



2020

In and Outside City Walls: Medieval Jewish Communities and Rulership in German Cities

Zoe K. Schwartz

Wittenberg University, schwartzz@wittenberg.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.mackseyjournal.org/publications>



Part of the [European History Commons](#), [Jewish Studies Commons](#), [Medieval History Commons](#), and the [Medieval Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Schwartz, Zoe K. (2020) "In and Outside City Walls: Medieval Jewish Communities and Rulership in German Cities," *The Macksey Journal*: Vol. 1 , Article 225.

Available at: <https://www.mackseyjournal.org/publications/vol1/iss1/225>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by The Johns Hopkins University Macksey Journal. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Macksey Journal by an authorized editor of The Johns Hopkins University Macksey Journal.

In and Outside City Walls: Medieval Jewish Communities and Rulership in German Cities

Zoe K. Schwartz

Wittenberg University

Abstract

As one would expect, Jewish life within the German Kingdom in the high middle ages (1000-1300 CE) was fraught with instability. The microhistory of specific Jewish communities has been undertaken by historians, but the Jewish experience within multiple cities has yet to be compared. Due to the diversity of authority structures within German cities, there was a concomitant diversity in their relationship (including restrictions and privileges) with the local Jewish community. The daily life of the Jewish community was subject to the authority of local bishops, for those inhabiting bishop-cities, or the emperor directly, for those living in free imperial cities. This paper undertakes a comprehensive analysis of the comparative experiences of the northern Jewish center of Worms and the southeastern Jewish community of Regensburg. The study of these communities by means of laws, rights, protections, and placement within the city, reveals a variety of medieval Jewish experiences within the German Kingdom; one that is divergent based upon city, the relationship between authority figures, and potentially the geographic location within the kingdom. By examining and comparing charters and laws between these cities, a mixed depiction of mutual benefit and subordination is created. The events that beset the Jewish communities during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries further demonstrate the consequences of dispersion between the geographical location of Worms and Regensburg. The comparison of the two communities results in an analysis of similarities and

variations, which helps with modern understanding of the medieval Jewish experience in the German Kingdom. The resulting picture is a more fully fleshed image of Jewish communities in the German Kingdom than can be received from either one micro-history or a broad-spectrum survey of the kingdom as a whole.

Keywords: Jewish Studies, Medieval Studies, European History

Foundations of Jewish Communities in the Kingdom

Within the medieval elective kingship system in the German Kingdom existed Jewish communities that were in existence partly due to the permission and protection of Christian local and royal rulers. Ultimately, princely or royal permission and offerings of protection to the Jews was due to the Jews' own economic services that appealed to princes and kings alike. The relationship between non-Jewish rulers and Jewish communities was based on a few conditions: the economic services of the Jews and the reliance on protection offered by rulers.

The economic factor of the Jews played a foundational role for Jews within the German Kingdom. Charlemagne (during the early middle ages, late eighth and early ninth century) allowed for the Jews to settle in and inhabit the German Kingdom "most probably to develop the commercial enterprises of his empire" (Rosenweig, 4). The appeal of Jews residing within medieval Christian society, for medieval rulers, was arguably based primarily on their economic services. For Charlemagne, and later for Bishop Rüdiger of Speyer (1084), Jews were valued in their role as merchants. Their services were indispensable for the emerging economy of the early middle ages. Their role as merchants changed after the twelfth century, when Jews were no longer the international merchants of Europe; instead, they were restricted to an area of

moneylending (Rosenweig 47; “Worms,” 444). The Christian guild system ultimately severely curbed the business and trade opportunities for Jews, who were excluded from guilds due to religious bias (Müller, 247). Unlike the Jewish merchants, Jewish moneylenders were more heinous to the Christian Church, who opposed usury on religious grounds. Nonetheless, the employment of Jews in the field of moneylending was extremely attractive to secular and non-secular rulers, specifically because Jews were not bound by the Christian restrictions on moneylending, which for Christian money-lenders meant they could not charge interest on loans” (Haverkamp, *Jews in Medieval German Kingdom*, 39).

The need for protection has a reoccurring role in princely or kingly charters where, in the name of protection, the charter subjects the Jews to the direct jurisdiction of the ruler. Alfred Haverkamp argues the deciding factor “for the formation of Jewish settlements –apart from religious and cultural requirements – was the Jewish need for protection within the Christian environment” (15). Protection offered by kings and princes included the securing of their physical safety and their rights as a separate community living in the German Kingdom. Charters thus had stipulations protecting Jewish lives, cemeteries, laws, and right to conduct business (“Duke Frederick of Austria, 1244,” 84-85). The beginning of the security offered by the ruler dates back to Carolingian times. Three extant charters granted by Louis the Pious before 825 secured the lives and possessions of the Jews under the protection of the emperor (Rosenweig, 4). The tradition of bringing Jews into the direct jurisdiction of the king was thus long standing, and in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the tradition remained. The privileges permitted by Bishop Rüdiger of Speyer in 1084 and King Heinrich IV stated, “Jewish litigants shall be convicted and judged by their equals and not by others...according to their own law” (Rosenweig, 5).

The rights of Jews within a territory were not decided solely by the ruler. Bernard Rosensweig argues that Jews had agency and a voice in the negotiation of the privileges granted to their Jewish communities, that the “Jews sought and received the right to internal self-government, to adjudicate their own litigations, and to live in accordance with Jewish law” (5). Jewish involvement in the charters allowing their habitancy in a city indicates Jews had a certain amount of leverage, where negotiation was possible due to the cities demand for Jewish economic services.

Kammerknechtschaft encompasses both economic and security factors of Jewish communities living in the German Kingdom. The stipulation in the duke’s charter recalls a trend within the German kingdom for Jews belonging to the ruler’s chamber or treasury, Duke Frederick implied that the business of the Jews in moneylending was associated with, and belongs to, the royal treasury (“Duke Frederick of Austria, 1244,” 88). The idea of Jews belonging to the ruler’s treasury is known as *Kammerknechtschaft* in the scholarship surrounding the relationship between Jewish communities and German kings (Rosenweig, 39). The beginning of this relationship is mentioned by King Frederick I in 1157, in his charter to the Jews of Worms, *cum ad cameram nostram attineant*, “subject to the Kaiser,” and *qui ad imperialem cameram nostram dinoscuntur pertinere*, “belong to the imperial chamber” in the charter for the Jews of Regensburg in 1182 (Friedrich I. charter to the Jews of Worms, April 6, 1157; Friedrich I charter approving the Jews of Regensburg’s traditional trade privileges, September 1182; Grabowsky, „Tutorium Arbeiten mit Quellen: Das Privileg Friedrich Barbarossas für die Wormser Juden (1157)”). Friedrich I’s concept was transformed into *servi camerae* in Latin and in German *Kammerknechte* by Frederick II in 1236 (“Emperor Frederick II, 1236,” 125). King Frederick II extended the charter granted by his grandfather Frederick I, the rights accorded to

the Jews of Worms in 1236. He states, “We cause this special grace to be extended to all Jews who belong directly to our court” (“Emperor Frederick II, 1236,” 125-125). From these claims to the direct service of the Jews, the concept of *Kammerknechtschaft*, belonging to the imperial chamber, was conceived. The bondage of the Jews to the king was taken seriously by the kings of the German Kingdom, despite being itinerant in nature, they still held their role as guarantors of the Jews’ legal position of great importance (Haverkamp, “Jews and Urban Life: Bonds and Relationships,” 64). The expression became commonplace when speaking of the political standing of the Jews. In scholarship the term *servi camerae* is translated as “the king’s serfs” or “Jewish serfdom,” but these imply the personal servitude of the Jews to the king, when in reality the term refers to the economic subordination (Agus, 242-253). The authority of the Jews, which the king claimed, was not without opposition from princes and feudal lords (Roth, 317).

Despite *Kammerknechtschaft*, which legally placed Jews only slightly above serfs, there is an element of mutual benefit in the relationship. Jews were taxed (sometimes heavily) but they had the legal rights afforded to them by the king and the king’s protection. For the king, he had the right to tax the Jews “the benefit of his treasury (*camera regis*)” (Roth 317). At the same time, the king had a duty to protect them from prosecution. Jews living in Jewish quarters sought protection, and their autonomy and safety often depended on local rulers as we have seen in the High Middle Ages earlier in the text. Nevertheless, kings upheld their role as guarantors for Jewish economic, legal, and physical safety, as seen with the reoccurrence of *Kammerknechtschaft* in royal documents.

The Case Studies: Worms and Regensburg

The two Jewish communities of Worms and Regensburg are examined in detail. The relationship between the Jewish communities and the local rulers or authorities is discovered not

just in royal charters, but also within the events that either endangered the Jewish community or endangered the city, as seen especially with Worms. The two studies reveal both kingdom-wide trends that Jews collectively experienced and more local events resulting in a varied Jewish experience based on Christian and Jewish written accounts, some coming from the *Germania Judaica*, and archeological evidence.

The Jewish quarter in Worms was located in the north-east curve of the interior city wall (Reuter, 64). The synagogue in Worms was built in 1034, and despite the violence of the First Crusade (1096), the synagogue survived (“Worms,” 1:444-445). The location of the Jewish community of Worms would not indicate a significant economic or social position, since the quarter lays about 1 kilometer away from the market square around which is the St. Peter’s Cathedral, the episcopal palace, and many civic buildings. Since the market square and the area around the cathedral would have been the hub for city activities, the location of the Jewish quarters farther away from the city center apparently did not hinder their vital role in Worms. Although the distance from popular streets of Worms could imply a less significant Jewish role within the city, the Jewish community of Worms was actually important to the city and was in fact crucial for the economic growth and stability within Worms.

The Jewish cemetery in Worms was the centerpiece for the Jews of Worms and acted as a central-cemetery for Jews living in the catchment land of the palatinate (Jews living in towns and villages surrounding the city) (Reuter, 65). The Jewish cemetery in Worms was probably established in the eleventh century, as the oldest grave stone for “Jakob hbachur” dates from 1076 (Reuter, 64). Called *Heilige Sands*, the cemetery was situated in front of the *Andreastor* (Andreas-gate), thus it was outside city walls and a decent distance away from the city-proper in the southwest (“Worms,” 1: 445). Like most Jewish cemeteries, the Jewish cemetery in Worms

was surrounded by a wall and was carefully cared for (“Worms,” 1:444-445). What sets the Worms cemetery apart from other medieval Jewish cemeteries, is that *Heilige Sands* is the oldest extant cemetery in modern Germany. From 1238-mid fourteenth century, the Jewish quarter did not expand, but a purchase of land in the 1260s led to an expansion of the Jewish cemetery (“Worms,” 2: 992). By the mid-thirteenth century, the Jewish community had outgrown the plot of land by the Andreas gate, so via the tear-down of some houses the cemetery was expanded (“Worms,” 2: 992). By 1260, the expansion and building of a surrounding wall was complete (Reuter, 65). The expansion of the cemetery sparked strife between the non-Jewish peoples of Worms and the Jewish community (Reuter, 65). The *Annals Wormatienses*, written by a lay man most likely employed by the city sometime at the end of thirteenth century, describes the issue between the Jews and citizens and Worms that arose due to the expansion of the cemetery as its last entry (Bachrach, 159). The entry implies that the lands the Jews lived on was “common land,” despite the Jewish community occupying the same area for over two hundred years, that permission to live within the city was transactional, Jews exchanged money for the city’s permission to occupy the land. The account suggests that the citizens were disgruntled about the cemetery, specifically the fortifications. It is unclear from the brief description whether the cemetery the citizens were most upset about, is the expansion of the cemetery in 1260. Although the *Annales* does not record it, the citizens of Worms did destroy the cemetery in 1278 (Reuter, 65). The synagogues, the mikvah, and the cemetery along with the expansion of the cemetery, provides information about the demographics of the Jewish community at any one time, along with the community’s financial situation. The two synagogues that were influenced by church architecture in Worms demonstrates some degree of cultural exchange.

The relationship between the Jewish Community and city authorities is exemplified in by the events of 1233, which began the city representatives' jurisdiction over the Jewish community dates back to at least 1233, evidenced by the conflict between the Bishop Heinrich II and the city councils. In challenging the status quo, the civic community met resistance from the bishop – possibly also the king. In 1233, the strife between the bishop of Worms and the multitude of citizens, councils and guilds in Worms resulted in almost a year of mass interdiction and the intervention of the king.

Chronicon Wormatiense, which was written by a cleric employed by the city's bishop and was written during the last quarter of the thirteenth century, describes the conflict in detail (Bachrach, 19). The Bishop Heinrich II of Worms went to the royal court being held in the city of Ravenna to complain about the interference of the city's councils upon the bishop's authority, "Here he complained in front of many princes and the lord emperor about these matters and about the consortium of fraternities and their works" ("Chronicon Wormatiense," 89). The fraternities as Heinrich II referred to are most likely both the councils and the guilds. In response, King Friedrich II granted a sealed letter declaring and commanding the end of the undermining influence of the "consortium of fraternities" on the bishop's authority/jurisdiction ("Chronicon Wormatiense," 89). The king's charter did not ward against resistance of citizens in Worms. The city was reluctant towards dismissing the council system that had been in place for many years. The bishop responded to the city's resistance by "taking up his spiritual sword and placed the whole city under interdict," that is ordering all clergy to leave the city, leaving parish priests behind to care for the sick, so that no one except the sick would receive communion ("Chronicon Wormatiense," 89-90). The *Chronicon* states this punishment stayed in effect for almost an entire year before the citizens asked for the king to act as arbitrator ("Chronicon Wormatiense,"

89-90). A year later citizens composed an agreement with King Heinrich, confirmed with the royal seal, then citizens gave their own sealed letter, that is the agreement between the citizens and the king, to the bishop and the cathedral chapter of Worms, and received a sealed letter in return (“Chronicon Wormatiense,” 89-90). With this exchange an agreement was reached and in 1233 the bishop returned to Worms and church mass was re-instituted. The bishop named nine councils according to the agreement reached between the citizens and the bishop (“Chronicon Wormatiense,” 91). He also named nine men who in turn chose six knights to precede over the councils (“Chronicon Wormatiense,” 91). The Chronicon reports that fifteen men swore holding the relics of saints the following oath:

...they would always preside following the statutes of the aforementioned privilege with the lord bishop of Worms in their council, that they would always be faithful to the bishop and the church, defending their rights in all matters, that they would defend and even increase rights and good customs of the citizens, and they would fairly judge clergy, laity, and Jews...(91)

Their oath, specifically “the clergy, laity, and Jews,” (in Latin: “iuste iudicarent, clero, laico, Judeo”) indicates the councils had—at least formally— some authority over the Jewish community of Worms (“Worms,” 1:442-443; Julius, 204). The statement itself, however, does not necessarily demonstrate the practice of councils’ involvement in helping govern the Jewish community. The fact that Jews were mentioned at all, specifically during an oath to the bishop about judging fairly, is nonetheless significant. An examination of the oath reveals information about where exactly the non-Jewish authorities integrated the autonomous Jewish community into the non-Jewish hierarchical structure. If one were to look at the three groups of people listed, the organization appears to be deliberate. The order might indicate a hierarchy, with clergy as most important, with Jews as the least important. The oath described how the Christian community interpreted the Jewish community of Worms.

The structure places Jews below the laity, but nonetheless, the mere presence of the minority group being featured in a governmental oath promising to judge fairly, demonstrates the importance and influence of the Jewish community in Worms. Jews must not have completely isolated themselves in their quarter, never interacting with the Christian majority, rather Jews were considered (by the bishop and the councilmen) part of the larger Worms community enough to be listed along with the clergy and laymen in the councilmen's oath.

Much like Worms, the earliest extant record of Regensburg's Jewish community is from the tenth century, when King Otto II "gifted" the country estate of *Schierstadt* (now known as *Stadtmhof*) to the St. Emmeram monastery in 981 ("Regensburg," 286). The land of *Schierstadt* the northern suburb of Regensburg was owned by a Jewish man, Samuel, before he sold the land to the monastery. The monastery, however, bought the property before asking for the king's permission ("Regensburg," 286). The source provides details about the Jewish community in the early middle ages: Jews had already owned property in the suburb of Regensburg and either the transfer of land required the king's explicit permission, or since this was a transaction between a Jew and a monastery, the king felt the need to interfere.

The extant and non-extant sources indicate that the Jewish community of Regensburg had planted roots in the city very early on. Their settlement likely influenced by the profitable location of the city upon the Donau, which encouraged the city's growing trade during the early middle ages ("Regensburg," 286). The context of the community is the backdrop for the community's experience during the high middle ages.

Records from the time describe a, not-completely-Jewish quarter. As the twelfth century records state Christians lived "*inter judeos*" (amongst Jews) ("Regensburg," 286). Italian merchants settled in *Wahlenstraße*, placing them next door to their Jewish neighbors (Codreanu-

Windauer, 394). The merchants and the Jewish community had much to gain from the neighborhood and their neighbors. They both had access to major transport routes via wide streets to the banks of the Danube, a major trade highway (Codreanu-Windauer, 395). Later the quarter would host more properties owned by Christians than Jews. The quarter, located in a central location, was apparently a desired place for merchants and public buildings.

The abnormal location of the synagogue in Regensburg is reflected by the typical location of the synagogues in Vienna and Worms. In Vienna the synagogue was located in the center of the large Jewish quarter, and likewise in Worms, the synagogue was located well-within the Jewish quarter, rather than on the periphery, bordering the Christian community (Codreanu-Windauer, 397). Considering the normal placement of a synagogue, the placement of the Regensburg synagogue is significant. With access to the synagogue both outside and inside the Jewish quarter, the placement was functional. The synagogue's function was two-fold, as a religious and cultural centerpiece for the Jewish community and as meeting-point with Christians, a "contact zone" of sorts for economic and mutual affairs (Codreanu-Windauer, 397). With this in mind, the access to the building both inside and outside the quarter demonstrates the relatively peaceful Christian-Jewish coexistence.

Despite the Jewish community's age, the first extant record of a cemetery is from 1210. The new cemetery was a result of an agreement between Abbot Eberhard von St. Emmeram and the entire Jewish community of Regensburg, represented by Rabbi Abraham ben Moses. According to the contract, in 1210, the Jewish quarter agreed that in exchange for land within "Emmeramer Breite," which was to be used as a cemetery, they must pay the Abbot 40 pounds of Regensburg's *Pfennig* coins (*Bayerisches Städtebuch: Handbuch Städtischer Geschichte*, 573). With the agreement the new Jewish cemetery was now located south of *Peters Tor*.

Although Jews had lived in Regensburg for at least a few centuries, the only known cemetery came to be in 1210. How can this be? Perhaps the answer lies with Abbot Anselm von St. Emmeram, who in 1729 stated there were two pre-existing cemeteries before the one in *Emmeramer Breite*. The two proposed by Abbot Anselm were located in Sallern, a district of Regensburg, and the other on Ermmeran Monastery's land near the monastery's hill and wood-guard (*Holtzwacht*) (Wittmer, 63). Since the only evidence supporting the theory of two previous cemeteries is Abbot Anselm's words written nearly five hundred years after 1210, his testimony is ultimately unreliable. Despite his unreliability, conjecturing on a previous cemetery used by the Jews of Regensburg is not preposterous. Whether this cemetery was inside the city or if the Jews had to travel to another city's Jewish cemetery is hard to say, but both could be possible. Interestingly, the cemetery was later expanded in 1282 for a price of 100 *Pfund* of Regensburg's currency (Härtel, 55).

Comparison

The two communities of Worms and Regensburg share various similarities, especially with the interactions and relationship between rulers and the Jewish community. How these interactions either positively or negatively influenced the Jewish experience in the high middle ages, is one of the primary focuses of this study. The following section attempts to highlight and then analyze some of the similarities and differences between the Jewish community of Regensburg and Worms. The kingdom-wide policies or events such as the crusades or kingdom encompassing royal charters—even regional charters are extremely similar in either content or the message the decree sends—create a similar environment for the Jewish communities in the kingdom. In most cases such charters confirmed the Jews' independence and religious and physical safety and often their place in the royal chamber, with the king as the guarantor of the

rights of Jews in the kingdom. Since Friedrich I, the policy of *Kammerknechtschaft*, situated the Jews, at least officially, in the sole hands of the king. The reality of *Kammerknechtschaft*, however is quite different, with bishops taking on the role as tax collectors.

The relationship between the Jewish community and the city councils challenged the long reigning authority of the church and the bishop occurred in the thirteenth century. As seen in Worms when the city challenged the bishop on suspending the city councils, it led to a short excommunication, before the king intervened and brought the city and the bishop together again. The compromise included keeping the councils and an oath, which stated the council members would “increase rights and good customs of the citizens, and they would fairly judge clergy, laity, and Jews” (“Chronicon Wormatiense,” 91). The council promised to protect the Jews of Worms, which they did until the city attempted to expel the Jews from the city in 1558. The attempt came at a time of a series of expulsions in the early sixteenth century within the kingdom, it was only an attempt and was unsuccessful, since the king forbade the expulsion.

Unlike in Worms, the expulsion of Jews from Regensburg was successful decades earlier in the beginning of the sixteenth century (Wittmer, 154). Likewise the relationship between the Jews of the city and the city council, who had similar interests of diminishing the power of the bishop in favor of the direct rulership of the king. This relationship lasted for almost as many years as the same relationship in Worms. The point being, Jews did not solely interact negatively with authoritarian bodies, in fact they may have worked together to diminish the not preferred rulership of bishops. These cross-religious associations faltered during the sixteenth century, similar to multiple other situations of co-existence in other cities or regions. Both the attempted and the successful expulsion were on the tail-end of a series of expulsions throughout the fifteenth century.

For both cities, the Jewish communities interacted with three authority figures, who held varying degrees of power. First, the king, who after King Friedrich I in 1157 and King Friedrich II in 1236, officially held sole legal claim control over the Jews. The king often acted as an arbitrator between the city and the bishop, and as a rival force of power against the bishop or local authorities. The relationship between the Jewish community and the city council was a beneficial one until it dissolved in the sixteenth century.

Besides politically, the Jewish communities shared obvious traits, derived from communities' religion, Judaism, and consequentially the cultural and social factors of the synagogue and the mikvah. The Jews of Worms and Regensburg fit nicely into the tendency for Jews in medieval Europe to be involved in moneylending and merchantry. Certainly, however, it must be noted that there were more aspects to the community than these two outward-trades, that deal with members outside the community.

Some superficial, although important, similarities between the two communities are the location of the Jewish quarter and the location of the cemetery. The Jewish quarter in Worms and Regensburg, although not similarly placed within the city, were both within city walls, enjoying the safety a city wall would bring. The location of the Jews within the city walls is likely due to the early settlement of the Jews in the city, as in they were not late-comers to a completely occupied city. Unlike the Jewish quarter, both of the Jewish cemeteries were located outside of the city walls. Lastly, the age of the community should also be considered for the reason why these two communities were similar. Both communities were recorded as first living city in the tenth century (Bönnen, 450; "Regensburg" 1:285-286; Stobbe, 68). Possibly, the longer presence of the Jewish community, as in one that had been there for generations, had a higher level of integration into the Christian city.

Community Divergences

Even with the similarities of relationships between the city council and king, the two communities differ most significantly on the level and frequency of violent anti-Jewish acts that plagued the communities. The amount of anti-Jewish violence based on written evidence was more apparent in Worms than in Regensburg. Both communities were devastated by the First Crusade of 1096 but rebounded within a few decades to their former size. In 1147, the Second Crusade in Worms led to the death of two Jews, while Regensburg did not have any disruptions (“Worms,” 1:441). An unparalleled event unique to Worms was the 1196 pogrom. Two rogue crusaders on November 15, 1196, attacked the household of Rabbi Eleasar ben Jehuda (“Worms,” 1:441). One of the perpetrators was captured and punished by the city, but the damage had already been done with the death of several Jewish persons.

To counter the various violent events that befell the Jewish community of Worms, there was the odd instance of anti-Jewish violence in the strange event documented by a monk in Holland (Wittmer, 27-28). The source, *Annales Egmundani*, which was written between 1120 and 1315, is problematic in its reliability, since the entry for 1137 could have been written as late as 1315. A report of a tense Christian and Jewish interaction involving undertones of blood-libel sentiments from a century after the event, places more doubt upon the accuracy of the report. At the report’s core there is a description of both conflict and contact between the Jewish community and the archdeacon, along with information on the perspective of Christians on the Jewish community in Regensburg.

The Jewish Community’s Role within the City

While both communities were located within city walls, the location of the community in the city was different for the two communities. The Jewish quarter of Regensburg was

abnormally located in the middle of the city, surrounded by Christian neighbors and with the synagogue on the outskirts of the quarter in the southwest corner. The actual location of the synagogue was revealed via the 1995 excavation. Prior to the mid-1990s there was a lack of extant contemporary illustrations or maps (Codreanu-Windauer, 387). The synagogue was located in the southwest part of the Jewish quarter. The door to the first synagogue faced the Christian exterior in the southwest and another door in the northwest, facing the Jewish quarter interior (Codreanu-Windauer, 395; Wittmer, 33-36). As Siegfried Wittmer speculated, the synagogue that was remodeled 1210-1220, was actually the first synagogue *after* 1097 (33-36). If there was a synagogue in Regensburg before the crusade in 1096 it would have been either destroyed or converted to a Christian chapel (Wittmer, 34). It seems plausible that there existed a synagogue before the destruction of 1096, other cities whose Jewish community was targeted like Speyer, Worms, Mainz, Prague, and Frankfurt am Main built synagogues in the first half of the twelfth century (Wittmer, 36). The actual building of the structure is placed between 1097 and 1140. Other communities in the German Kingdom whose synagogues were likewise destroyed in 1096, rebuilt their new synagogues sometime after 1096 up to 1150 (Wittmer, 35-36).

The door that was built on the southwestern corner of the courtyard wall, was at some point during the first “Romanesque” synagogue walled up and access was then obstructed by two annex rooms (Codreanu-Windauer, 395). The reasoning behind this change is unknown, not having an exact date to the change of the southwestern door, which hinders proper analysis and possible connections to be made with major pogroms. The change might have been spurred by anti-Jewish violence or tensions between the Christian majority and the Jewish minority, but the

archeological results remain ambiguous (Codreanu-Windauer, 395). Silvia Codreanu-Windauer proposed the change may have been practical and the Jews simply needed more room (395).

In contrast to the location of the Jewish community in Regensburg, the Jews of Worms were more distant from the hub of the city, since it was about 1 kilometer from the cathedral and market square. In Worms the Jewish community was flush against the northeastern city wall, rather than being surrounded by the Christian public. The placement in Worms in the northeastern curve of the city wall meant for Jews a significant distance from the rest of the city. The distance, although a factor in the Jewish community's role in the city, did not hinder their involvement in city politics and supporting the city.

The role of Jews in Regensburg is less obvious, yet evidence from the synagogue's entrances suggest, the synagogue might have been a meeting-point for the Jews and Christians in Regensburg (Codreanu-Windauer, 397). The abnormal location of the synagogue in Regensburg is reflected by the typical location of the synagogues in Vienna and Worms. In Vienna the synagogue was located in the center of the large Jewish quarter, and likewise in Worms, the synagogue was located well-within the Jewish quarter, rather than on the periphery, bordering the Christian community (Codreanu-Windauer, 397). Considering the normal placement of a synagogue, the placement of the Regensburg synagogue is significant. With access to the synagogue both outside and inside the Jewish quarter, the placement was functional. The synagogue's function was two-fold, as a religious and cultural centerpiece for the Jewish community and as meeting-point with Christians, a "contact zone" of sorts for economic and mutual affairs (Codreanu-Windauer, 397). With this in mind, the access to the building both inside and outside the quarter demonstrates the relatively peaceful Christian-Jewish coexistence.

The Jewish community was thus in the center of the city, an unavoidable community whose houses neighbored Christian houses. Perhaps as a result of being the center of the city, and upon a merchant-coveted street, the Jewish quarter hosted more than just Jews, since at least the twelfth century with the Italian merchants living *inter judeos* (Codreanu-Windauer, 393). Additionally, by 1350-1353 most properties within the quarter belonged to Christians and the quarter hosted a variety of public buildings: a barn, the well-house, the slaughterhouse, and a house for weddings (Codreanu-Windauer, 395). Christian presence within the Jewish quarter suggests that unlike Worms, Regensburg's Jewish community was more integrated within the city, perhaps due in part to the location of the quarter in the center of the city. The Jewish community in Worms, although not as integrated in the Christian city, was at least officially recognized as part of the city, evidenced by the 1233 oath of recently elected councilmen, who swore "they would fairly judge clergy, laity, and Jews" (Codreanu-Windauer, 395). The two communities and their participation in the city, and acknowledgment from the city seem well matched. Legally, the Jews of Worms were acknowledged as a group to be protected in the councilmen's oath in 1233. While socially, the Jewish quarter in Regensburg was well placed in the city for frequent interactions with their Christian neighbors.

Age of the Cemeteries

The discrepancy between the start dates of the Jewish cemeteries in Worms and Regensburg opens up the possibility for another older Jewish cemetery somewhere in Regensburg, that may have been destroyed or lost. The cemetery in Regensburg was founded in 1210, while the cemetery in Worms dates back to 1076. The lack of evidence for a cemetery before 1210 in Regensburg does contrast with Worms' oldest extant Jewish cemetery, *Heilige Sands* (Reuter, 64). The evidence for a cemetery of Worms in the eleventh century pre-dates the

Regensburg Jewish cemetery, nearly two hundred years before the purchase of land in *Emmerams Breite* in Regensburg, which brings into question if the Jews of Regensburg had an hitherto undiscovered cemetery prior to 1210 or if the community utilized a cemetery in another city. Another point of divergence between the two cemeteries, was the resistance of Christians to the Jewish cemetery in Worms in the second half of the thirteenth century (Reuter, 65). The inconsistency between the two Jewish cemeteries, with one cemetery almost two centuries older, and Jewish presence in the city, which was recorded by the tenth century, is troublesome. A possible solution to the missing pre-1210 graveyard in Regensburg, as mentioned earlier, might come from the Abbot Anselm von St. Emmeram in 1729, who claimed to know the location of two pre-1210 Jewish cemeteries in Regensburg (Wittmer, 63). To say the source is unreliable would be an understatement, however, since there appears to have been no attempts to prove or disprove the abbot's assertion via archeological excavations, the possibility of the cemeteries located elsewhere in the city remains open.

Conclusion

Through a comparison of the two cities, high medieval Worms and Regensburg during a time of political change as local and royal power vie for authority, the interactions between the Jewish community and Christian authorities present a mixed relationship, where Jews were offered some legal and religious rights while being exploited for the economic services and often persecuted by Christians inside and outside the city.

Both communities, while located within city walls, had different levels of interaction with the whole city. The level of violence might be in part due to the location of the city and of the Jewish quarter. Worms faced more crusade related violence, like most other cities along the Rhine including Mainz. Other small-scale cases of violence were not seen in Regensburg, in fact

the relationship between the community and city was fairly positive, perhaps due to the central location of the quarter. Also, theoretically, the community in Regensburg might have also been protected by a buffer of Christian homes and buildings.

The similarities between the two communities' interactions with rulers is partially due to kingdom-wide policies of kings, such as *Kammerknechtschaft*. The policies of kings during this time period remained fairly consistent, with most kings after Friedrich I, confirming what the previous king promised to the Jews in the area. Examples are King Friedrich II, who confirmed Friedrich I's 1182 charter in 1216, and King Heinrich VII in 1230, who added more rights protecting stipulations to his charter ("Regensburg," 1:287). This meant giving the Jews religious and legal freedom within their community and tying them to the king for the purpose of protection and exploitation of the Jews' finances. Also, due to the similar development of the civic communities, which like the Jews, sought the king's protection while rebuking the rulership of bishops or princes, the Jewish communities remained in the city in the fourteenth century.

There is much more to be said about medieval Jewish history in the German Kingdom, with this research being only an in-depth examination of two Jewish communities that were geographically and not culturally distant. Case studies involving communities within different parts of Europe would unveil more wide-spread dispersions for more geographically representative and cohesive conclusions on the Jewish experience during the Middle Ages. More research should be done on the commonalities and differences of medieval Jewish communities, since an analysis of these comparisons often leads to intriguing insights and an uncovering of patterns needed for understanding the medieval Jewish experience.

Works Cited

- Agus, Irving A. "Preconceptions and Stereotypes in Jewish Historiography." *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. 51, no. 3, 1961, p. 242., doi:10.2307/1453440.\
- Aronius, Julius. *Regesten Zur Geschichte Der Juden Im fränkischen Und Deutschen Reiche Bis Zum Jahre 1273*. Edited by Albert Dresdner and Ludwig Lewinski, Olms, 1970.
- Bachrach, David Stewart, translator. "Chronicon Wormatiense." *The Histories of a Medieval German City, Worms c. 1000 - c. 1300: Translation and Commentary*, Routledge, 2016.
- Bönnen, Gerold. "Worms: The Jews between the City, the Bishops, and the Crown." *The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages (Tenth to Fifteenth Centuries): Proceedings of the International Symposium Held at Speyer, 20-25 October 2002*, Brepols, 2004, pp. 449–458.
- Codreanu-Windauer, Silvia. "Regensburg: The Archeology of the Medieval Jewish Quarter." *The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages (Tenth to Fifteenth Centuries): Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Speyer; 20-25 October 2002*, Brepols 2004, pp. 391-403.
- "Duke Frederick of Austria, 1244." *Church, State, and the Jew in the Middle Ages*, by Robert Chazan, Behrman House, 1979.
- "Emperor Frederick II, 1236." *Church, State, and the Jew in the Middle Ages*, by Robert Chazan, Behrman House, 1979.
- "Fourth Lateran Council, 1215." *Church, State, and the Jew in the Middle Ages*, by Robert Chazan, Behrman House, 1979.

“Friedrich I Charter Approving the Jews of Regensburg’s Traditional Trade Privileges, September 1182, Regensburg.” *MGH DD F I. 4*, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, www.dmggh.de/mgh_dd_f_i_4/index.htm.

“Friedrich I. Charter to the Jews of Worms, April 6, 1157, Worms.” *MGH DD F I. 1*, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, www.dmggh.de/mgh_dd_f_i_1/index.htm.

Grabowsky, Annette. “Das Privileg Friedrich Barbarossas Für Die Wormser Juden (1157).” *EStudies*, Mapublishing-Lab.uni-Koeln.de, 15 May 2015, www.historicum-estudies.net/etutorials/tutorium-quellenarbeit/beispielanalysen/privileg-barbarossas/.

Härtel, Susanne. *Jüdische Friedhöfe Im Mittelalterlichen Reich*. De Gruyter, 2017.

Haverkamp, Alfred. *Jews in Medieval German Kingdom*. Translated by Christoph Cluse. Trier: Universität Trier, 2015.

Haverkamp, Alfred. “Jews and Urban Life: Bonds and Relationships.” *The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages (Tenth to Fifteenth Centuries): Proceedings of the International Symposium Held at Speyer, 20-25 October 2002*, by Christoph Cluse, Brepols, 2004, pp. 55–69.

Haverkamp, Alfred. “The Jewish Quarters in German Towns during the Late Middle Ages.” *In and Out of the Ghetto: Jewish-Gentile Relations in Late Medieval and Early Modern Germany*, Cambridge University Press, 1995, pp. 13–28.

Keyser, Erich. “Regensburg.” *Bayerisches Städtebuch: Handbuch städtischer Geschichte*, Kohlhammer, 1974.

Müller, Jörg R. “Erez Gezerah—‘Land of Persecution’: Pogroms against the Jews in the Regnum Teutonicum from c. 1280 to 1350.” *Cultural Encounters in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages (Tenth to Fifteenth Centuries)*, 2004, pp. 245–260.

“Regensburg.” *Germania Judaica: Band I Von den ältesten Zeiten bis 1238*, by I. Elbogen, and H. Tykocinski. Mohr Siebeck, 1963.

“Regensburg.” *Germania Judaica: Band II Vom 1238 Bis Zur Mitte Des 14. Jahrhundert*, by Zvi Avneri, Mohr Siebeck, 1968.

Reuter, Fritz. “Die Heilige Gemeinde Worms.” *Juden in Deutschland*, F. Steiner, 1995.

Rosenzweig, Bernard. *Ashkenazic Jewry in Transition*. Wilfrid Laurier Univ. Press, 1975.

Roth, Cecil. “Servi Camerae Regis.” *Encyclopedia Judaica*, 2nd ed., vol. 18, Thomson Gale, 2007, p. 317.

Stobbe, Otto. “Die Juden in Deutschland Whrend Des Mittelalters in Politischer, Socialer Und Rechtlicher Beziehung.” *Google Books*, C. A. Schwetschke Und Sohn, books.google.com/books?id=UFwLAAAAIAAJ.

Wittmer, Siegfried. *Jüdisches Leben in Regensburg: Vom frühen Mittelalter Bis 1519*. Universitätsverlag, 2001.

“Worms.” *Germania Judaica: Band I Von den ältesten Zeiten bis 1238*, by Elbogen, I., and H. Tykocinski. Mohr Siebeck, 1963.

“Worms.” *Germania Judaica: Band II Vom 1238 Bis Zur Mitte Des 14. Jahrhundert*, by Zvi Avneri, Mohr Siebeck, 1968.