertag, St. Pölten 2008. Tagungsbericht*. Veröffentlichungen des Verbands Österreichischer Historiker und Geschichtsvereine, 34 (St. Pölten: Niederösterreichisches Landesarchiv und Niederösterreichisches Institut für Landeskunde, 2010), pp. 742–49.

7 Birgit Wiedl, 'Codifying Jews. Jews in Austrian Town Charters of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries', in *Slay Them Not: Jews in Medieval Christendom*, ed. by Merral Price and Kristine Utterback (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2013), pp. 201–22 (pp. 201–03); Birgit Wiedl, 'Jews and the City. Parameters of Jewish Urban Life in Late Medieval Austria', in *Urban Space in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Age*, Fundamentals of Medieval and Early Modern Culture, 4, ed. by Albrecht Classen (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), pp. 273–308 (pp. 291–92, 301).

8 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, vol. II (2010), p. 322, no. 929; Christine Magin: 'Wie es umb der iuden recht stet'. *Der Status der Juden in spätmittelalterlichen deutschen Rechtsbüchern*. Göttinger Philosophische Dissertationen, D7 (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 1999), pp. 102–05, 371–72. On the Statute of the Market, see Michael Toch, *The Economic History of European Jews. Late Antiquity and Early Middle Ages*. Études sur le Judaïsme Médiéval, 56 (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2013), p. 211; Wiedl, 'Codifying Jews', p. 208.

9 The collection and evaluation of these sources is an ongoing project at the Institute for Jewish History in Austria. So far, the material up to the year 1386 has been published (Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, I–III); volume IV, which covers the period from 1387–1404, is currently being prepared for publication. On Jewish house ownership in Vienna, see Ignaz Schwarz, *Das Wiener Ghetto, seine Häuser und seine Bewohner*. Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der Juden in Deutsch-Österreich, 2 (Wien-Leipzig: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1909), pp. 1–148.

we need to look further than to sources documenting moneylending alone.¹⁰ When, for example, the Bishop of Brixen and Austrian chancellor, Johann von Platzheim, addressed the Viennese Jew David Steuss as ‘der erber und weiser, unser lieber freunt David der Steuzze’ (‘the honourable and wise [man], our dear friend David Steuss’) in a business charter in 1364, it can hardly be considered a typical example. At that time, David Steuss was by far the richest and most important Jewish moneylender – not only in Vienna, but in the entire duchy of Austria – and Johann von Platzheim was so heavily in debt that he would probably have gone to great lengths to avoid losing David Steuss as a creditor.¹¹ It is certain that David Steuss, too, profited from the association with the influential chancellor, but their business contacts represent the absolute elite of the Austrian clergy and the Viennese Jewry respectively, and give us no insights into the way clerics and Jews interacted on a daily basis.

The fact that these two groups interacted in the first place is evident from the source material, especially from the sources pertaining to land and house ownership in and around the city, and to the various rents and levies that had to be paid by the holders of these properties. There is ample evidence for Jews as tenants of church-owned estates, or paying rent charges from their houses to monastic institutions.

A significant portion of the plots of land in and around the city of Vienna were under ecclesiastical – often monastic – lordship,¹² so it is not surprising that Jewish tenants frequently came into contact with clerical land lords or land ladies. In 1359, the Jew Isserl of Ödenburg and his wife Nechel sold a house that had come into their possession as an unredeemed pledge for a loan. Since the house, situated next to the nunnery of St. Agnes *an der Himmelspforte*, was under

10 Eveline Brugger, ‘Neighbours, Business Partners, Victims: Jewish-Christian Interaction in Austrian Towns during the Persecutions of the Fourteenth Century’, in *Intricate Interfaith Networks: Quotidian Jewish-Christian Contacts in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Gerhard Jaritz and Ephraim Shoam-Steiner (Turnhout: Brepols, 2015) [in print].

11 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, II, pp. 305–06, no. 1081. On David Steuss, see Eveline Brugger, ‘Loans of the Father: Business Succession in Families of Jewish Moneylenders in Late Medieval Austria’, in *Generations in Towns. Succession and Success in Pre-Industrial Urban Societies*, ed. by Finn-Einar Eliassen and Katalin Szende (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009), pp. 112–29 (pp. 117–18); *Germania Judaica III/15,2,3. 1350–1519*, ed. by Arye Maimon, Mordechai Breuer and Yacov Guggenheim (Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1987, 1995, 2003), vol. III/2, p. 1606; Christian Lackner, ‘Juden im Rahmen der habsburgischen Finanzverwaltung im 14. Jahrhundert’, in *Jüdisches Geldgeschäft im Mittelalter*. Aschkenas. Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der Juden, 20/2, ed. by Eveline Brugger and Birgit Wiedl (Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2012), pp. 357–69 (pp. 365–67); Klaus Lohrmann, ‘Die Juden im mittelalterlichen Klosterneuburg’, in *Klosterneuburg. Geschichte und Kultur 1: Die Stadt* (Klosterneuburg: Stadtgemeinde Klosterneuburg, 1992), pp. 209–23 (pp. 216–18).

12 Richard Perger, ‘Die Grundherren im mittelalterlichen Wien. Part 2: Geistliche Grundherrschaften des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts’, *Jahrbuch des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Wien*, 21/22 (1965/1966), pp. 120–83.

the *Grundherrschaft* (lordship or, in this case, ladyship over a piece of land) of the monastery, the new Jewish owners could sell it only 'mit der grundvrowen hand'; i.e., with the consent of Prioress Katharina von Leis. The prioress also sealed the deed of sale together with the Jewish judge of Vienna.¹³ The Jewish judge (a Christian municipal official) was involved because part of his duty was to seal documents on behalf of the Jews, since most Jews did not use seals themselves.¹⁴ The corroboration of a sale with the seal of the person who held lordship over the specific piece of land (*Grundherr*), however, was the general practice, and it obviously made no difference that the sellers were Jews.

Before the use of land registers became more common towards the end of the fourteenth century, we often only learn of a house or a plot of land being in Jewish possession at the point when it was sold as a forfeited pledge. However, that does not mean that Jews were forced to resell land quickly, or that they only came into its possession in the form of unredeemed pledges. When the Jewish widow Zema and her cousin Scheftlein, both from the Lower Austrian town of Bruck an der Leitha, sold a vineyard that was under the lordship of St Stephen's cathedral in Vienna in 1377, the deed of sale stated explicitly that Zema had bought the vineyard with her own money.¹⁵ The transaction was made with the consent of the Provost of St Stephen's as *Bergherr* (holder of the lordship over the vineyard), and the formulas used in the charter are exactly the same that were used for similar transactions between Christians, whether the object of purchase was under ecclesiastical or secular lordship.

Such comparisons are crucial because an exclusive focus on sources concerning Jews has led to misapprehensions in the past, such as Ignaz Schwarz' conclusion (published in 1913, but adopted by a considerable number of later works) that Viennese Jews were forbidden from owning property outside the Jewish quarter and only got a temporary right of disposal over unredeemed land pledges so they could resell them.¹⁶ The charters Schwarz cited to back up this claim do indeed

13 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, II, p. 227, no. 926.

14 Brugger, 'Von der Ansiedlung bis zur Vertreibung', pp. 149–50, 161; Wiedl, 'Jews and the City', pp. 290–91. Under Jewish law, charters were confirmed with the signatures of the involved parties, although some prominent Jewish businessmen adopted the Christian custom of sealing their charters as a way of emphasising their prestigious position towards their Christian business partners. Martha Keil, 'Ein Regensburger Judensiegel des 13. Jahrhunderts. Zur Interpretation des Siegels des Peter bar Mosche haLevi', *Aschkenas, Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der Juden*, 1 (1991), pp. 135–50 (pp. 135–40).

15 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, vol. III (2015), p. 240, no. 1538.

16 Ignaz Schwarz, 'Geschichte der Juden in Wien. Von ihrem ersten Auftreten bis zum Jahre 1625', in *Geschichte der Stadt Wien*, vol. V, ed. by Anton Mayer (Wien: Holzhausen, 1913), pp. 1–64 (p. 36). Schwarz' assessment even made it into the *Germania Judaica*, the most important handbook on medieval Jewish history in the German-speaking territories (*Germania Judaica*, III/2, p. 1599, note 102), although it had been disproved as early as 1923, see Otto H. Stowasser, 'Zur Frage der Besitzfähigkeit der Juden in Österreich während des Mittelalters', *Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Wien*, 4 (1923), pp. 23–27 (pp. 23–26).

grant the new Jewish owner the right to resell the pledge, but only because it was a part of the common formula of 'an die gewer setzen,' i.e., granting full right of ownership – the same formula that was used if the new owner was a Christian.¹⁷ Even joint possession by Jews and Christians was possible: in 1380, a Christian couple and the aforementioned Isserl of Ödenburg sold a house and adjacent vineyard outside the *Widmertor* city gate with the consent of their *Grundherr* (lord over that land), the chaplain of the Viennese castle chapel. The three of them stated that they had held the objects of purchase *in Burgrechtsgewer*, and all three of them guaranteed the transfer of their rights to the house and vineyard to the new (Christian) owners.¹⁸

It should be noted that while the Viennese clergy seem to have made no distinction between Jewish and Christian tenants, the same was not true everywhere in the duchy of Austria during the fourteenth century. From in and around the city of Krems, which housed the second largest Jewish community after Vienna, come several documented cases of individual clergymen or monasteries (never laypeople) selling or renting out houses or vineyards on condition that the new owners or tenants could resell or re-lease the plots only to Christians, not to Jews. This seems to have been specific to the region around Krems, even though most ecclesiastic owners who used this stipulation were not local themselves.¹⁹ So far, no such case has been found for Vienna.

Even more numerous than Jews living under ecclesiastical lordship in Vienna were Viennese Jews paying rent charges to ecclesiastical institutions. Rent charges

17 Schwarz cites the charter summaries published in *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Wien II: Regesten aus dem Archive der Stadt Wien*, vol. 2: *Verzeichnis der Originalurkunden des Städtischen Archives 1412–1457*, ed. by Karl Uhlirz (Wien: Verlag des Alterthums-Vereines, 1900), p. 3, no. 1917 and 1919 to back up his theory. The full text of the formula can only be found in the originals: Wiener Stadt- und Landesarchiv (Municipal Archives of Vienna), Hauptarchiv-Urkunden no. 1917 and 1919. In the second case cited by Schwarz (*Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Wien*, II/2, p. 3, no. 1966, 1971 and 1976), the charters mainly focus on confirming the Jewish creditor's right to resell the pledge in order to protect the buyers from any remaining third-party claims (especially from the original debtor's heirs), which became common practice during the late fourteenth century. Nowhere does the full text of the charters (Wiener Stadt- und Landesarchiv, Hauptarchiv-Urkunden no. 1966, 1971 and 1976) indicate that the new Jewish owner was under obligation to resell. In charter no. 1976, the Jew Hocz even used the exact same formula to transfer the ownership of the former pledge – including the right to resell – to the Christian buyer that had earlier been used in charter no. 1966 to grant Hocz himself the same right.

18 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, III, p. 306, no. 1653.

19 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, III, p. 59, no. 1229 (seller: Deacon Friedrich of Krems); pp. 109–10, no. 1320–1321 (steward of the monastery of Admont in Krems); pp. 167–68, no. 1412 (monastery of Reichersberg), p. 180, no. 1433 (monastery of Gleink), p. 181, no. 1435 (monastery of Lambach); Diözesanarchiv St. Pölten (Archives of the Diocese St. Pölten), Uk. 1401 XII 08 (chaplain Hans Stadler of Stein). However, not all property transactions by ecclesiastical owners in and around Krems contained an anti-Jewish clause. See for example Steiermärkisches Landesarchiv (Styrian Provincial Archives), AUR 3846a: in this charter, the steward of Admont in Krems grants the new owners the explicit right to resell the house to anyone.

could be owned independently from the ownership of the house or plot for which they were owed, and were frequently in the possession of monasteries. It was not uncommon at all among Christians to endow a monastery with the rent on a Jewish house. For example, the prominent Viennese citizen Pilgrim von Poigen donated a total of five pounds rent charges to the monastery of Heiligenkreuz in 1294.²⁰ One pound was from the house of the Jew Pendit, located right next to the 'schulhof der juden', the yard next to the synagogue, which incidentally constitutes the first known mention of today's Judenplatz.²¹ The monastery collected the rent charge until 1379, when the abbot allowed the Jew Rötöl of Klosterneuburg, who owned the house at the time, to redeem it for a one-time payment of eight pounds.²²

Even clergymen had no qualms about donating revenues from Jewish property. In 1339, Jans Sture, chaplain of the Corpus Christi Altar at St Stephen's cathedral in Vienna, endowed his altar with a number of revenues for the salvation of his soul. Among those pious donations was a rent of one pound from a vineyard in today's thirteenth district of Vienna (located outside the city at the time), which was owned by the Jew Lesir, and another rent of eight pounds from the house of the Jew David. The charter also mentions that another rent of fifteen shillings from David's house was owed to the monastery of Heiligenkreuz.²³

Even Jewish owners, such as the Jew Freudel of Perchtoldsdorf near Vienna who sold a vineyard to a citizen from Perchtoldsdorf in 1372, openly declared those *Seelgeräte*, i.e., rent charges donated for the salvation of one's soul, that were due from their property – at least in their German-language charters, while Freudel would probably have used a different term in a Hebrew document, where he could be sure he would not be understood by Christians.²⁴ In the German bill of sale that he issued, Freudel noted that a yearly payment of one and a half buckets of wine *zu Seelgerät* from the vineyard was due to the nuns of St. Theobald in Vienna. It had obviously been donated by a prior Christian owner of the vineyard, but Freudel too had to pay it while the vineyard was in his possession.²⁵

20 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, I, pp. 88–89, no. 81.

21 Lohrmann, *Die Wiener Juden im Mittelalter*, pp. 95–99.

22 *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Wien III: Grundbücher der Stadt Wien*, vol. 1: *Die ältesten Kaufbücher (1368–1388)*, ed. by Franz Staub (Wien: Verlag des Alterthums-Vereines, 1898), pp. 186–87, no. 1142.

23 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, II, pp. 13–14, no. 464.

24 Most of the business charters issued by Austrian Jews during the fourteenth century were written in German, although it was common to add the issuer's and/or the witnesses' Hebrew signatures as confirmation under Jewish law. Eveline Brugger and Birgit Wiedl, '...und ander frume leute genuch, paide christen und juden. Quellen zur christlich-jüdischen Interaktion im Spätmittelalter', in *Räume und Wege. Jüdische Geschichte im Alten Reich 1300–1800*. Colloquia Augustana, 25, ed. by Rolf Kießling and others (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2007), pp. 285–305 (p. 294).

25 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, III, p. 146, no. 1379.

There are plenty of such examples from fourteenth-century Vienna. A comparison with similar transactions devoid of Jewish involvement shows that there was no difference between the rent charges due from Jewish houses or plots and those paid from Christian property.

In 1360, Duke Rudolf IV tried to ease the financial burden on Viennese house owners by granting them the right to redeem their yearly rent charges by means of a one-time payment of eight pounds per pound rent charge. He ordered all beneficiaries of rent charges, ecclesiastical or secular as well as Jews, to allow the redemption.²⁶ The inclusion of Jews in that list was no mere formality, since Jews appear in the sources not only as payers of rent charges, but also as beneficiaries. In some cases, a single person could be both: in 1370, the Provost of St. Pölten (Lower Austria) and his convent allowed the aforementioned David Steuss to redeem a rent charge of four pounds on his house in Vienna through a payment of thirty-two pounds in accordance with the late Duke Rudolf's order.²⁷ Nine years later, David Steuss' steward Chisel took the Christian owner of a vineyard in Mayerling near Vienna to court before an official of the monastery of Klosterneuburg because the *Burgrecht* of one pound per year, which David Steuss was owed from the vineyard, had not been paid in six years. The verdict transferred the vineyard into the possession of David Steuss, as it was common when owners failed to pay the rent charges. However, Steuss still had to pay off the Jew Seligman, steward to the widow of the Viennese rabbi Tenichel, who also had a claim to the vineyard because of a debt the former owner had failed to pay back.²⁸

The redemption of rent charges did not always go as smoothly as in the case of David Steuss and the provost of St. Pölten. In 1383, the Jew Heschlein turned to the Viennese city council for help with a *Burgrecht* of one pound on his house in the Jewish quarter, which the Teutonic Order who owned it would not allow him to redeem. In accordance with Duke Rudolf's decree, the city council allowed Heschlein to redeem the rent charge for the designated payment of eight pounds.²⁹ In the same year, the Jew Isserlein, son of Aron of Klosterneuburg, quarrelled with a chaplain at St. Agnes' about a *Burgrecht* of two pounds from his house in the Jewish quarter. Again, the matter was decided by a secular authority, the *Hubmeister* (a ducal official), who decided that Isserlein only had to pay one pound *Burgrecht*, which he was subsequently allowed to redeem at the usual rate.³⁰

26 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, II, pp. 240–41, no. 947.

27 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, III, pp. 96–97, no. 1302.

28 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, III, pp. 287–88, no. 1619.

29 *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Wien*, III/1, p. 248, no. 1486.

30 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, III, pp. 357–58, no. 1742.

Among the sources pertaining to house and land ownership, or to the profits drawn from it, court documents make up a significant percentage. This is not limited to interactions between Jews and the clergy, of course, and the sources do not indicate that members of the clergy were more likely to take Jews than Christians to court (or vice versa), but lawsuits between Jews and clergymen were not rare either. If the object in question was situated in the city, the case usually went before the city council or the *Bürgerschranne*, a municipal court presided by the city judge. Such was the case with the suit that the Jew Hebel of Vienna filed against the Commander of the Teutonic Order in 1368. Hebel had bought a house in the Jewish quarter from the Order, but later was faced with a claim from the mayor of Vienna that two pounds of *Burgrecht* were due from the house. Hebel wanted the Teutonic Order to reimburse him because every seller had to guarantee that the object they sold was free from encumbrances not mentioned in the deed of sale. However, the court stated that according to Viennese municipal law, such a guaranty was valid only for a year and a day. According to his own testimony, Hebel had owned the house for eight years before the mayor had raised his claim. For that reason, Hebel's demand for reimbursement was dismissed.³¹

Some cases involving Jews were decided by a municipal court presided jointly by the city judge and the Jewish judge.³² Jakob Poll, chaplain of the Ottenheim chapel in Vienna's City Hall, took the Jew Merchlein, son of Nachman of Salzburg, before such a court in 1351 because of unpaid levies from a house in the Jewish quarter, which had belonged to Merchlein's late grandfather, and which was under the lordship of Jakob's chapel. The charter issued by Merchlein about the matter states that Jakob Poll declared before the court that he would forgive the outstanding payments and give up his claim to the house because Merchlein and 'other people, Christians as well as Jews,' had pleaded with him. In return, Merchlein promised to pay the levies from now on; if he failed to do so, the Jewish judge would take pledges out of Merchlein's movable property in order to satisfy the claimant. Merchlein probably owed this extremely favourable ruling to ducal interference – he promised in his charter not to appeal to the ducal court in the matter, which was not a standard formula for this type of document and suggests that he might have been in a position to have the city's verdict overturned by the

³¹ Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, III, p. 58, no. 1228.

³² This is not to be confused with the *Judengericht* ('Jewish court'), a 'mixed' municipal court consisting of Christian and Jewish assessors and presided by the Jewish judge. Sources documenting the existence of such a court are extremely rare in Austria, and can mostly be found in the neighbouring duchy of Styria. However, when Duke Rudolf IV reformed the Viennese judiciary in 1361, the charter he issued explicitly mentioned the Viennese *Judengericht* as an existing institution that would be allowed to continue. Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, II, p. 263, no. 992; Brugger, 'Von der Ansiedlung bis zur Vertreibung', p. 150; Wiedl, 'Jews and the City', p. 290, note 77.

duke. In addition, a ducal official sealed the charter instead of the city's Jewish judge, thus emphasizing the duke's authority over the Jews living in the city.³³

On other occasions, Chaplain Jakob Poll was a lot less forgiving. In the course of his long tenure, he started legal quarrels with a number of his neighbours; while most of the chaplain's opponents were Christians, Merchlein found himself among them in 1373. This time, Jakob Poll took Merchlein to court before the city council because Merchlein had built a kitchen in the courtyard of his house, which was situated adjacent to Jakob Poll's house and to the Ottenheim chapel. Also, Merchlein had allegedly built a new chimney, which was so low that the smoke couldn't rise over the rooftops. Instead, the smoke and 'unrainer gesmach' ('unclean smell') from Merchlein's kitchen wafted through a window and into Jakob's house. According to the claimant, the smoke and bad smells were even noticeable in the chapel during early morning mass. After an inspection by two members of the city council, Merchlein was ordered to make the chimney higher in order to keep the smoke out of the chapel, and to remove the kitchen and refrain from building another 'hearth or fireplace or kitchen' in his courtyard that might damage Jakob's house or chapel.³⁴

It is interesting to note that the charter issued about the decision does not address the matter of religion at all, even though Merchlein's actions could easily have been construed as an attempt to violate the sanctity of the chapel. Maybe the remark about the 'unclean smell', which most likely came directly from the claimant, was a dig at the Jewish neighbour considering that uncleanliness and bad smells were well-known stereotypes in anti-Jewish rhetoric, both ecclesiastical and secular: the *odor iudaicus* appears as a trope in Christian theological texts from late Antiquity onwards,³⁵ and jibes against the Jews' 'stankes und ungelouben' ('stench and unbelief') can be found in late-thirteenth-century Austrian satirical poems.³⁶ Based on similar disputes about bad odours from the windows of Jewish houses that allegedly bothered Christian churchgoers, Gunnar Mikosch

33 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, II, p. 117, no. 687.

34 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, III, p. 173, no. 1421.

35 Heinz Schreckenberger, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (1.-11. Jh.)*, Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe XXIII Theologie, vol. 172 (Frankfurt a. M.-Bern-New York-Paris: Peter Lang, 2nd ed. 1990), p. 722; Birgit Wiedl, 'Laughing at the Beast: The Judensau. Anti-Jewish Propaganda and Humor from the Middle Ages to the Early Modern Period', in *Laughing in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times. Epistemology of a Fundamental Human Behavior, its Meaning, and Consequences*. Fundamentals of Medieval and Early Modern Culture, 5, ed. by Albrecht Classen (Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), pp. 325–64 (pp. 337–38).

36 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, I, pp. 152–54, no. 144; Knapp, 'Geistige Auseinandersetzungen der Christen mit jüdischem Gedankengut', pp. 17–19; Heinz Schreckenberger, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (13.-20. Jh.)*, Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe XXIII Theologie, vol. 497 (Frankfurt a. M.-Berlin-Bern-New York-Paris-Wien: Peter Lang, 1994), p. 341.

has postulated that the real issue behind such conflicts was visibility and the creation (or destruction) of exclusive Christian or Jewish spaces.³⁷ Formally, though, the Viennese city council treated the matter as nothing more than a dispute between neighbours.³⁸ Those were frequent enough in the cramped housing situation inside the city walls, and there seems to have been no special consideration for the chapel as a Christian sacred space.³⁹ Likewise, the council's decision in the matter was pragmatic: Merchlein was ordered to remove or adapt his offending structural measures (which, the charter states, he had undertaken without authorisation), but that seems to have been the end of the matter, and there is no mention of any further consequences for him. Nor did the council take Jakob Poll's claim at face value – the decision was made based on the report of two inspectors who had found the chaplain's claim to be factually correct. It is of course possible that anti-Jewish bias influenced the inspectors' report, but at least as far as legal procedures were concerned, Merchlein might just as well have been one of the Christian neighbours Jakob Poll was quarrelling with.

Merchlein's case is not the only neighbourly dispute between Jews and members of the clergy in fourteenth-century Vienna. These disputes reflect the most immediate kind of contact, that between people who live right next to each other. While Jewish authorities were well aware of the risks inherent in such proximity (as illustrated by admonitions to be cautious with religious ceremonies that could be seen or at least heard by the Christian neighbours),⁴⁰ the conflicts documented in the surviving records from fourteenth-century Vienna were usually mundane in nature. One of the conflicts that had to be resolved by the city council was a quarrel between the Teutonic Order, represented by the Order's Austrian *Landkomtur* (Bailli) and the Commander of Vienna, and the Jew Hessman, son of Baruch. Again, the object of dispute was a small courtyard, which was situated behind the Jew's house and part of a bathhouse in the possession of the Order. It

37 Gunnar Mikosch, 'Zeichen, Bilder, Codes – Prolegomena zu einer Semiotik jüdischer Räume', in *Städtische Räume im Mittelalter*, Forum Mittelalter Studien, 5, ed. by Susanne Ehrlich and Jörg Oberste (Regensburg: Verlag Schnell&Steiner, 2009), pp. 35–47 (pp. 44–45).

38 *Handwörterbuch zur deutschen Rechtsgeschichte*, ed. by Adalbert Erler and Ekkehard Kaufmann, vols I–V (Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1971–91), vol. III, 815–19 (article 'Nachbarrecht'); Benjamin Laqua, 'Nähe und Distanz. Nachbarrechtliche Regelungen zwischen Christen und Juden (12.–14. Jahrhundert)', in *Pro multis beneficiis. Festschrift für Friedhelm Burgard. Forschungen zur Geschichte der Juden und des Trierer Raums*, Trierer Historische Forschungen, 68, ed. by Sigrid Hirbodian and others (Trier: Kliemedien, 2012), pp. 73–92 (p. 81).

39 The situation might have been different if the window in question had led directly into the chapel instead of the chaplain's house, since windows which created a direct line of sight towards the other religion's sacred spaces could be considered problematic by both ecclesiastical and Jewish authorities. Laqua, 'Nähe und Distanz', pp. 84–85; Mikosch, 'Zeichen, Bilder, Codes', pp. 43–44.

40 Martha Keil, 'Gemeinde und Kultur – Die mittelalterlichen Grundlagen jüdischen Lebens in Österreich', in *Geschichte der Juden in Österreich*, by Eveline Brugger, Martha Keil, Albert Lichtblau, Christoph Lind, and Barbara Staudinger (Wien: Ueberreuter, 2nd ed. 2013), pp. 15–122, 573–85 (p. 79).

seems that both parties wanted to build inside the courtyard, because the settlement allowed each of them to build and use one storey, the Order on the ground floor and the Jew on top of that. Besides, Hessman had to build his own latrine⁴¹ in the courtyard. The settlement is very specific on the technical details, and also emphasizes that Hessman had to empty out the latrine through his own house and not through the Order's property.⁴² The strict separation between Jewish and Christian calls of nature seems like a logical counterpart to the infamous Church regulation, propagated in Austria (to little avail) by the canons of the so-called Council of Vienna in 1267, that prohibited Jews and Christians from eating and drinking together.⁴³ However, the placement and use of latrines and cesspits was a frequent cause of neighbourly quarrels that was by no means limited to Jews and members of the clergy.

Things went even further in another, somewhat similar case of neighbourly troubles in 1380, this time outside the city of Vienna in the nearby town of Klosterneuburg, which housed a small, but prosperous Jewish community with close ties to Vienna. Again, the matter came before a secular authority: the ducal steward decided about a complaint lodged by the Augustinian monastery of Klosterneuburg against a Jewish house situated between the synagogue and the monastery's *Obleihaus*, where the administration of the monastery's revenues was situated. The Jewish house belonged to the aforementioned David Steuss, whose family hailed from Klosterneuburg.⁴⁴ Reasons for the complaint were once more a latrine, which had been built too closely to the wall of the *Obleihaus*, and the water that ran from the courtyard of Steuss' house into the courtyard of the *Obleihaus* through a hole in the wall.⁴⁵ This was obviously no small matter – the charter issued by the ducal steward states that David Steuss not only appeared in court himself, he was also accompanied by the entire Jewish community of Klosterneuburg, although it is likely that this should be understood as 'all representatives of the community'. Both parties agreed to name three arbiters each, whose ruling would be binding for everyone. All six arbiters were from Klosterneuburg; the Jewish party, too, chose three Christian arbiters, which is not that surprising considering that the entire Jewish community of the town was involved in the quarrel. They chose the current Jewish judge of Klosterneuburg

41 The charter uses the term 'hewsel' (literally: 'little house'), which rarely appears in this specific meaning in medieval texts, but is still in use as a rather coarse dialect term for 'toilet' in Austria and Bavaria until today. Johann Andreas Schmeller, *Bayerisches Wörterbuch*, vol. I (München: Rudolf Oldenbourg, 2nd ed. 1872), col. 1177.

42 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, III, p. 251, no. 1559.

43 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, I, pp. 59–61, no. 45; Brugger, 'Von der Ansiedlung bis zur Vertreibung', pp. 133–34.

44 Brugger, 'Loans of the Father', pp. 117–18.

45 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, III, pp. 307–08, no. 1656.

and his predecessor; their third arbiter was the monastery's cellarer, who had ties to David Steuss that went back to Steuss' successful lawsuit about a vineyard in Mayerling the year before.⁴⁶

The arbiters decided that the Jews would be allowed to keep their latrine where it was, but would have to build a wall around it so it could no longer damage the wall of the *Obleihaus*. The rainwater dripping from the roof into the courtyard of the Jewish house would still be allowed to flow through the wall and the courtyard of the *Obleihaus*; however, the Jews must not pour anything else into the water, be it filth (the charter uses the term 'unflot', which can also mean excrement), kitchen scraps or blood. If they were caught doing it anyway, they would have to divert the water so it would no longer run through the *Obleihaus*.

The mention of blood stands out in this list, because it suggests that the Jewish community of Klosterneuburg used David Steuss' house as a slaughterhouse for kosher butchering, which would also explain why the entire Jewish community was involved in the case.⁴⁷ The term 'trankch' for kitchen scraps indicates that the Jewish inhabitants might have used the water to dispose of those leftovers that Christians used for *Sautrank*, pig swill, which of course was not open to Jews as a way of 'recycling'. It is not entirely clear from the wording of the charter whether the Jews had actually poured anything into the water until then. If they had, the monastery's main interest was obviously in no longer having sewage flowing through their courtyard. If, however, this clause was just a precaution the monastery considered necessary, it would constitute a rather peculiar expansion to otherwise common regulations concerning the drainage of wastewater in contracts between neighbours,⁴⁸ indicating not only a basic knowledge of Jewish religious customs (which was a given considering the close cohabitation),⁴⁹ but also a certain mistrust towards the Jews' handling of the unavoidable by-products. It may be tempting to speculate that such ideas could have been influenced by the anti-Jewish accusation of well-poisoning which had been propagated (albeit mostly through secular channels) during the period of the Black Plague several decades earlier.⁵⁰ A persecution of the Jews in Krems in 1349 had – according to monastic sources – been triggered by such accusations. However, the Krems persecution had been the only outbreak of anti-Jewish violence in Austria during

46 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, III, pp. 287–88, no. 1619.

47 Lohrmann, 'Die Juden im mittelalterlichen Klosterneuburg', p. 212.

48 Laqua, 'Nähe und Distanz', p. 78. When David Steuss purchased part of a house in Vienna from a Christian couple in 1372, the deed of sale contained detailed regulations concerning gutters and the drainage of rainwater as well as the positioning and the ventilation of the latrine, but did not mention sewage or any other kind of waste products in the water: Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, III, pp. 153–54, no. 1389.

49 Keil, 'Gemeinde und Kultur', pp. 95–96.

50 František Graus, *Pest – Geißler – Judenmorde. Das 14. Jahrhundert als Krisenzeit* (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 2nd ed. 1988), pp. 305–34.

the time of the Plague because Duke Albrecht had punished the citizens most severely for it.⁵¹ Furthermore, the concept of Jewish well-poisoning had repeatedly been refuted not only by secular, but also by Church authorities as well as by ecclesiastic authors, some of them specifically referring to Austria.⁵² Therefore, even though it is safe to assume that both the representatives of the Klosterneburg monastery as well as the secular officials were familiar with the polemical linkage of Jews to contaminated water, there is no evidence of any direct influence on the handling of the case. Although the monastery's motivation for demanding the aforementioned provision remains unclear, the charter itself treats the matter as nothing more than another boundary dispute between neighbours with no discernible religious implications.

Although charters and register entries were not a common vehicle for polemics in general, it is still noteworthy that the sources documenting everyday interaction between Jews and the clergy display a mostly pragmatic approach. Although the vast majority of these texts were written by Christians, even descriptions of conflicts were usually free from open hostility. In view of these findings, Jonathan Elukin's postulation of a 'pragmatic tolerance and stability of relations between Jews and Christians', which 'balanced the violence and pressure against Jews', although made for the period after 1492, seems to apply to fourteenth-century Vienna as well.⁵³ However, on the rare occasions that the aforementioned sources do mention violence against Jews, it is treated with the same kind of pragmatism, as can be seen in a charter issued by the priest Andreas von Muthmannsdorf in 1376 about a rent charge of four pounds on a Jewish house that was to be donated to endow a Mass. The rent charge had yielded only half of the usual redemption sum because the house had been damaged by fire 'ze der zeit do man di juden gemainlich angegriffen her' ('during the times the Jews had been universally

51 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, II, pp. 97–98, no. 646–47. In order to assess the importance of Duke Albrecht's protection of the Austrian Jews, it is essential to keep in mind that the massive outbreaks of anti-Jewish violence in the Holy Roman Empire during the time of the Plague, especially in the later stages, were premeditated persecutions instigated by municipal authorities or even territorial rulers, not spontaneous attacks carried out by a fearful or traumatised mob. Jörg Müller, 'Eretz gezerah – 'Land of Persecution': Pogroms against the Jews in the *regnum Teutonicum* from c. 1280 to 1350', in *The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages (Tenth to Fifteenth Centuries)*, ed. by Christoph Cluse (Turnhout; Brepols, 2004), pp. 245–60 (pp. 256–57); Graus, *Pest – Geißler – Judenmorde*, pp. 62–63.

52 Chazan, *Jews of Medieval Western Christendom*, p. 196; Chazan, *Reassessing Jewish Life*, p. 177. Although he explicitly stated that he did not mean to defend the Jews, Konrad von Megenberg pointed out in his Book of Nature how the Viennese Jewry had been so heavily affected by the Plague that it became necessary to enlarge the Jewish cemetery, and that it would have been very stupid of them to bring that kind of catastrophe upon themselves by poisoning the wells: Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, II, pp. 100–01, no. 650.

53 Elukin, *Living Together, Living Apart*, pp. 123.

attacked'), and had subsequently fallen into ruin. The Christian donor made sure to obtain a sealed document from the Jewish judge to prove the loss of value.⁵⁴

We know of no general persecution of Jews in Vienna that would fit into this timeframe. However, several Christian narrative sources mention mass abductions by order of the Austrian dukes, who took wealthy Jews captive to extort ransom, during the 1370ies.⁵⁵ The narrative sources recording these extortions are not very detailed and sometimes contradictory;⁵⁶ therefore, the remark in the aforementioned charter constitutes a rare indicator that they were accompanied by massive physical violence, even though the charter's issuer was only concerned about the financial loss that resulted from it.

Still, the overall impression the charters leave us with is that relations between Jews and members of the clergy were part of the everyday normality for both parties in fourteenth-century Vienna. This is consistent with Benjamin Laqua's recently-published findings for several cities in Southern and Central Germany.⁵⁷ While charters are highly formalised and therefore hardly ever lend themselves to an analysis of the emotions of the involved parties, they still depict a way of interacting that is a far cry from the theological rhetoric of the time. This conclusion does not negate or even qualify the impact of said rhetoric,⁵⁸ although it should be noted that it was its influence on the Austrian duke, not on the populace, which eventually led to the annihilation of Vienna's entire Jewish community

54 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, III, pp. 213–14, no. 1493.

55 Brugger, 'Between a Rock and a Hard Place', p. 199, Lohrmann, *Judenrecht und Judenpolitik*, pp. 216–17.

56 The exact chronology remains unclear; Christian historiographic sources put the extortions into the years 1370, 1371, or 1377; Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, III, pp. 116–17, no. 1330, pp. 138–39, no. 1368, pp. 245–46, no. 1550. The Hebrew rapport by Joseph Ha-Kohen also gives the year as 1371 (5131), see Karin Almbldh, *Joseph Ha-Kohen, Sefer 'Emeq ha-Bakha (The Vale of Tears) with the chronicle of the anonymous Corrector. Introduction, critical edition and comments*. Studia Semitica Upsaliensia, 5 (Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1981), p. 50. However, the text was written in the sixteenth century and confuses the events with those surrounding the 'Vienna Gesera', the persecution and expulsion of Austrian Jews in 1420/21. The same kind of confusion seems to be at the root of the claim made by the *Fragmentum historicum de quattuor Albertis Austriae* that the dukes also tried to coax the Jews into converting; Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, III, pp. 116–17, no. 1330. There is no other record of ducal pressure towards conversion in fourteenth-century Austria, while forced conversions played a major role during the Gesera, see Lohrmann, *Die Wiener Juden im Mittelalter*, pp. 159–61.

57 Laqua, 'Nähe und Distanz', p. 87, 91.

58 For a general discussion on the influence of theological anti-Jewish rhetoric, particularly in German sermons, see Christoph Cluse, 'Blut ist im Schuh. Ein Exempel zur Judenverfolgung des "Rex Armleder"', in *Liber Amicorum necnon et amicarum. Für Alfred Heit: Beiträge zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte und geschichtlichen Landeskunde*. Trierer Historische Forschungen, 28, ed. Friedhelm Burgard, Christoph Cluse, and Alfred Haverkamp (Trier: Verlag Trierer Historische Forschungen, 1996), pp. 371–92 (pp. 373–75); Gunnar Mikosch, 'Nichts als Diskurse. Juden in den frühen mittelhochdeutschen Predigten des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts', in *Historische Diskursanalysen. Genealogie, Theorie, Anwendungen*, ed. Franz X. Eder (Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2006), pp. 253–69 (pp. 253–54, 267–68).

in the course of the Gesera in 1420/21.⁵⁹ Instead, it adds another facet that also should be taken into account when trying to reconstruct the circumstances of fourteenth-century Jewish life.

59 Robert Chazan's explanation that the Viennese Jewish community was hit by the Gesera because 'the Austrian dukes were not successful in adequately protecting their Jews or in maintaining a consistently supportive policy' (Chazan, *Jews of Medieval Western Christendom*, p. 197) disregards the fact that it was Duke Albrecht V himself who instigated and organised the persecution of 1420/21 in an abrupt departure from the established Habsburg policy towards the Jews: Brugger, 'Von der Ansiedlung bis zur Vertreibung', pp. 221–24; *Germania Judaica*, III/3, pp. 1986–1988; Martha Keil, 'Bet haKnesset, Judenschul. Die mittelalterliche Synagoge als Gotteshaus, Amtsraum und Brennpunkt sozialen Lebens', *Wiener Jahrbuch für jüdische Geschichte*, 4 (1999/2000), pp. 71–89 (pp. 73–74); Lohrmann, *Die Wiener Juden im Mittelalter*, pp. 155–73. On the influence of theologians from the Vienna university on Duke Albrecht V's policy, see Michael H. Shank, *'Unless You Believe, You Shall Not Understand': Logic, University, and Society in Late Medieval Vienna* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1988), pp. 170–200.