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In 1391, the municipal court of the Swiss town of Zurich was confronted with a series of charges brought in by several attendees of a wedding that had been hosted by the family of Vifli, one of the wealthiest and most prominent Jews of the town. During the wedding, a long-pending quarrel between members of his and...
other prominent Jewish families had obviously reached a crisis and had erupted in first a vociferous argument, then in a brawl and had ended in several members of the respective families facing each other with their swords drawn. The quite detailed court records reveal astonishing facts: Not only did the Jews turn to the Christian municipal court to settle their dispute, they were bearing arms and were obviously accustomed to using them; yet the probably most remarkable fact, as Markus Wenninger has pointed out, was the quite high number of Christian witnesses who gave testimony at court. Apart from those who had been hired as servants or musicians, twelve Christians—hence about a third of the witnesses—had clearly been present as guests, most of them being members of the Zurich upper class: a knight, the former mayor, the town scribe; and at least five of them lived in close vicinity, some even within the same lane, the Brunnagasse, which housed the majority of the Zurich Jewish population in the Middle Ages. Under penalty of excommunication, the synods at Wroclaw (for the archbishopric of Gniezno) and Vienna (for the ecclesiastical province of Salzburg, and city and bishopric of Prague) had stated in 1267, Christians shall not invite Jews and Jewesses as their dinner guests, or drink or eat with them, neither shall they dance at their weddings or feasts. This article was, in fact, an elaboration of the


regulations of the Fourth Lateran Council that had generally aimed at limiting the possibilities for Jews to take part in the everyday lives of their Christian neighbours, and vice versa. The church authorities were, however, not oblivious to the impossibility of transferring these regulations into the reality of (inevitable) daily interaction between Jews and their next-door Christian neighbors; the lamentations and complaints of the Bishop of Olomouc and the provincial synod at Salzburg as early as 1273 and 1274 respectively about the ‘persistent violation’ of these regulations speak for themselves. Tellingly, it was the breach of the ‘safe conduct and peace’ (freies geleit und fried) that the town of Zurich had promised the out-of-town visitors on Vifli’s request that required an examination before the aldermen, the fisticuffs, the verbal and bodily assaults, and particularly the drawn

---


swords, whereas the presence of Christians at what was clearly a ‘Jewish feast’ merely meant the interrogation of additional witnesses.

In whichever house the wedding took place, it must have been close to the house which once had belonged to the money-lender Minna, widow of Menachem, who had lived in the same street in the first half of the fourteenth century with her sons Mordechai and Moshe. She had the representative parts of her house decorated with what is today regarded as one of the most striking examples of cultural translation, having commissioned wall paintings the iconographic program of which were accessible to both Christians and Jews alike. Some of the scenes,

8 Wenninger, “Von jüdischen Rittern,” 73.
particularly the rural and somewhat rude dance scenes, greatly resemble the scenes described in the lyrics of the thirteenth-century Austrian poet Neidhart and could as well have been the decoration of a Christian household—like the ‘Neidhart-frescoes’ from around 1398 in the house of a wealthy Viennese citizen, or the fourteenth century dance scenes a citizen of Regensburg had one of his representational rooms decorated with. And like the Vienna (Christian) example, the decoration of the Zurich Jewish house also bears scenes that cater to a more noble audience—hunting scenes, particularly falconry, and as a special ‘bonus’ the coats of arms of Minna’s noble guests (and quite probably debtors) on a frieze running above the paintings and provided with an inscription of their names in Hebrew letters. The conclusion that intense cultural translation took place between the Jews and Christians of medieval Ashkenas and Sephard in the areas of their lives they shared as well as those they lived separately, is most widely recognized by now. However, it does not translate as assimilation but rather as transferring...
one’s own culture into a new context, as adapting personal tastes as well as general concepts of aesthetics that are shared by people of a comparable social status. This shared taste extends to areas of life that remain more private, or at least representational within a smaller group of people. When, for example, Israel Isserl, *magister iudeorum* and one of the most prominent Jews of Vienna, commissioned a *Sefer Mordechai*, a collection of Rabbinical responsae by Mordechai bar Hillel from the late thirteenth century, to be written for him in 1371/1372, he had the manuscript decorated in what is known as Niederösterreichischer Randleistenstil, a particular style of book illumination that was quite widely used at that time; it was, for example, the style a missal of the Lower Austrian monastery of Klosterneuburg that originated from about the same time was adorned in (see Figure 5). Despite the fact that Isserl’s Hebrew codex would rather not, or at least not mainly, be used in the presence of Christians, he nevertheless had it decorated in what can be called the ‘in-fashion’ style of the time and region, Isserl’s codex being but one example of Hebrew manuscripts the margins of which were decorated in that particular style. Both Jews and Christian monks had acquired the same taste as far as book illumination was concerned, regarded the same style as beautiful and prestigious, and, probably, knew how to impress visitors with their gems.

However close though the cultural and social contacts to their Christian neighbors were, Jews remained in many respects a separate, if not homogenous, group within (or rather outside) the Christian society. As far as the Christian

---


17 Keil, “Lebensstil und Repräsentation,” on the example of luxury garments.


20 On the highly problematic and widely discussed ‘label’ of Jews as a fringe group, see Frantisek Graus, “Randgruppen der städtischen Gesellschaft im Spätmittelalter,” *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung* 8 (1981): 385–437; here particularly 396 on the definition of ‘fringe group’; Gerd
secular authorities were concerned, the legal as well as the economic position of Jews, both as a group and as individuals, was generally defined by the ruler, in particular the Holy Roman Emperor who held the general sovereignty over all the Jews of the empire, counting them as a part of his treasure.  

“the rulers’ sole purpose is money,” as Rabbi Jacob bar Jechiel phrased it clearly in mid-thirteenth century. 

As early as the beginning of the thirteenth century, however, this sovereignty was reduced to a mere claim, the Imperial lordship weakening in the course of the transition of Imperial rights to the regional rulers, the right to the Jews (Judenregal) being but one among them. 

In quite a number of German cities, their grip on the Jews dwelling within their realm tightened along with their rise to economical as well as political importance, whereas in the region of modern-day Austria, both towns and Jews remained under the strong grip of the respective regional ruler, be he the Habsburg duke, the Archbishop of Salzburg, the Bishop of Bamberg, or a local nobleman.

---


Martha Keil, “Nähe und Abgrenzung. Die mittelalterliche Stadt als Raum der Begegnung,” Nicht in einem Bett, 2–8; here 4–5. The whole article is downloadable as a pdf file here: http://www.injoest.ac.at/upload/JudeninME05_1_1/g5568.pdf (last accessed on April 8, 2009).


The first encompassing definition of the legal standing of the Austrian Jews was the quite comprehensive regulation which the Babenberg Duke Frederic II issued in 1244, which remained the basis for further legislation within the duchy of Austria and also served as a model for other rulers. The rather detailed economic issues, mostly in favor of the Jews, and the quite wide-ranging protection suggest that Duke Frederic aimed at providing an incentive for Jews to settle down in Austria—as part of his, and no longer the Emperor’s, treasure. With regard to the towns, this also means that the ruler was determined not to lose his control over what he had just acquired and regarded as his immediate property, a part of his treasure that he protected and/or exploited and utilized as he saw fit. It remained the rulers’ sole prerogative to grant Jews the right to take their abode on his realm, their favorite financiers were given wide-ranging economic and legal privileges without as much as informing the cities. Only during the last decades of the fourteenth century, some Austrian cities were able

---


26 Re-issued ad imitationem clare memoria quondam Friderici ducis Austria et Stirie by King Rudolf I in 1277 (Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, vol. 1, 71–73, no. 56). The explicit reference to Duke Frederick II conveys a clear meaning—on the one hand, Rudolf’s rival Přemysl Otakar, the (outlawed) duke of Austria, was being blatantly ignored, and on the other hand, by reverting to the ducal privilege of 1244, and not the Imperial one, Rudolf stressed his family’s claim on the duchies of Austria and Styria (Eveline Brugger, “Von der Ansiedlung bis zur Vertreibung – Juden in Österreich im Mittelalter,” Geschichte der Juden in Österreich, 123–228; here 142).

27 Hungary: Bela IV, 1251 (Monumenta Hungariae Judaica, vol. 1: 1092–1539, ed. Ármin Friss and Mór Weisz [Budapest: Magyar Izraeliták Országos, 1903], 23–30, no. 22); Bohemia and Moravia: Přemysl Otakar II, 1255, 1262, and 1268 (Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, vol. 1, 45–48, no. 34, 51–54, no. 39, and 62–65, no. 47, the first including Austria, the latter two Austria and Styria); Poland: Duke Boleslav, 1264 (Juden in Europa: Ihre Geschichte in Quellen, vol. 1: Von den Anfängen bis zum späten Mittelalter, ed. Julius Schoeps and Hiltrud Wallenborn [Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001], 139–43, no. 65); Bamberg: Bishops Henry II and Wulfing, between 1304 to 1328 (Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, vol. 1, 255–57, no. 302). No privileges for the Styrian and Carinthian Jews have been transmitted, the later Habsburg privileges of the second half of the fourteenth century however include both these territories, referring to an ‘older existing legislation’ (see Lohrmann, Judenrecht, 182–89 [Carinthia], 200–06 [Styria], late Habsburg privileges 230–35).

28 The Jewish immigration into the middle Danube area had already increased during the first half of the thirteenth century; at least for Vienna, an existing community can be proven for around 1200 (first mention of the Vienna Synagogue in 1204; see Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, vol. 1, 18–19, no. 5), thus Frederic might also have reacted to the newly arisen need of regulating the Jewish life that had begun to flourish.

29 In 1331, Emperor Louis IV officially enfeoffed the Austrian dukes with the right to the Jews (Judenregal), Brugger, “Ansiedlung,” 143–44.
to gain at least partial control over the Jews, mainly focusing on juridical and economic matters.\textsuperscript{30}

Yet the seemingly undue preference accorded the Jews rankled with the citizens, causing the author of the Viennese \textit{Stadtrechtsbuch} (a compendium of legal regulations from the end of the fourteenth century) to complain polemically about the “cursed Jews” having a better legal position against the Christians than the Christians against the Jews, directly referring to the 1244 regulations and blatantly ignoring the everyday reality that had by then long changed to the clear disadvantage of the Jews.\textsuperscript{31}

Their increasing influence notwithstanding, Austrian cities remained for the most part powerless should the respective ruler, in whose official possession the Jews remained until the end of Jewish medieval settlement, decide to interfere. The Austrian dukes gave their Jews as fiefs to noblemen they wanted to particularly honor, reward, or bribe,\textsuperscript{32} without as much as notifying the government of those cities where the Jews dwelled; should a Jew flee from a ruler’s territory, the cities were neither involved in the ensuing trial nor did they participate in the sharing of the Jew’s confiscated property.\textsuperscript{33} This applies not only to towns that were under the rule of a powerful lord, like (partially) the Duke of Austria, but also to noblemen whose immediate rule extended to a considerably limited area managed to maintain a close grip on the Jews as an outstanding group. In 1350, the nobleman and chancellor of Styria, Rudolf Otto of Liechtenstein, granted the Jew Häslein, the wealthiest and most prominent Jew in the Carinthian/Styrian area at that time, the right to settle in his town of Murau, placing him and his family in a


\textsuperscript{32} The most famous of these was the enfeoffment of the Counts of Cilli (today’s Celje, Slovenia) with the Jew Chatschim and his family by duke Rudolf IV. Despite the fact that the towns Chatschim lived in were quite prosperous (Ljubljana, Celje, Trieste), there is no notion of any involvement of either of these towns. See \textit{Germania Judaica}, vol. III/3, 209; Brugger, “Ansiedlung,” 184–85; Lohrmann, \textit{Judenrecht}, 206–07; Markus Wenninger, “Die Bedeutung jüdischer Financiers für die Grafen von Cilli und vice versa,” \textit{Celjski grofje, stara tena – nova spoznanja}, ed. Rolanda Fugger Germadnik (Celje: Pokrajinski Muzej, 1999), 143–64; here 151–52. On Jews between ruler and (Lower Austrian) nobility, see Eveline Brugger, \textit{Adel und Juden im mittelalterlichen Niederösterreich}. Studien und Forschungen aus dem Niederösterreichischen Institut für Landeskunde, 38 (St. Pölten: Selbstverlag des Niederösterreichischen Instituts für Landeskunde, 2004).

\textsuperscript{33} For ‘famous flights’ of Jews see below; further Brugger, “Ansiedlung,” 181–82 (Häslein) and 184–85 (Chatschim and Mosche); Lohrmann, \textit{Judenrecht}, 218–20 (Häslein) and 225–30 (Chatschim and Mosche).
very privileged position with respect to both the Jewish community of Murau and the town itself.  

Although it is very likely that Rudolf Otto of Liechtenstein issued the privilege with ducal approval, there is no mention of any involvement whatsoever of the town of Murau—which, if nothing else, had to renounce any jurisdictional rights over Häselin who fell under the sole competence of Rudolf Otto himself. This example concurs with a general increase of personalized privileges in the second half of the fourteenth century, privileges that granted a special status to an individual Jew or Jewess (usually including the entire family) and exempted them from the legal requirements of the town they lived in. When several years later, Häselin left his new abode in the ducal town of Judenburg without seeking permission beforehand and Duke Rudolph IV confiscated all his property and outstanding debts, neither of the towns he had lived in or had business contacts with was given a share.

The Austrian rulers’ control even extended to Jewish geographical spaces within a city. The permission to erect or rebuild a synagogue, to establish or to enlarge a cemetery remained the right of the respective lord of the town, leaving the town’s administration with no say in the matter. To the contrary, a ruler like the Bishop of Bamberg who owned the Carinthian town of Villach could even, after having granted the Jew Ashrok the right to erect a synagogue (in return for a payment of 200 pounds) coercing his Christian subjects, in this case the mayor and council of Villach, into promising to protect the Jews should any “uprise” against them occur. But even if reduced to the mere geographical space, to the public and

---

35 Eveline Brugger and Birgit Wiedl, “... und ander frume leute genuh, paide christen und juden.’ Quellen zur christlich-jüdischen Interaktion im Spätmittelalter am Beispiel Österreichs,” Räume und Wege, 286–305; here 288–89.
36 See for the similar French legislation the contribution of Rosa Alvarez Perez in this volume.
37 The Church, however, tried to gain control over the erection of new and the alteration of already existing synagogues. The provincial synagogue of Vienna in 1267 forbade the erection of new synagogues, while (re-)used existing ones were not to be made wider, higher nor more precious (latest print Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, vol. 1, 59–61, no. 45; here 60).
private places, a medieval town was a space of meeting for Jews and Christians. They were living next door, and not only in these two streets in Zurich—in Vienna and Krems, in Wiener Neustadt and Graz, in the episcopal towns of Friesach, Villach and Wolfsberg in Carinthia and the then South-Styrian, now Slovenian Maribor and Ptuj, to name but the biggest of the Jewish communities, Jewish settlement might have been concentrated around central locations, in particular the synagogue(s), yet many members lived outside these parts of the city where Christians lived, as (not only) the Viennese sources call it, under den Juden, “among the Jews”: thus, encounter was inevitable. Jews employed the services of Christian craftsmen as much as Christians called on Jewish services; and, although frowned upon by the Church, Christian servants to Jewish households were common, even essential: “he had servants and maids, non-Jewish and Jewish too,” Ephraim bar Jacob wrote in his memorial book about the Jew Schlom, master of the ducal mint in Vienna around 1192, not finding this in the least peculiar. On both sides, religious authorities were up in arms about Christian women engaging Jewish, and Jewesses engaging Christian wet nurses, and the story told by the Carinthian Abbot and historiographer Johann of Viktring about a Christian wet nurse, who in 1343 abducted the daughter of her Jewish employers to have her baptized, may on the one hand confirm that the worries, at least on the Jewish side, weren’t completely unfounded, but on the other hand gives evidence of the

---

42 Whereas the synod at Wroclaw, where the matter is addressed directly for the first time, does not forbid Christians to work as servants in Jewish households, but merely declares that they were not to stay there day and night (die nocteue), it is debated whether the wording of the Viennese synod (die noctuque) aims at prohibiting Christian servants at all. Grayzel, Church and Jews, vol. 2, 244–46, no. 6 (Wroclaw); Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, vol. 1, “59–61, no. 45 (Vienna), see above for further editions; Schreckenberg, Adversus-Judaes-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (13–20. Jh.), 230. For the schabbesgoj, the ritually essential Christian servant, see Keil, “Gemeinde und Kultur,” 76.
43 Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, vol. 1, 17–18, no. 4 (full text in Hebrew and German translation); Brugger, “Ansiedlung,” 126.
commonness of this practice (since Johann of Viktring interprets the abduction as remarkable, but not the employment itself). There has been, and still is, a vast and vivid discussion on the topic of Jewish quarters, and whether their settlement was scattered or close-together within the city, and the most prominent public building within, the synagogue.

In addition to being the center of Jewish life on many levels—the primary worship institution, the social center, a place of identification, but also a place of...
flaunting one’s social status—and the stage where sanctions of the internal Jewish jurisdiction were imposed publicly—the synagogue was also perceived by Christians not as an “exclusively” Jewish space but as a public one they too had access to. In some towns, the Jews had to take their oaths in front of the synagogue, and according to Austrian ducal legislation, the synagogue was the place to hold a court sitting if a Jew was somehow involved in the process. Thus, the synagogue held a semi-legal function for Jews and Christians alike, in addition to providing a convenient and therefore common meeting place where business transactions were negotiated and concluded, goods delivered and the newest gossip discussed while its acoustic signals permeated into Christian space as much (if not as manifold) as church bells.

Christians therefore showed no sign of hesitation, or repulsion, to use the synagogue as a meeting point and accept it as a place of public significance. In early November 1354, Nikolaus Petzolt, the town judge of the prospering southern Styrian (today’s Slovenian) town of Maribor, which housed one of the largest Jewish communities of that region, was called on by messengers of the Counts of Pfannberg, a local noble family with considerable business contact to the Jews. They asked him to accompany them to the shul, the synagogue. Petzolt, the index iudaeorum Wilhelm, and another citizens of Maribor, obliged, and having arrived at the synagogue, the messengers sent for the shulkapper to ask around whether

---


49 The ‘minor oath’ of the Jews of the Lower Austrian town of Krems had to be taken in front of the synagogue, with the oath-taker’s hand on the doorknob; see Brugger, “Ansiedlung,” 151. According to ducal legislation, the Jews had to take their oath solely in front of the duke, which proved highly inexecutable, whereas humiliating rituals accompanying the oath (self-execration, standing on a sow’s skin), as described in the Schwabenspiegel, are not recorded for Austria; see Hans Voltelini, “Der Wiener und Kremsner Judeneid,” Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Wien 12 (1932): 64–70; here 69–70; Toch, “Hand auf der Thora,” 162–67.


52 The shulkapper (German Schulklopper, in Christian documents—like in the charter quoted above—often called ‘sacristan of the Jews’, judenmesner) was responsible for calling the Jews to prayer; he served as a crier, and was involved in the collection of taxes, the taking of oaths, and in handling jurisdiction, see Germania Judaica, vol. III/3, 2092–93; Encyclopaedia Judaica, sec. ed., vol.
any of the Jews still held some debenture bonds of the Pfannberg family, and if so, to produce them at the synagogue in order that they could repay the debts. The Jews answered that none of them held any obligations; thus the messengers had the shulklapper declare that any bonds presented later on were to be considered null and void. The three citizens corroborated the charter issued on that occasion with their seals, declaring that they had been present at the synagogue along with ‘other respectable people.’

One of the main opportunities of contact and interaction remained the contact via business—and the close everyday contact and the interaction can easily be detected in items and activities of the daily business life. Business documents are one of the most extensively transmitted type of sources in Austria as far as Jewish-Christian interaction is concerned.

From the financier of noblemen and rulers to the lowly pawn broker, their clientele was predominantly Christian and often recruited from their immediate surroundings, especially when it comes to small-scale pawnning and loaning; whereas the noble clients, both secular and ecclesiastical, of financially stronger Jews usually came from a greater geographical area. Jewish-Christian business interaction might evoke ideas of credit transactions and pawn-broking only, yet these are by far not the sole form of business that took place between Jews and their Christian neighbors. ‘Classical’ contracts like debenture bonds, pawn certificates, and charters for safeguarding the guarantor (Schadlosbriefe) are but a part of the vast amount of Jewish appearances in business documents. Jews appear in both ducal and municipal account books, they were registered in rentals not only as pawn keepers but as regular land- and/or house-owners and appear in charters as such; when, e.g., the Styrian nobelman Poppo of Peggau bequeathed several of his estates to the Upper Austrian monastery of Reichersberg in 1235, he did so aput Winnam in domo Techani iudei, in Vienna, in the house of Teka the Jew, to whom, along with several Viennese citizens, the estates had been pledged.

54 Austrian State Archives Vienna, Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, AUR Uk. 1354 XI 4.
56 See the survey by Eveline Brugger, “‘Do musten da hin zue den iuden varn’ – die Rolle(n) jüdischer Geldgeber im spätmittelalterlichen Österreich,” Ein Thema – zwei Perspektiven, 122-38; for in-depth studies for Lower Austria and Carinthia, see Brugger, Adel und Juden, and Wadl, Jüden Kärnten, 193–225, respectively.
58 Apart from the aforementioned broad variety of other occupations Jews pursued, it is of great importance to stress that money-lending was at no time exclusively a ‘Jewish trade’: see with respect to Jews the newest summary by Michael Toch, “Economic Activities of German Jews in the Middle Ages,” Wirtschaftsgeschichte der mittelalterlichen Juden, 181–210; here 184–87 and 194–95; generally Joseph Shatzmiller, Shylock Reconsidered. Jews, Moneylending, and Medieval Society (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990); for a comparison of the different
Even more so, Teka did not only act as a host but was named as the intermediary of the entire transaction (quo mediate et procurante hoc omnia sunt).\(^{59}\) Although Teka is to be considered a rather exceptional figure with close connections to the Hungarian king and the Austrian duke\(^{60}\), quite casual references to Jews owning houses or plots of land are not exceptional, and often merely given to identify another—Christian-owned—house.\(^{61}\)

However, it would most definitely be short-sighted to dismiss those business contracts as yielding merely information on matters of economy;\(^{62}\) as objects of forms of credit, see Hans-Jörg Gilomen, “Die ökonomischen Grundlagen des Kredits und die christlich-jüdische Konkurrenz im Spätmittelalter,” Ein Thema – zwei Perspektiven, 139–69; further id., “Wucher und Wirtschaft im Mittelalter,” Historische Zeitschrift 250 (1990): 265–301; id., “Kooperation und Konfrontation,” 216–22, with statistics on Jewish and Lombard credits in fifteenth-century Zurich. As early as the thirteenth century, Lombards and Cahorsins appear in the Austrian region; Duke Rudolf IV bestowed himself with the right to “hold Jews and Cahorsins” (tenere iudaeos et usurarios publicos, quos vulgo vocat gauwerschin) in the forged Privilegium Maius of around 1358. Particularly in the south of Austria, the Carinthian dukes and the nobility resorted to business companies from the Veneto-Friulian area that included both Jews and Christians; see now the two articles by Wenninger, “Jüdische und jüdisch-christliche Netzwerke,” and Gerd Mentgen, “Netzwerkbeziehungen bedeutender Cvidaler Juden in der ersten Hälfte des 14. Jahrhunderts,” Beziehungsnetze aschkenassischer Juden, 163–76 and 197–246 respectively, with further literature. See also Gerd Mentgen, Studien zur Geschichte der Juden im mittelalterlichen Elsaß. Forschungen zur Geschichte der Juden, Abteilung A, Abhandlungen, 2 (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1995), 574–789, on the ‘Jewish’ Alsace vs. the ‘Lombard’ Lorraine as far as money-lending is concerned, with further literature. However, Christian participation in all kinds of money-based business is not reduced to these specific groups. Apart from (rather rare) open money-lending and pawn-broking, which was severely criticised by the contemporaries, Christians usually engaged themselves in more ‘clandestine’ transactions, like masking the pawning of a pledge, usually a plot of land, as selling and subsequently repurchasing it after a predetermined time span, where only the final total was stated in the documents, usually already including the interest to be paid at the end; for Austrian examples, see Brugger, “Ansiedlung,” 157.

\(^{59}\) Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, vol. 1, 24–25, no. 11.

\(^{60}\) Probably the best example for this is the peace treaty of 1225 between King Andrew II and Duke Leopold VI, where Teka stands bail for the Austrian duke; a few years later, he is the comes camere (tax farmer) of the Hungarian king (Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, vol. 1, 20–21, no. 7, 23, no. 10, with further literature).

\(^{61}\) From the vast amount of charters, see the arbitrament that settled a dispute between citizens of the Lower Austrian town of Klosterneuburg over several vineyards and houses, one of which was located an dem niedern marcht ze nachst Steuzzen haus dez juden (“at the lower market, next to the house of [David] Steuss the Jew,” Archives of the Monastery of Klosterneuburg, Uk. 1364 X 31, facsimile online at: http://www.monasterium.net, sub archivio; last accessed on April 8, 2009).

daily life, they give as much clear evidence of the mutual impact of the overlapping living spaces of Jews and Christians as any building, piece of cloth, or object of art. In everyday transactions, Jewish businessmen adjusted to the needs of their Christian clientele: documents they issued for their Christian partners were not only in either German\(^63\) or (very rarely) in Latin,\(^64\) they differ in no point to those issued by Christians—the formula commonly used by Christians is adopted word-for-word. Crucial dates like the due date of the debt or the date of issuance are rendered in the same way as in Christian charters, by usage of commonly known days of saints or feasts. As much as this is due to the fact that the Christian business partner had to understand the document as well, this also provides evidence of a firm knowledge (and usage) of the Christian calendar and certain ‘key days’ like the ever-popular pay days of St. Michael (September 29), St. Martin (November 11), and St. George (April 23/24).

Following the standard formulae, however, was not limited to documents issued by Jews for Christians; in the (rare) charters in Hebrew\(^65\), which were either, in the majority of cases, issued as an additional confirmation of the transaction dealt with in the German one (see Figure 6)\(^66\) or kept by the Jewish business partner, most of the common phrases (e.g., “of our own accord and with the approval of our heirs,” the Schadlosformel that protects the business partner should a third party raise claims) were literally translated into Hebrew. In contrast, all the dates are stated according to the Jewish calendar, and the corroboration is exclusively given by signature. Quite telling is the only modification to one of the standard formulae—whereas the Christian version reads “all who see this letter or hear it being read” (allen die diesen brief sehen oder hören lesen), the Hebrew version is adapted as merely “all who see this letter,” proceeding on the assumption that any Jew who sees the letter will be able to read it as well on his own.\(^67\)

---

63 The question whether medieval Ashkenazic Jews spoke Middle High German or Old Yiddish, or regional dialects, has been a topic of academic literature since the nineteenth century, albeit with a clear focus on literary texts. The still ongoing discussion has been summed up and analyzed lately by Edith Wenzel, “Alt-Jiddisch oder Mittelhochdeutsch?” Grenzen und Grenzüberschreitungen, 31–50, with an extensive bibliography in the footnotes.

64 The eldest Latin charter in the Austrian region is also the eldest one issued by a Jew altogether in this region: February 18, 1257, the two brothers Lublin and Nekelo, comites camere (tax farmers) of the Austrian duke and later Bohemian king Otakar Přemysl II, settled a dispute with Bishop Conrad I of Freising, which they corroborated with their shared (and, unfortunately, missing) seal, see Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, vol. 1, 50–51, no. 38, with further literature.

65 Brugger and Wiedl, “Christlich-jüdische Interaktion,” 305, fig. 2.

66 These Hebrew charters were often stitched, glued, or somehow else attached to the German document they correspond to (which was partially done centuries later); see the example from the monastery of Kremsmünster from 1305, Figure 6.

67 See, e.g., the two eldest Hebrew charters from the Austrian region, both of them issued by the four
Jews do appear in other functions as well: should the need arise, they act as arbitrators together with Christians, they corroborate Christian charters as witnesses even if they (or any Jews at all) are not involved in the transaction documented in the charter. Jewish appearance as witnesses declines perceptibly from the last quarter of the thirteenth century onward, which precedes the general decrease in the usage of witnesses in favour of seals as the (almost) only means of authentication by only a few decades. Wealthy and prominent Jews, however, did adapt this custom, this ‘new fashion article,’ and started using seals, albeit only for charters issued for Christian business partners.

The common way of corroboration among Jews remained the aforementioned Hebrew signature that was used on both Hebrew and German documents, partly announced with the same formula that would be used for announcing a seal: with the forumla und umb taz pesser sicherhait bestett ich die obergeschrift mit meiner judischen hantgeschrift unden darunder (“as an additional corroboration [as an additional insurance] I hereby confirm the above-written [text] with my Jewish
handwriting”) the Jew Mosche from Herzogenburg announced his signature (Mosche ben haKadosch Rabbi Izchak s.k.l., “Mosche, son of the martyr Rabbi Izchak, the memory of the martyr may be honored”), using the same ‘keywords’ of pesser sicherheit a Christian would herald their seal with.73 Additional confirmatory signatures, often those of Rabbis, were introduced using of a wording similar to that Christians would introduce additional corroborators with.74

Town-dwelling Jews without a seal of their own often turned toward the particular Christian who at that time occupied the office of what was known as iudex iudeorum, an office quite unique to the eastern parts of modern-day Austria,75 to witness and seal their documents.76 Introduced in Duke Frederic II’s 1244 privilege for the Austrian Jews and usually held by a member of a high-ranking family of the town, the principal duty of the iudex iudeorum was the settling of disputes between Jews and Christians;77 furthermore, he had limited rights of control over the selling of unredeemed pledges and was entitled to a number of fines from both Jews and Christians, thus, participating at least marginally in the revenues of the ducal protection of the Jews. Despite the strong ties to the ruler which the iudex iudeorum could enjoy,78 the towns were generally interested in

73 Keil, “Namen und Beinamen,” 138, sales deed from May 10, 1445.
75 The first iudex iudeorum is mentioned in the lower Austrian town in 1264 of Krems (Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, vol. 1, 56–57, no. 42.). It was to become a rather common office in both Austria and Styria, partly also in the Styrian and Carinthian enclaves of Salzburg, but was never introduced into other parts of the Holy Roman Empire save Bohemia and Moravia, where the 1244 privilege was introduced by King Premysl Otakar II. For the few appearances outside these territories see Germania Judaica, vol. III/3, 2190.
76 Having someone else seal a document was a common practise among Jews and Christians alike; if the issuer had no seal of their own, they asked for someone else to corroborate the charter with their seals (Siegelbitte), which was noted down separately in a particular formula together with the announcement of the seals. For the iudex iudeorum as corroborator for Jews, see also Keil, “Namen und Beinamen,” 138.
77 Little is known about the organization that is referred to as Judengericht (despite the literal translation “Jewish court” it is not to be confused with the internal court of the Jewish community, see Keil, “Gemeinde und Kultur,” 40–41, 60–72). Its existence is first documented for the city of Vienna in 1361 (Lohrmann, Wiener Juden, 47; Brugger, “Ansiedlung,” 150). In the course of a general court reform, Duke Rudolf IV decreed the continued existence of the Viennese Judengericht, yet specified neither its constitution nor its competence in detail. Presided over by the iudex iudeorum, its assessors consisted of delegates from the city and the Jewish community in equal representation. Its range of jurisdictional competence, however, can not be inferred from its only mention for Vienna or from the Styrian references of the fifteenth century (see Brugger, “Ansiedlung,” 150), although it is very likely that the extent of empowerment mainly encompassed conflicts between Jews and Christians.
78 E.g., all of the iudicis iudeorum of today’s Upper Austria’s capital of Linz were also caretakers of the castle of Linz, the residence of the ducal steward (Lohrmann, Judenrecht, 159). None of the legal documents refer to how the iudex iudeorum was to be appointed/elected; thus, an appointment by the ruler is at least possible, if not likely (at least as far as less influential towns are concerned).
strengthening his position as well as expanding his competences, gradually transforming the office into an at least partly municipal one.

With the growing claim of the towns on a more comprehensive jurisdictional and economic control of ‘their’ Jews, which, unsurprisingly, started shortly after the wide-ranging persecutions of 1338, the offices of the town judge and the iudex iudeorum were utilized to supervise the business activities of the Jews to a greater extent. Jews were obliged to produce their debt instruments to the town judge annually\(^\text{79}\) or even thrice a year,\(^\text{80}\) whereas pledges had to be presented to the iudex iudeorum on a regular, sometimes even weekly basis;\(^\text{81}\) in some Styrian towns, the municipal control was expanded further by demanding that any debt instrument was to be sealed not by either but by both the town judge and the iudex iudeorum.\(^\text{82}\) In the second half of the fourteenth century, cities tried to get organized when it came to keeping an eye on the Jews and their business transactions.

The increasing decline of the ducal protection offered considerable leeway for the towns to shift competences to their favor, allowing them to tighten their grip on the Jews perceptibly. Their aim of controlling and monitoring loans and pledges no longer merely encompassed the aforementioned producing, and certifying, of business documents but was extended to the many transactions concerning smaller amounts, most of which had heretofore not been documented in writing at all. To establish this control, many towns set up what is known as Judenbücher (“codices for the Jews”).\(^\text{83}\) Sometimes included in the general Satzbuch of the respective town\(^\text{84}\) and usually administered by the iudex iudeorum, the

---

\(^\text{79}\) E.g., 1376 in the town charter of the Salzburg town of Ptuj, today in Slovenia, see Scherer, Rechtsverhältnisse, 549–50; Wadl, Juden Kärnten, 176–77.

\(^\text{80}\) E.g., in the town charter of the Lower Austrian town of St. Pölten from 1338, granted by the Bishop of Passau who was the lord of the town; see Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, vol. 1, 341, no. 444.

\(^\text{81}\) Ptuj: Inanimate pledges (Schreinpfland, as opposed to essendes Pfand, “eating pledge,” i.e., livestock) had to be presented to the iudex iudeorum every Thursday, Lohrmann, Judenrecht, 160; Germania Judaica, vol. III/2, 1100.

\(^\text{82}\) Meir Wiener, Regesten zur Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland während des Mittelalters, vol. 1 (Hanover: Hahn’sche Hofbuchhandlung 1862), 236, no. 144 (Graz, Leoben); Lohrmann, Judenrecht, 160, incorrectly applies this regulation to the majority of Styrian towns.

\(^\text{83}\) The setting up of Judenbücher was not exclusive to the cities —rulers as well as noble families and in the fifteenth century, also the Estates of Styria and Carinthia tried to keep track of their debts by establishing Judenbücher (Brugger, “Ansiedlung,” 161–62). In some cases, it was the ruler who committed the town to set up a Judenbuch (e.g., Duke Albrecht III, who obliged the Lower Austrian town of Bruck a. d. Leitha to set up a Judenbuch, see Lohrmann, Judenrecht, 158). Most of the Judenbücher were lost during the persecutions of 1420/1421 that ended Jewish settlement in Lower Austria. As far as the general scholarly discussion on Judenbücher is concerned; for a recent discussion see Thomas Peter, “Judenbücher als Quellengattung und die Znaimer Judenbücher. Typologie und Forschungsstand,” Räume und Wege, 307–34.

\(^\text{84}\) The best documented examples within Austria are the “Judenbuch der Scheffstrasse” and the Liber
Judenbuch was the place where all the business transactions conducted by and with Jews had to be registered in (which also provided some protection for the Jews since the entry rendered it impossible for debtors to claim that the bonds the Jews presented were forgeries).

With the tightening grip of the cities on their Jews, the demand for them to partake in civic duties grew, Whilst in return, many German cities had taken to granting (partial) citizenships to Jews; a right that had, for the most part, been transferred to them by the lord of the town. In the territory of modern-day Austrian territory, both the dominating position of the ruler(s) and the lack of really powerful, important cities is most likely the reason for non-existing Jewish citizenship, the granting of settlement remaining exclusively in the hands of the rulers. Information on Austrian Jews participating in urban duties is therefore

Judorium of Wiener Neustadt. The Scheffstrasse, a small community right outside the Vienna city walls that was subject to the duchess of Austria, had its own register, kept by both ducal officers and representatives of the city of Vienna, which was a cadastral register as well as a book of loans. Whereas the second part was dedicated to loans among Christians, the third part is the “Judenbuch,” entries of loans granted by Jews (Viennese as well as Lower Austrian and Bohemian Jews) to inhabitants of the Scheffstrasse. Since the majority of the inhabitants were small-scale craftsmen, most of the sums (a considerable number of which were granted by Jewesses) were rather small. Artur Goldmann, Das Judenbuch der Scheffstrasse zu Wien (1389–1420). Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der Juden in Deutsch-Österreich, 1 (Vienna and Leipzig: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1908). An older Judenbuch of the city of Vienna has been lost; see Artur Goldmann, “Das verschollene Wiener Judenbuch (1372–1420),” Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der Juden in Österreich, 11: Nachträge (Vienna: Selbstverlag der Historischen Kommission, 1936), 1–14. For Wiener Neustadt, see Martha Keil, “Der Liber Judeorum von Wiener Neustadt 1453–1500. Edition,” Studien zur Geschichte der Juden in Österreich, ed. ed. and Klaus Lohrmann (Vienna, Cologne, and Weimar: Böhlau, 1994), 41–99.

Wenninger, “Vom jüdischen Rittern,” 54–67, on Jews partaking in the military duties within a city.


There are very few examples of cities (Worms, Prague) where this right to grant citizenship to Jews was independent from the concession of the ruler; see Germania Judaica, vol. III/3, 2169, 2181–82.

Klaus Lohrmann, “Bemerkungen zum Problem ‚Jude und Bürger‘,” Juden in der Stadt, 145–66; here
scarce. Since the Jews were generally subjected to taxation to no one but the ruler, the towns strove either to charge additional taxes or at least partially to incorporate the Jews into the tax revenue of the town.\(^89\) The earliest documented example in Austria, however, is remarkable in two respects: in 1277, King Rudolph I not only confirmed but also expanded the rights of the (small) town of Laa/Thaya (Lower Austria), amongst which he added the right to exclude ‘their’ Jews from the general Jewish tax and to include them into the citizens’ tax revenue,\(^90\) thus documenting not only the first exception to the general tax the Jews were paying directly into the treasury but the first mention of the ‘Jewish tax’ on Austrian territory at all.\(^91\)

For more than a century, however, the rulers’ claim to taxing the Jews remained widely unchallenged; only the late fourteenth century saw Austrian dukes yield to the pressure of both towns and the rising estates. In 1396, a large number of Styrian towns were allowed by the Dukes Albrecht IV and William to coerce the Jews owning houses and/or plots of land within the realm of the town either to sell these premises within a year or to participate henceforward in the tax revenue of the town.\(^92\) The references to Jews partaking in other civic duties like the city
watch, of which there is evidence in other regions,\textsuperscript{93} are even rarer; there is but one example of the nowadays Italian town of Gorizia where in 1307, Jews and Christians alike were committed to watch duties.\textsuperscript{94}

Faced with similar challenges, Jews and Christians often arrived at quite similar solutions. The organization of the Jewish community (kehilla) is in its main features rather uniform;\textsuperscript{95} yet, it bears astonishing analogies to Christian organizations, particularly to those of craft guilds.\textsuperscript{96} The contemporaries were not oblivious to this fact: in the Austrian region,\textsuperscript{97} the Jewish community is quite commonly called Judenzeche, “Jewish guild,” whereas their parnass, the head of the Jewish community, was referred to as Zechmeister der Juden, “guild master of the Jews.”\textsuperscript{98}

The term was partly used as self-denomination by the Jews as well,\textsuperscript{99} whereas the scribe of the Viennese Eisenbuch\textsuperscript{100} translated the Hebrew expression into samnung, a word regularly used to describe conventual communities.\textsuperscript{101} As diverging as the
Jews and the City

‘basic prerequisites’ may have been, the similarities both in the general composition of the community as well as many details are striking: by demand of mandatory membership, the organization could not only offer extensive protection for, but also wield wide-ranging authority over the members, whilst the ban from the community, which posed a genuine threat to insubordinate members, was utilized to exert control. Social concerns like the care for widows, orphans and impoverished members were dealt with by, and through, the community by the institution of Tzedakah and the guilds’ welfare system respectively, both of which were financed by regular contributions; members who somehow offended against rules were put on trial at the internal court; premises of religious as well as secular denomination were owned in common; and generally, a code of conduct regulated (at least theoretically) many areas of life both public and private. Feasts that were celebrated together played an important role in creating a sense of identity, an identity that in fact went far beyond the local scope—itinerant craftsmen arriving in the town were taken care of by the guild which provided them with shelter, food and sometimes money, the same way as foreign Jewish students and/or paupers were looked after by the kehilla.

Jews were participating in everyday activities at the cities’ market(s), thus entering and sharing both social and economic space with their Christian neighbors. Areas like markets, however, also provided convenient opportunities for exclusion and (physical) division. While thirteenth century towns were busy banning Jews from holding public offices, they generally strove to gain control

102 For a summary of the academic discussion, see Rainer Barzen, “‘Was der Arme benötigt, bis Du verpflichtet zu geben: Forschungsansätze zur Armenfürsorge in Aschkenas im hohen und späten Mittelalter,” Wirtschaftsgeschichte der mittelalterlichen Juden, 139–52; particularly 142–48.


104 On the importance of markets as ‘crucial elements of the medieval city,’ the aspect of gender, and how market space can be utilized for inclusion and exclusion see the article by Shennan Hutton in this volume.

105 The prohibition goes back to canon 69 of the Fourth Lateran Council which in turn referred to canon 14 of the Third Concilium Toletanum of 589. It is, however, the only regulation from the Lateran IV that had made its way into secular legislation. From the vast literature on the topic, see Heinz Schreckenberg, Die christlichen Adversus-Judaos-Texte (11.-13. Jahrhundert): Mit einer Ikonographie des Judenthemas bis zum 4. Laterankonzil. Europäische Hochschulschriften. Second edition. Reihe XXIII: Theologie, 335 (1988; Frankfurt a. M., Bern, New York, and Paris: Peter Lang, 1991), 425–26. Emperor Frederick II included this paragraph in the privilege he granted the city of Vienna in 1238 (for the latest edition, see Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, vol. 1, 28–29, no. 17, with additional editions and literature). The ban was reconfirmed for Vienna in 1247 (by Emperor Frederick II) and 1278 (by King Rudolf I) and was also included in the privilege for the Styrian

over the legal status and to restrict, or at least monitor, the economic activities of ‘their’ Jews during the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Neither Jewish landownership nor Jews being involved in wine-growing and trade were uncommon, yet the range of professions the Jews could make a living with within the towns’ realms was being more and more limited. With the craft guilds gaining importance, regulations that excluded Jews from specific professions on behalf of the respective guild appeared in town charters as well as guild articles. In Austria, the Jews of one of the biggest and most important Jewish communities on Habsburg territory, Wiener Neustadt, were prohibited the trading and selling of cloth, presumably at the request of the guild; but it was mainly professions concerned with food that were blacklisted. For instance, professions such as the brewing of beer (St. Veit, Carinthia) or the trading as well as serving of wine at a (local) bar (Ptuj, Lower Styria, Slovenia) was not permitted to Jews, yet overall, the butchering and selling of meat turned out to be the most disputed issue.

town of Wiener Neustadt, which allegedly predates the Viennese charter but is in fact a forgery from the last third of the thirteenth century (Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, vol. 1, 40, no. 29, 76, no. 60, 22–23, no. 9). For the whole complex of the Wiener Neustädter forgeries, see Peter Csendes, “Die Wiener Neustädter Stadtrechtfälschungen,” Fälschungen im Mittelalter, vol. 3: Diplomatische Fälschungen (part 1). Monumenta Germaniae Historica Schriften, 33.3 (Hanover: Hahnische Buchhandlung, 1988), 637–52; for this charter 646–47; on the factual validity of forged charters, see Thomas Hildbrand, “Sisypheus und die Urkunden: Mediävistische Überlegungen zur semiotischen Arbeit,” Text als Realie, 183–92; here 186.

Brugger and Wiedl, “Codifying Jews.”


Wiener Neustadt 1316, Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, vol. 1, 195–96, no. 205. It is not quite clear whether the regulation refers to cloth trade or tailoring, or both.


Ptuj/Pettau 1376. Ferdinand Bischoff, “Das Pettauer Stadtrecht von 1376,” Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse 113 (1886), 695–744. The article (§ 18), however, refers only to the retail trade within the city; the Jews of Pettau were far-distance traders on a big scale, especially with wine and goods from Venetia. Wenninger, “Juden Salzburg,” 753.
The Christian mistrust toward ‘Jewish meat’ had been clearly expressed at the provincial synods of Wrocław and Vienna in 1267, where in very clear words, Christians were cautioned against buying any nourishments from Jews lest these, who allegedly regarded the Christians as their enemies, poison them with their food (nec christiani carnes vales seu alia cibaria a iudeis emant, ne forte per hoc iudei christianos, quos hostes reputant, fraudulenta machinatione venenent). The later adoptions in several town charters, however, hardly ever referred straightforwardly to any threat posed to Christians should they buy, or consume, meat (or, come to that, any other goods) of “Jewish origin.” The first attempt at excluding Jews at least partially from that branch of business appeared as early as 1267 (!), when the butchers’ guild of the Lower Austrian town of Tulln put additional charges on the fatstock that was bought by Jews. Considering that the Jews were most likely butchering the animals themselves to guarantee kosher slaughter, the sum the Jews had to pay was presumably intended as a kind of fine for the loss of income the craftsmen suffered since they could not charge them for their slaughtering service.

Up until the fifteenth century, the main problem however remained that the Jews were not only doing the slaughtering themselves, but were also selling meat to Christians; and that by doing so they entered the domain of the crafts guilds. The Christian authorities, partially at the instigation of the craft guilds, partially of their own volition, dealt with the issue in different ways, most of which went along with, or were expressed by, a physical separation. The “simplest” solution, chosen by the Carinthian town of St. Veit in the late thirteenth century, was to ban Jews from selling their meat publicly altogether. The Jews of this town were only allowed to butcher and sell their meat at home; according to the town’s regulations, they not only remained without a possibility to participate in the public meat market but were also being denied the right to own livestock (most likely for breeding purpose, since they were allowed to slaughter at home) and refused their share in the borough’s common.

115 Jews were, however, not the only group of people medieval butchers had to concede the right to carry out slaughter on their own. Butchering within certain limits (zur hausnotdurft [for personal needs at home]) was regarded as the right of the citizens in many towns, and particular institutions like inns or taverns sometimes even had their own slaughterhouse and employed journeymen of the butchers’ guilds.
This complete ban of Jews from the public (economic) sphere of market activities remained rather unique among the regulations of the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries. Commonly, Jews were allowed to sell their meat at the public market via a specific stall that was either directly administered by the municipal government or at least under their strict control. That stall was usually remote from those of the Christian butchers and quite often located at the fringe of the market place.\textsuperscript{116} In addition to that, some towns demanded that the meat be presented ‘in an unobtrusive way’: not, as at the butchers’ guild’s booths, hooked-up and dangling from the ceiling or a pole, but placed on a stool.\textsuperscript{117} That their meat was to be sold solely at this particular type of stall may thus be interpreted as placing the Jews at a mere economic disadvantage, yet in many of the regulations, additional specifications aimed at a segregation of the Jews that went further beyond a mere economic measure.

The municipal stall was usually the place where \textit{pf"{u}nnig fleisch} was to be sold,\textsuperscript{118} which meant foul (trichinous) meat as well as meat from sick or injured animals.\textsuperscript{119}

\textsuperscript{116} An \textit{den endten} (“at the sides”) and not at the regular butchers’ stalls shall the \textit{judenfleisch} (“Jewish meat”) be sold, where it has been sold \textit{von allert} (“since time immemorial”), states the regulation the town of Judenburg issued for their butcher’s guild in 1467; Fritz Popelka, \textit{Schriftdekm"{a}ler des steirischen Gewerbes}, vol. 1 (Graz: Eigenverlag des Wirtschaftsforderungsinstitutes der Kammer der gewerblichen Wirtschaft für Steiermark, 1950), 137–37, no. 104; \textit{Germania Judaica}, vol. III/1, 594.

\textsuperscript{117} Liberties of the city of Salzburg, 1420: \textit{Item, das judenfleisch und pf"{u}nnigs sol man vor dem schl"{a}tor vaill haben auf einen stall und niet auffhahen}. Adolf Altmann, \textit{Geschichte der Juden in Stadt und Land Salzburg von den fr"{u}hsten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart}. Rpt. of the 1913 ed. and continued until 1988 by G"{u}nther Fellner and Helga Embacher (Salzburg: Otto M"{u}ller Verlag, 1990), 100–01.

\textsuperscript{118} Salzburg 1420 (see above), but the regulation dates back to the early fourteenth century: it appears as early as 1307 in the town charter of the Bavarian town Burghausen (1307, Christian Haeutle, “Einige altbayerische Stadtrechte,” \textit{Oberbayerisches Archiv f"{u}r vaterl"{a}ndische Geschichte} 45 [1888/1889]: 163–262; here 183) and was adopted, often with a quite similar wording, in the town charters of Neuötting (1321, id., “Einige altbayerische Stadtrechte: Fortsetzung und Schluß,” \textit{Oberbayerisches Archiv f"{u}r vaterl"{a}ndische Geschichte} 47 [1891/1892]: 18–124; here 29), Landshut (1344, \textit{Germania Judaica}, vol. II/1, 467–68), and Sch"{a}rding (1316, today Upper Austria, Brugger and Wiedl, \textit{Regesten}, vol. 1, 194, no. 202). The inclusion of the article in the town privilege of Schärding, however, is the only indication of a Jewish settlement in this (rather small) town at all; and since the wording of the article in the town charters is rather similar, it might have merely been copied, perhaps as a kind of ‘preventive measure’ against potential future Jewish inhabitants. Further, e.g., \textit{Germania Judaica}, vol. II/2, 557 and \textit{Germania Judaica}, vol. III/2, 902 (Munich), 1500 (Ulm), \textit{Germania Judaica}, vol. II/2, 946 (Zurich); Gilomen, “Kooperation und Konfrontation,” 177.

\textsuperscript{119} According to the liberties of the town of Mühldorf (before 1360), \textit{pf"{u}nnichs fleischs, wolfpaiczichs fleischs und swaz der jud ersucht} (foul meat, meat that ‘has been bitten by the wolf’ and meat ‘which the Jew desires’), should be sold by the butchers, but in front of and not inside their booths. Karl Theodor Heigel (ed.), “M"{u}hl dorfer Annalen 1313–1428,” \textit{Die Chroniken der baierischen St"{a}dte Regensburg, Landshut, M"{u}hldorf, M"{u}nchen}, ed. Historische Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Second edition. Die Chroniken der deutschen Städte vom 14. bis ins 16. Jahrhundert, 15 (1878; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), 369–410; here 396; Hans-Georg Herrmann, “Das M"{u}hl dorfer Stadtrecht im Sp"{a}tmittelalter und in der Fr"{u}hen
The additional association of Jews with the “rotten” and “foul” is therefore quite obvious, a connotation that was stressed even more when the meat had to be clearly tagged and/or the potential Christian customer had to be alerted to the fact that they were about to buy either foul or “Jewish meat.”\textsuperscript{120} In late fourteenth/early fifteenth centuries, the idea of the well-poisoning Jews prevailing, many towns resorted to more drastic and encompassing measures by declaring any meat that had merely been touched by Jews as being in the same category, therefore considering it being of a lesser quality, or even unfit for Christian consumption. This often concurs with, or is included in, regulations which aim at a comprehensive control of the behavior of Jews at the market: instead of touching the goods, Jews were to point at those items, particularly victuals, they intended to buy, and should they happen to touch an item, they had to purchase it, often with a surcharge.\textsuperscript{121}

Jewish existence within the space of cities was, to conclude, a risky one at all times. Schlom, the master of the ducal mint and the first Austrian Jew known by name, fell prey together with his family to crusaders in 1196,\textsuperscript{122} some 100 years later, the first blood libels and accusations of alleged host wafer desecrations were launched on Austrian territory, claiming their victims among the Jews of Lower Austrian towns. Yet as much as these horrendous incidents are indicative of the at best fragile balance between Jews and their Christian surroundings, details still hint at

\textsuperscript{120} Liberties of the town of Mühldorf: (…) swer daz flaisch von in chauf, ez sei gast oder purger, dem sol er ez sagen, wie ez unmb daz flaisch ste, pei 72 den (whoever buys the meat, be they visitor or citizen, he [the butcher who sells the meat] shall tell them about the condition of the meat, at a penalty of 72 pence), Heigel, “Mühldorfer Annalen,” 396; The judenfleisch has been frequently interpreted as “kosher meat” in general, whereas the fact that it was sold at the market to Christians suggests that the term refers to the parts of the kosherly slaughtered animals the Jews were not allowed to eat and thus sold via the municipal stall (which, in fact, might have also heightened the Christian suspicion that the Jews were selling them meat of low quality). The bigger Jewish communities usually owned a slaughterhouse and employed their own kosher butcher, e.g. Vienna; see Lohrmann, Wiener Juden, 55, 100, and 102.

\textsuperscript{121} Town liberties of Bolzano (late fourteenth century, see Germania Judaica, vol. II/1, 99; pertaining to all kinds of goods), adapted the butchers’ regulation; town liberties of Munich (fish), order of the municipal council of Ulm (1421, livestock, fish, meat, poultry, fruits), see Scherer, Rechtsverhältnisse, 577–78, with analogies to French legislation; whereas the city of Passau took a different (and quite intriguing) stance by forbidding their butchers to work for them, Municipal Archives of Passau III/22 (Gemainer Statt Passau Recht und Freiheiten samt alten und neuen Verträgen). The 1424 dating in Germania Judaica, vol. III/2, 1089, is questionable: the butchers’ regulation originates from 1432, and the paragraph containing the aforementioned sentence is an undated yet clearly later addition.

\textsuperscript{122} Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, vol. 1, 17–18, no. 4 (Hebrew and German translation).
a in parts functioning Jewish-Christian coexistence. Schlm had his thieving Christian servant imprisoned, and only the strident complaints of the servant’s wife in the nearest church alerted the crusaders; and when the accusation of a host wafer desecration was launched in the small Lower Austrian town of Korneuburg in 1305, the Jew Zerklin sought refuge at his Christian neighbor’s house, who took him in willingly and tried to protect him from the enraged citizens, albeit in vain.\textsuperscript{123}

The first overall shift to the worse came with the persecutions that followed another alleged host wafer desecration. Starting from Pulkau in 1338, thus almost parallel to the catastrophic “Armleder” persecutions that heavily affected the Jewish communities in Southern Germany,\textsuperscript{124} this soon became the first wave of persecutions that went beyond the local scope, affecting over 30 towns in Austria, Bohemia, and Moravia.\textsuperscript{125} While in Zurich, Minna and her sons fell prey to the pogroms accompanying the Black Plague\textsuperscript{126} during the fatal years of 1348–1350, Duke Albrecht II still managed to hold a protective hand over most of the Austrian Jewish communities; his coming down heavily on the town of Krems that had persecuted their Jews on account of an alleged well poisoning earning him the


insulting epithet of _fautor iudeorum_, “Patron of the Jews,” from the Church. The traditional stereotype of the ‘Wucherjude,’ the rapacious Jewish usurer, was repeated in and permeated by literature and iconography alike, posing a deathly threat together with the ideas of Jewish well-poisoning, the blood libel accusations and alleged host wafer desecrations. Although there were fewer persecutions in the second half of the fourteenth century than had been in the first half, the political and economic interests of rulers, estates and municipalities alike led to a considerable worsening of the overall situation of the Jews in the Austrian territories during the last decades. The rulers’, noblemen’s, and cities’ ideas of profiting from prospering Jewish communities had changed from squeezing as much money as possible out of them to not needing them any further at all, while the ecclesiastical climate had shifted from being at least ambiguous to clearly—and outspokenly—anti-Jewish, further fostering those sentiments within both authority and the populace. From the devastating Viennese Geserah in 1420/1421 that ended Jewish life in the duchy of Austria to the expulsion of the Jews of Salzburg in 1498, Jewish existence was violently brought to an end in the Austrian territories in the course of the fifteenth century.

In the beautiful illumination of an early fourteenth century Mahzor, a woman and a man during a wedding scene are depicted (see Figure 4). The man, clad in a cloak of an offish white and dark green garments, wears a cornuted hat, and his hand reaches out towards his presumptive bride. It is the figure of the bride that is unusual—not the garments in reversed colors, the cloak brimmed with fur, and the hint at a throne which she is sitting on, but the a crown on her head and the blindfold across her eyes come as a surprise. The connection with the Christian iconography is clear, the reference to the numerous statues and depictions of

---


130 Brugger, “Ansiedlung,” 221–27, with reference to further literature.
Synagoga defeated with her blindfold, the broken staff and the crown slipping off her head, Ecclesia triumphant with her crowned head watching her often somewhat warily (see Figures 1, 2, and 3). Here, the roles are reversed, the Christian character sits with her eyes blindfolded and the Jewish one can see, yet both figures reach out for each other. Encounter, contact, and interaction were inevitable, neither Christian nor Jewish authorities being able to hamper Christians and Jews meeting on a daily basis in their shared living space of a medieval city. Neither group being a homogenous one, Jews and Christians also meet on several social levels, the personal meeting level often being more defined by belonging to a comparatively similar social class. The close contact allowed and facilitated the exchange of knowledge, the mutual translation of cultural goods and habits, and the general acquaintance with the respective other; but with changes in the economic, social, and ecclesiastical climate and by the will, or at least lack of interest, of the rulers, these neighborly relationships erupted into violence and expulsion.

While the academic focus has widened as far as Jewish history is concerned during the past decades to encompass broader, and more different, questions, it is, in many regards, still a desideratum for Jewish history to be fully integrated into the history of a region, city, or topic rather than to be treated in a footnote or, at the best, a separate chapter. Jews do play a role in urban history, claiming their spaces within medieval cities and interacting in many ways and on many levels, their history being, in the case dealt with here, as much urban as it is Austrian and Jewish.
Figure 1: Statue of Synagoga, Bamberg cathedral, ca. 1230
Figure 2: Statue of Synagoga, Strasbourg cathedral, ca. 1225
Figure 3: Statue of Ecclesia, Strasbourg cathedral, ca. 1225
Figure 4: Mahzor with a depiction of a bridal couple, the bride, with the typical items of Ecclesia, has her eyes blindfolded, which, in Christian depictions, is the distinctive feature for Synagoga, ca.1330,
(Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg)
Figure 5: Decoration in the “Niederösterreichischen Randleistenstil,” Missale, second half of fourteenth century (Stiftsbibliothek Klosterneuburg, Cod. 74)
Figure 6: Sales deed of the monastery of Kremsmünster (Upper Austria) with the corresponding Hebrew charter attached to it (Stiftsarchiv Kremsmünster, 1305 April 29, Hebrew, and May 3, German)