Anti-Jewish polemics can be found in abundance in medieval theology, literature, and art; yet as for documents that stemmed from economic encounters, little research has been done so far. In late medieval Austrian economic source material, only a few hints at anti-Jewish stances can be found in business documents, most of which stem from either an ecclesiastical or a municipal environment. While these brief references to the Jews’ interest rates, to Jewish counterfeiting and Jewish duplicity might not be categorized as polemical per se, they introduce polemical stereotypes and arguments into scenarios of everyday Jewish-Christian interaction, and thus contribute to making anti-Jewish sentiment part of the Christian mind-set.
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The honorable and wise, our dear friend, Johann (II) Ribi of Platzheim-Lenzburg, bishop of Gurk and chancellor of the Austrian Duke Rudolph IV, addressed the Viennese Jew David Steuss in 1364, when David Steuss had, because of the loyalty and friendship he bears towards us, negotiated a loan of 100 pound pennies from the Viennese Jewish community for the bishop. Honorific, even flattering forms of addresses from Christians towards their Jewish business partners are rare, although not unheard of, and those few but noticeable addresses might suggest that references to the contrary, to anti-Jewish stereotypes and prejudices would be even more numerous. By the late thirteenth century, when business charters and other economic or administrative records began to flow in abundance, anti-Jewish sentiments had already been firmly established. Narratives of Jewish usurers, host desecrators and ritual murderers, of the Jews’ obstinacy against Christ and their animosity, even hatred, towards Christianity, their conspiracy with, alternatively, heretics, lepers, and Mongols, were spread in many ways, and depictions of Jews suckling a sow’s teats or being condemned
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to eternal punishment were visible for anyone to see.\textsuperscript{5} Instances of violent persecution give evidence as to how ingrained into the Christian mind-set these stories were by the early fourteenth century – the mere presence of two triggers, a host wafer and a Jew, in the same surrounding set in motion an almost predestined process, and a process that could be relied upon – as seen in the example of the priest of the small Lower Austrian town of Korneuburg, when he, wishing to create a pilgrimage site, planted a host wafer dipped in goat’s blood in front of a Jew’s house in 1305, resulting in the murder of the entire Jewish population.\textsuperscript{6}

Documents that record the everyday interaction between the Ashkenazi Jews and their Christian neighbours make up the majority of source material,\textsuperscript{7} their number skyrocketing with the Late Middle Ages. So far, however, research concerning anti-Jewish polemics (as cultural studies more generally) rarely looks towards business and its documents as a potential source.\textsuperscript{8}

Yet charters have long been recognised as being more than a mere means of recording a business. Their role within the broad field of medieval communication studies has been, and still is, undergoing close scrutiny. Interest has broadened to include their graphic symbols, and, particularly, the rituals that surround their issuance and (public) presentation.\textsuperscript{9} While the focus of research (for now) lies mainly on high medieval charters issued by rulers or high clergy, many of these approaches can be applied to charters of the minor nobility, of citizens, peasants, or, of course, Jews. Not only did the process that led to their issuance include meetings – in public, at the town scribe’s office, but perhaps also in the Christian or Jewish business partners’ houses – but the documents themselves can be perceived as »a micro-cosm of cultural transfer.«\textsuperscript{10} Charters were a space of contact and encounter in which Jews visibly participated: as addressees, as witnesses, subsumed under »honourable and pious people«,\textsuperscript{11} and also as issuers. These charters, mostly issued for the respective Christian business partner, were a space of Jewish-Christian encounter in itself: in (rarely) Latin or German, written, perhaps, by a Christian scribe\textsuperscript{12} but often with the Jew’s (or Jewess’s) signature in Hebrew; whereas Jewish moneylenders often added Hebrew notes to the debenture bonds handed over to them by their Christian debtor. Charters issued by both Jews and Christians

\textsuperscript{5} Higgs Strickland, Saracens, Demons and Jews; Wiedl, Laughing at the Beast.
\textsuperscript{6} Wiedl, Host on the Doorstep, on the priest’s conspiracy 321-322; Merback, Pilgrimage and Pogrom, 72, 77-78, 129, 177
\textsuperscript{7} See, for the Holy Roman Empire, the steadily growing database www.medieval-ashkenaz.org (retrieved on 11 November 2017), maintained by the project Corpus der Quellen zur Geschichte der Juden im spätmittelalterlichen Reich at the Arye Maïmon-Institut für Geschichte der Juden at the University of Trier; for Austria, see the ongoing project Documents on Jewish History in Medieval Austria, www.injoest.ac.at/en/projects/projects-in-progress/medieval-jewish-documents/medieval-jewish-documents.html (retrieved on 11 November 2017, with download links to the volumes already published).
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were a model example of shared space, such as the charters of Count Ulrich of Celje and the Jew Isserlein of Korneuburg, who, acting as ducal arbitrators, not only issued their verdicts in both of their names but showed the shared space in their respective corroboration: with the Count’s pending seal and the Jew’s Hebrew signature next to each other.\(^{13}\)

A shared space then, and space for occasional flattery – and every now and then, in the Hebrew notes, there is space for jibes against the Christian business partner: Christian feast days were characterized as »cursed« or »impure«, and two Jewish brothers from Vienna referred to the female part of their debtors as »quiver«, and perhaps shared a smile over the joke that only fellow Jews would be able to read, and thus understand.\(^{14}\) Such remarks vacillating between general polemics and (personal) slander are rare in Jewish documents and, at first glance, seem to be missing completely from their Christian counterparts.\(^{15}\)

Perhaps, one might argue, it was not necessary to insert gibes and quips into business charters, since anti-Jewish sentiment and polemical thoughts were expressed and propagated openly by word and image anyway. Perhaps our first and foremost question must be the potential audience – a limited one for sure, even including the public reading and publishing of some charters, if compared with the unlimited accessibility of a Judensau, or widely audible preaching.\(^{16}\) But then, is this the right question to ask? Wouldn’t it be even more significant if theologically founded anti-Jewish polemics made it into documents that neither focus on religious topics nor address a broader public, were in many cases not even read in public, yet were there to plant the seeds or, even more likely, trigger existing memories?

Bishop Johann’s reverence to David Steuss was supposedly owed to the favour the bishop needed from his Jewish business partner. Another Jewish loan triggered a completely different reaction: his predecessor in the seat of Gurk, Paul of Jägerndorf, had left the bishopric in financial tatters, as he had sold and mortgaged mensal revenues and church property, had taken out loans with Jewish creditors, and had pawned a mitre and a crosier to Jews and subsequently neglected to redeem them. Although common practice, the pawning of church property was frowned upon by ecclesiastical law, regardless of the pawnbroker’s faith.\(^{17}\)

Hardship and dire need were the only excusable reasons for giving away even surplus

---


14 Yuval, Christliche Symbolik, 95 (Cursed Thursday for Maundy Thursday), Keil, Jewish Business Contacts, 362 (Impure James); Keil, »...und seinem Köcher Anglis«, 113-114; on the image of the male »arrow« in rabbinic literature see Goldin, *Jewish Women*, 122. Israel Yuval has stated how »surprisingly similar« the language was in which Jews and Christians express their mutual hostility (Yuval, Christliche Symbolik, 87), and from the growing research on Jewish anti-Christian polemics, namely the Toledot Yeshu, the findings of Cuffel, Between Epic Entertainment and Polemica Exegesis, are particularly interesting in their connection of the characterisation of Jesus in the Toledot with Christian anti-Islamic polemics.

15 On the difference between polemics and defamation/slander, see Przybilski, Zwei Beispiele antichristlicher Polemik, 254-255, who sees defamation as aiming at destroying the other, the alien, while polemics primarily serve self-affirming purposes for which the other is used as a foil.

16 On the accessibility of the Judensau sculptures, see Wiedl, Laughing at the Beast, 339, 342; on the audience of (Dominican) preaching see Cluse, Jewish Moneylending in Dominican Preaching, 196-197.

church articles, and severe restrictions applied when handing over those items.  

Although high medieval church law focussed on Christian recipients of those pawns, many theologians condemned the idea of Jews coming into possession of sacred church objects, lacing it with anti-Jewish sentiments from the sixth century onwards. Jews were suspected of deliberately maltreating these objects in lieu of Christ, and scorching criticism was poured upon the »unjust and diabolic law« [i.e. the Statute of the Market] that rewarded Jews for actions for which Christians were hanged. While municipal legislation concerned itself mainly with the question of which objects to allow as pawns, legal codes such as the Sachsenspiegel emphasised the unjust advantage of the Jews and added visual stimuli: in several copies of the Sachsenspiegel, a Jew is shown being punished (hanged, or with his hand chopped off), with a chalice standing next to him, making his crime evident.

Therefore, Johann had ample legal grounds to seek both ducal and papal intervention to get these treasured items back. Pope Innocent VI’s order corresponded to Johann’s wishes: Paul of Jägerndorf had to immediately restore the church’s sacred objects. Although the pope’s main target was clearly the recalcitrant bishop, three words are quite revealing: the mitre and crozier had been pawned sub usurarum voragine to »certain Jews.« The use of this particular phrase was by no means coincidental. With the same words, usurarum voraginem, the Second Council of Lyon of 1274 had headed its constitution 26 that called for an expulsion of foreign moneylenders. The condemnation of the Jews as rapacious, voracious and merciless, and the image of them preying on Christians to – literally – capitalize on their plights, and threw to throw them into the abyss of usury, already had a longstanding tradition. Greed and avarice were linked to Jews in the early church scriptures already, and usury as an accusation against both Jews and Christians had increased from the twelfth century onward. With Lateran III, ecclesiastical critique of moneylending and usury gained momentum, with the Jews’ interest rates being labelled »grave and immoderate.« Criticizing Jewish moneylenders was utilised as a means to target secular rulers – among them the Austrian Duke Rudolph III, whose prevention of persecution of the Viennese Jews in 1306 was inter-

18 E.g. by melting down the items and giving away only the value of the metal, see Müller, Verpfändung sakraler Kultgegenstände, 183.
19 On the Statute of the Market (Marktschutzrecht) see below.
20 Peter the Venerable, see Schreckenberg, Christliche Adversus-Judaeos-Texte (11.-13. Jh.), 180-196; in the context of the pawning of church objects, see Magin, »Wie es umb der iuden recht stet«, 361-362.
21 See Magin, »Wie es umb der iuden recht stet«, particularly (but not exclusively) the chapter on the Statute of the Market, 52-99, for banned items 391-399; for Austria, Wiedl, Codifying Jews, 210-213
22 E.g. the Heidelberger Sachsenspiegel, UB Heidelberg, Cod. Pal. germ. 164, fol. 13v; digit.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/digit/cpg164/0040; see Magin, »Wie es umb der iuden recht stet«, 55; Slatzmiller, Cultural Exchange, 37-38; Wenninger, Juden in den Bilderhandschriften, 12-14.
23 See Dorin, »Once the Jews have been Expelled«, and idem, Canon law; for an overview Cluse, Zum Zusammenhang von Wuchervorwurf.
24 Cluse, Zum Zusammenhang von Wuchervorwurf, 137-139. The phrase sub usurarum voraginem was also used in charters without Jewish involvement, e.g. in context with debt-ridden monasteries, see Municipal Archives Mainz, U /1276 Dezember, www.deutsche-digita-bibliothek.de/item/P223HEONYI1276AUBFTXELGZBYUARMUR (retrieved on 11 November 2017).
preted as a means to further profit from their usury. Thirteenth-century chroniclers such as Peter of Zittau contributed to the spread of the image of the Jewish usurer. In his Chronicon Aulae regiae, Peter painted a dramatic picture of the plights suffered by the monks of the Bohemian monastery of Sedlec during the famine of 1280/81: eventually, their only way to avert starvation was to give away in pawn the very last of their church valuables to the Jews sub usurarum voragine.

The reference must undoubtedly have resonated with the addressee of the papal order, Ludovico della Torre, successful candidate for the Patriarchy of Aquileia against Paul of Jägerndorf, who was being commissioned not only with making sure that Paul returned said objects but with a general examination of Paul’s financial conduct. The disputed legitimacy of the pawnning and Paul’s refusal to redeem any of the pawned and mortgaged objects and revenues were to be the main focus of the investigation, yet the almost offhand reference subtly shifted at least part of the blame towards Paul’s Jewish creditors.

Surprisingly, neither mitre nor crozier were mentioned during the further process that also involved the Austrian dukes and the Counts of Celje – perhaps the two objects had indeed been returned or had, however valuable and representative, paled against the looting Paul had performed: not only had revenues been mortgaged, but castles, villages, houses, and fortifications had been sold, and even silverware, household items, and garments were missing and had to be retrieved from Paul’s various households. Yet, his indebtedness to Jewish moneylenders was indeed considerable – 12,451 florins, in capital alone – for which the Austrian dukes offered compromises that not only contained no anti-Jewish remarks but made sure that the moneylenders, among them some of the wealthiest Jews of the Habsburg territories, were not subjected to too heavy losses. Also the final legal opinion of the papal investigation held Paul solely accountable for the financial losses since he had failed to seek the sanction of his superior and the consent of his canons prior to selling, mortgaging, and pawning any church property.
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25 See the examples quoted by Treue, Schlechte und gute Christen, 110-112; Cluse, Zum Zusammenhang von Wuchervorwurf, 142-144; on Rudolph III, see Wiedl, Host on the Doorstep, 318-320; on similar accusations to the early Habsburgs, see Brugger, Minem herren dem hertzogen sein juden, 746-747.
26 Emler, Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum 4, 18.
28 References to older papal legislation also appeared in secular contexts, such as the (theological) servitus iudeorum, the perpetual servitude of the Jews due to their »sins« that appeared in secular bans of Jews from public offices, in Austria for the first time in Emperor Frederic II’s town statute for Vienna from 1237, and was repeated by King Rudolph I and Duke (later King) Albrecht I upon the reissuance in 1278 and 1296 respectively, see Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten 1, 28-29, no. 17, 76, no. 60, 93-94, no. 88. This concept is not to be confused with what is referred to as »Kammerknechtschaft«, the political claim of the Emperor (and territorial princes) to include the Jews in their treasury, see Abulafia, King and the Jews; and Abulafia, Christian-Jewish Relations, on the 1237 statute and its relation to Frederic’s privilege 52. The ban from public office goes back to canon 14 of the Third Council of Toledo (589) and was repeated in canon 69 of Lateran IV, see Schreckenberg, Christliche Adversus-Judaos-Texte (11.-13. Jh.), 425-426.
29 Wiedl, Sacred Objects, 68.
A minor remark, therefore, in a series of lawsuits, orders, demands, and compromises, perhaps noteworthy yet hardly meriting, or allowing for, in-depth speculation about anti-Jewish polemics against usury being slipped into legal and economic considerations? Almost twenty years later, in August 1379, after the death of Johann’s successor to the seat of Gurk, Johann (III) of Töckheim, two clerics presented the catalogue of the late bishop’s legacy to the papal emissary: no more than 400 florins, the bishop’s steward lamented, had his superior been able to leave behind, despite his honest efforts. The list of the bishop’s financial burdens was long, yet according to his steward, there was only one reason for the descent into the abyss: even all the revenues of the whole bishopric together had not been enough to pay the unduly high interest demands of the Jews; and only through the aid of the Austrian dukes (perhaps a reference to their intervention twenty years earlier) had misery been averted.  

This drastic imagery is no invention of the bishop’s steward: in 1282, Bishop Lutolf of Naumburg had, when declaring the sale of several properties of the bishopric, explained these transactions by what seems an almost identical reasoning – the church’s revenues were not enough to cover his predecessor’s debts that still kept increasing on a daily basis, and without help, the church would be swallowed up by the Jews’ vortex of usury (apud judeos absorbebamur usuram voragine).  

The assignments of guilt were enhanced by anonymising the (existing) Jewish money-lenders. Bishop Paul’s and both Johanns’ creditors were known and appear by name in various documents. However, even if – one might argue – these documents were not available to the clerics present, at least one person must have known: the bishop’s steward, Hans Payer, who had not only been closely involved with the bishopric’s administration for almost twenty years but had actually stood surety for some of the bishops’ Jewish credits. Thus, he could have easily added at least some of their names to his lament. Yet, in contrast to the usually quite precise declarations and listings of business charters, in its use of anonymity the rendering resembles theological polemics, which aim at de-personalising their statements to make them as universally applicable as possible. In this context, it is important to remember that both mentions, however offhand, of the Jews’ usury were done in a (partly)
ecclesiastical context and therefore must have resonated with at least some among those who were present – and the character of the documents in question, the papal order and the catalogue of the legacy, suggest a public presentation and thus quite a large audience.

These few examples already show that tracing anti-Jewish sentiment in business documents can be tricky. Formulaic phrases such as *sub usurarium voragine* clearly have an anti-Jewish ring to them which might still resonate with the audience when applied to non-Jewish loans. Clauses such as the order to resell or release vineyards only to Christians and never to Jews that several Austrian and Bavarian monasteries and clergymen introduced into their sale deeds from the mid-fourteenth century onwards might reflect an actual fear of losing their property in the event of an unredeemed pledge, yet (wilfully) ignore the very real possibility of Christian moneylending and pawnbroking. In other economic sources, anti-Jewish stances are expressed more blatantly. In their struggle to gain control over the Jews living within their walls, cities focussed on the Jews’ legal standing and economic activities; and it is therefore not surprising that these subjects play a key role in municipal anti-Jewish expressions. *Since the cursed Jews have much better rights towards the Christians than the Christians towards the Jews*, a paragraph of the Viennese Stadtrechtsbuch, a privately commissioned compendium of legal regulations from before 1360, describes the legal situation regarding stolen pawns. While its other, extensive regulations on business transactions and pawnbroking that concern both Jews and Christians remain quite impartial in their phrasing, the author lashes out against the same law, the Statute of the Market, that Peter the Venerable had stigmatised as the »very old but truly diabolic law« that allowed Jews to »be fattened and revel in luxury« in the early twelfth century. The Statute, the right of the Jews to clear themselves of the suspicion of having accepted stolen goods as pledges by taking an oath, had in the tradition of the imperial regulations from the late eleventh century been given to the Jewish inhabitants by most territorial rulers of the Holy Roman Empire. Over time, it had developed into a bone of contention, particularly between rulers and cities, on an economic level, with the latter seeking to abolish or at least curtail it. Lawful it might be, the Viennese Stadtrechtsbuch therefore conceded, yet not proper and fair. The Christian pawnbroker is identified as the innocent businessman, and the author follows Peter of Zittau (and many others) in the emotional stress he puts into the image: Christian pawnbrokers, such as innkeepers or grocers, ran the risk of having to return any pledge that had been stolen beforehand, meaning that »the poor man [would] lose his pennies he had borrowed on the pledge« (*hat der arm man sein phenning verlorn, die er auf die phant geparigt hat*). The pitiful image is not only contrasted with the indifference of the Jews (*duncht des die juden nicht*), the author even ascribes an actively negative role to them: the Christian pawnbroker simply
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33 In a settlement over levies and endowments, the parish of Chorherren forbade the pawning or selling of vineyards to Jews with the explicit argument that »much has been lost to the aforementioned church already« (Archives of the Diocese of St. Pölten, I/03-05/02 Pfarr- und Klosterakten – Chorherrn 1, 1393; forthcoming: Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten 4, no. 2035). On the prohibition, see Brugger, Smoke in the Chapel, 84.


35  For the ample discussion on the topic, see the overview by Magin, »Wie es umb der iuden recht stet«, 352–400.
»had« the pledges in his possession, while pledges of Jewish pawnbrokers were in eines juden gewalt vervangen, »caught up in the Jew’s power,« adding a sense of aggression to the percieved economic injustice. It might be far-fetched to associate this half-sentence with images of Jews as predators such as hyenas and manticors, and it is questionable whether the scribe of the Viennese Stadtrechtsbuch had ever seen such depictions, but his phrasing does conjure up visions of the Jewish aggressor who sinks his talons into the Christian prey. The chronicle of the monastery of Klosterneuburg, about fifteen kilometres upstream from the Viennese city centre, reflects a similar image when commenting on the fire that ravaged the Jewish quarter of Vienna in 1406: however horrible the fire might have been, it had impoverished more Christians than Jews. The Christians had lost their pledges, kept in the burnt-down houses of the Jews, while, implicitly, the Jews still could, or would, demand their loans back, thus portraying the Jews as still being able to benefit from Christian misery.

Usury and unjust legal status were two of the most prominent anti-Jewish tropes that were raised; in the course of the fourteenth century, with the growing importance of written and corroborated documents in everyday business, another economy-based stereotype was added: that of Jews as counterfeitors of seals and charters. Several processes were conducted against Jews and ended in death sentences, and eviction decrees of the late fifteenth century, such as the eviction of the Styrian Jews in 1498, included forgery in the list of »Jewish crimes«. The first time this accusation had been raised in Austria was in the introduction to the judenbuch of Duke Albrecht II, established in 1340. Written by a clerical notary, it utilises extremely hostile rhetoric: in the past, the perfidy (infamia) of the Jews, particularly their counterfeiting of charters and seals, had caused harm of and dispute between Christians, playing upon the image of the Jews as the wilful instigator of disaster and distress, but when it had been brought to the attention of the Duke, he commanded the extirpation of said perfidy and sought to prevent any further detriment by instituting two notaries who were to record all future business transactions.

The recording of Jewish business transactions, either in commonly used ledgers or in separate judenbücher, in addition to the issuance of a charter, were quite customary and, at least sometimes, were authorised by ducal permission. While the judenbücher were primarily a means of control over Jewish (business) activities, they could also serve as a safeguard for the Jews against accusations since they could present these ledgers before court.

---

36 Higgs Strickland, Saracens, Demons and Jews, 136-137 (manticore), 153 (hyena).
37 Stowasser, Zur Geschichte der Wiener Geserah, 117.
38 Lehnertz, Judensiegel im spätmittelalterlichen Reichsgebiet, 183-185; Keil, Regensburger Judensiegel, 139-140.
39 See the detailed analysis by Haverkamp, Verschriftlichung, 13-21.
40 Peter, Judenbücher als Quellengattung; for Austria Wiedl, Juden in österreichischen seriellen Quellen, 140-142.
41 Ducal permission is transmitted for the Lower Austrian town of Bruck an der Leitha: in 1388, Duke Albrecht III permitted the town to set up a ledger »in the custom of our other towns« in which all loans from Jews to Christians should be recorded (Municipal Archives of Bruck an der Leitha, Urb. no. 27; forthcoming: Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten 4, no. 1886).
42 Wiedl, ... und kam der Jud, 252-253.
introductions of other Austrian (still existing) *Judenbücher* could not be any more different to the one in Albrecht’s *Judenbuch*: *hie hebt sich an das judenpuech*, »here begins the Jews’ book«, is the caption of the *Judenbuch* of the Viennese Scheffstrasse, actually the middle of a three-part *Grund- and Satzbuch* (title and mortgage register). All three parts are accompanied by a drawing: a crown (as a symbol for the Scheffstrasse being owned by the duchess of Austria), a Christian, and a Jew. While the Christian remains anonymous, the Jew, with a Jewish hat and an axe that might signify judicial power, has *maister Lesyr* in parenthesis above his head, perhaps a fictitious person, but perhaps identifying the drawing with an actual individual from the Jewish community. Despite the stereotypical Jewish hat that marks Lesir as a Jew, the drawing shows none of the vituperation so visible in another depiction of Jews in an economic source: the infamous rendition of the Norwich Jews Isaac, Mosse-Mokke and Abigail in the tallage-rolls of 1233, whose usage of grotesque facial features and surrounding demons caused Anthony Bale to literally use it as a depiction of his definition of medieval anti-Semitism.

Neither of the Austrian *Judenbücher* contains any kind of anti-Jewish entry, which makes the introduction of the ducal *Judenbuch*, and particularly the prayer it closes with, all the more puzzling. The invocations of the prayer to Christ and Mary for protection against the Jewish evildoers take anti-Jewish sentiment far beyond the economic context of allegedly counterfeited charters and seals and bear a strong resemblance to later anti-Jewish sermons from the Viennese theological faculty. Unfortunately, when trying to analyse the source itself one is faced with a major problem: the ducal *Judenbuch* has not survived. The date and circumstance of its loss are unknown, and the introduction is only transmitted in a transcript from the eighteenth century. Only a rather vague description of (presumably) the original codex exists, from the sixteenth-century archivist Wilhelm Putsch with whom at least the introduction resonated so much that he included it in his short description: the ledger had been established *damit sy die Cristen mit den falschen siglen nit mer betriegen*, »so that they would not be able to further betray the Christians with their false/counterfeited seals«. However, no conclusions can be drawn as to how long, or how extensively it had been used, and what regions it actually managed to cover. Unlike other (existing and lost) *Judenbücher* which are mentioned with increasing frequency in business charters from the mid-fourteenth century onwards, the ducal *Judenbuch* is conspicuously absent from other source material.

---

43 Austrian State Archives, FHKA AHK VDA Urbare 1067A und B, 1068, the drawings on fol. 1r (crown), fol. 38r (Christian) and fol. 109r (Jew). The *Judenbuch* of Wiener Neustadt, like the Viennese one part of a larger manuscript that contained mortgage and title registers and testaments, and the *Judenbuch* of the monastery of Rein, both 15th century, have similar headers, see Keil, Liber Judeorum von Wiener Neustadt, and Herzog, »Juden-Puech« des Stiftes Rein.

44 The cartoon (British National Archives, Kew, E.410/1565, Rolls of the Issues of the Exchequer, Hilary Term 1233) can be seen here: www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/education/resources/medieval-mystery/ (retrieved on 11 November 2017); it is used (under the header »A medieval mystery«) in the »Classroom courses« of the National Archives.


46 Stowasser, Zur Geschichte der Wiener Gesera, 110.

47 Only in 1386, in a charter of Jörg of Liechtenstein-Nikolsburg, ducal Kammermeister, that records the transfer property rights to the Jew Lesir of an unredeemed estate, it is mentioned that the pawning of the estate had been recorded in the *Judenbuch* (Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten* 3, 405, no. 1830). It is, however, not clear whether this refers to the ducal *Judenbuch* or the *Judenbuch* of the city of Vienna (where Lesir lived) that had been established in 1372.
Nevertheless, the introduction with its vicious anti-Jewish rhetoric is quite unique in the context of Austrian business sources. A closer look at the ruling duke and the surrounding political events however does not contribute to any clarification; on the contrary: the strong protection Duke Albrecht II, the *fautor iudeorum* of the Calendarium Zwettlense, had provided for the Jews has led to speculation whether the *Judenbuch* had actually been planned as a further means of security for the Jews, particularly after the wide-ranging pogroms of 1338.\(^{48}\)

Other economic source materials from that period dealing with seal-cutting do not yield any clues about anti-Jewish sentiment, and remain silent on the accusation of Jews counterfeiting seals, most notably the 1366 code of the guild of the Viennese goldsmiths that regulated the cutting of seals. The code’s safety precautions forbade the cutting of seals in places that were considered suspicious, yet while these places included *unter den juden, »among the Jews«*, they also listed any Christian house (meaning the rooms inside) or »secret chambers«. Also, in production and possession no difference was made between Jews and Christians: neither goldsmiths nor anyone else, be he priest, layman, or Jew, was allowed to cut a seal without prior and secure knowledge of its legitimacy, and any illegally obtained seal had to be destroyed, whether it had belonged to a Christian or a Jew.\(^{49}\) References to Jews allegedly forging charters and seals are also missing from the period’s historiography. The only actual mention of (again, alleged) Jewish counterfeit stems from the ducal *Fronbuch*, where to the *Siegelverruf* (the official invalidation of lost or destroyed seals) of a Viennese citizen the note was added: *und daz sein ze dem ersten mal, daz unter den juden gefelscht ist worden, »and this was the first time that there had been counterfeiting among the Jews.«* \(^{50}\)

Accusations of unjust interest rates and of counterfeited seals and charters seem almost custom-made for mocking remarks in business charters. Business charters deal aplenty with lost, stolen or invalid seals, and even more often with charters that had been lost by either the Christian debtor or the Jewish creditor,\(^{51}\) yet in the sources that resulted from daily Jewish-Christian interaction, there seems to be no indication that the persisting stereotypes that were being reinforced in the people’s minds by narratives and images somehow reverberated in the phrasing of these documents.

---

\(^{48}\) Haverkamp, *Verschriftlichung*, 31; Brugger, *...hat ein hebraisch zettel dabey*, 427-428.

\(^{49}\) Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten* 3, 27, no. 1174. Lost or stolen seals were considered a serious matter; when, e.g., in 1404, the seal of the long-dead Reinprecht of Ebersdorf reappeared in the possession of a goldsmith, it was confiscated by the masters of the mint and declared invalid by Duke Albrecht IV, who had this message sent to all Christian and Jewish business partners (Archives of the Province of Lower Austria, NÖLA, Urkunden des Ständischen Archivs, no. 1616; forthcoming: Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten* 4, no. 2294).

\(^{50}\) A register of lawsuits conducted by the nobility and monasteries before the ducal court (Hoftaiding) between 1386 and 1397, Austrian State Archives, HHStA, Hs. Weiβ 18, fol 36v (1388); a term later, the citizen again declared his and his father’s seal void, with the addition that this was *ze dem andern mal* (for the second time) that there had been counterfeiting (fol. 41v). Invalidation of seals was a quite common occurrence, and since it often concerned Jewish business partners, many of these proclamations were done in front of Christian courts and synagogues, see Wiedl, *Do hiezen si der Juden mesner ruefen*, 440-441.

\(^{51}\) Brugger, *...hat ein hebraisch zettel dabey*, 426-427.
Perhaps we need to take an even closer look. In 1368, the mayor, town judge and city council of the small Lower Austrian town of Hainburg, about 50 kilometres downstream from the city centre of Vienna, were involved in a conflict which the citizens of the nearby Hungarian town of Pressburg/Bratislava had with their Jews. As a consequence of the (short-term) expulsion of the Hungarian Jews under King Louis I around 1360, the Jews of Bratislava had relocated to Hainburg from where they tried to collect the outstanding debts of the Bratislava citizenry. To be able to enforce their claims, they had to present their debenture bonds to the Hainburg iudex iudeorum (the Christian »Judge for the Jews«) and the town judge of Bratislava within a year, and the latter would corroborate them with his seal. On first impression, this seems to conform to a quite common procedure – both the presentation of debt instruments and pledges to a municipal authority and the corroboration of business documents by a town official was mandatory in many cities.\(^52\) The Bratislava Jews however had not only to hand over their documents for sealing: they remained in the possession of the Bratislava town judge, wan man die urchund und brief in der Juden gewalt nicht lazzen wolt und in der auch nicht getrawn wolt, »since one doesn’t want to leave the documents in the power of the Jews and would not want to trust them.« Suspicion of a potential manipulation of the charters, of a presentation of illegal debt instruments, and ultimately of illegally obtained financial gain and betrayal of Christians on part of the Jews is clearly implied, regardless of the fact that their weaker position had just led to their expulsion.\(^53\)

In the confined space of medieval towns, Jews and Christians lived in close proximity. Apart from being sources that pay witness to everyday meetings, court documents that show Jews as both plaintiffs and defendants attest to the acquaintance of Jews with the legal systems of towns, counties, and ruling courts. While Jews were, in theory, direct subjects to the respective ruler and could claim jurisdiction before his court, and while in some cases, intervention from the dukes or their representatives can be traced,\(^54\) the majority of cases were dealt with before the court that was responsible, be it the town’s Bürgerschranne, the court of an ecclesiastical institution, or of a particular vineyard (Berggericht). The lawsuits deal with issues of moneylending and pawnbroking as much as with everyday quarrels between neighbours – houses or sheds that were built too high or too close, construction defects such as crumbling walls or overflowing rainwater drains that endangered the adjacent property, in both cause and procedure similar to disputes between Christian neighbours, and often subjected to municipal regulations. Expressions of mistrust and a certain reluctance to share the same space, however, can be traced on both sides – Benjamin Laqua has pointed out the significance of the Jew Joseph of Ahrweiler’s wish to brick up and relocate a window in his house through which he had the neighbouring chapel in direct line of sight, echoing the twelfth/thirteenth-century Sefer Hasidim that called for shading or walling up windows that forced Jewish inhabitants to look upon the crucifixes of adjacent churches.\(^55\)

\(^52\) Wiedl, Codifying Jews, 217.
\(^53\) Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten 3, 71-72, no. 1253. It has been doubted that there had been any expulsion of the Hungarian Jews under Louis I, the 1368 charter, however, is one of the (few) sources that give evidence of such an expulsion, see also the comment to no. 1253.
\(^54\) Wiedl, ...und kam der jud, 246-247.
\(^55\) Laqua, Nähe und Distanz, 83-85, on the Sefer Hasidim concerning windows see also Mikosch, Zeichen, Bilder, Codes, 43-44.
of his Jewish neighbours, and the closing off of his Christian space from Jewish eyes might have been the reason for the Viennese citizen Peter Püchler to demand of the Viennese Jew David Steuss, to whom he had sold a part of his house in 1372, that David should be obliged to not only erect a separation wall but also brick up all existing windows, doors, and skylights that faced Püchler’s garden.\textsuperscript{56} Similar wishes of an obstructed view presumably prompted the Teutonic Knights of Vienna to demanded that their Jewish neighbour, Hessmann, with whom they quarrelled over the reconstruction of their courtyard between the two houses, should not be allowed to have, or build in, any windows that led into the courtyard.\textsuperscript{57} While these demands might have been rooted in desires for limited visibility of and for Jews and the establishing of exclusive Christian (and Jewish) spaces, such regulations are not specific to conflicts between Jewish and Christian neighbours but appear as matters of dispute between Christian neighbours as well.\textsuperscript{58}

Jewish presence was noticeable beyond the visual – sounds of prayers and the \textit{shofar} were audible on the streets and in close-by buildings. The Sackcloth Friars of 1270’s London had felt so annoyed by the neighbouring Jews’ »continuous wailing from the synagogue« \textit{(per ipsorum iudeorum continuum ululatum in eadem scola)} that they pleaded with King Henry III to relocate the Jews’ centre of community and rededicate the former synagogue as a chapel for them; and the fifteenth-century German author Michael Beheim thought (or pretended) to hear »wailing, hellish cries, and dogs’ barks« from the synagogue.\textsuperscript{59} Alleged foul and unhealthy smells that wafted from the newly installed windows of Jewish houses in early fourteenth-century Gerona caused protest among the churchgoers of the nearby church so that the windows had to be bricked up again; it is, considering how much stench was a constant in a medieval city, highly questionable whether the smell alone had given rise to the Christians’ aversion.\textsuperscript{60} Perhaps the chaplain of the Vienna city hall, Jakob Poll, felt similarly bothered when, in 1373, he was up in arms against the new kitchen and chimney his neighbour, the Jew Merchlein, had built.\textsuperscript{61} Smoke and kitchen smells not only wafted through Poll’s house but, according to the claimant, also permeated into the most Christian of all spaces: the bad smells were noticeable in the chapel during morning service. The phrasing of the olfactory nuisance is interesting; not only smoke but \textit{aller unrainer gesmach}, all sorts of unclean smells/tastes, or \textit{ungesmach}, un-smell, interfered with the church service. It might very well have been a coincidence that the words used to describe the smells that wafted

\textsuperscript{57} Brugger and Wiedl, \textit{Regesten} 3, 251, no. 1559.
\textsuperscript{58} Mikosch, Zeichen, Bilder, Codes, 45; for Vienna, see e.g. Municipal Archives of Vienna, H.A. Urk. 559 (monasterium.net/mom/AT-WStLA/HAUrk/559/charter, retrieved on 11 November 2017).
\textsuperscript{59} Andrews, \textit{Other Friars}, 201; Heil, \textit{»Gottesfeinde«}, 113; on the aspect of Hebrew as an unhuman language and its ridiculing, see Heil, \textit{»Gottesfeinde«}, 173-74; Wiedl, Laughing at the Beast, 349-350.
\textsuperscript{60} Mikosch, Zeichen, Bilder, Codes, 44-45.
\textsuperscript{61} He had already sued Merchlein twice over overdue revenues (1351 and 1354); in 1351, Merchlein reached a compromise »by advocacy of honourable people and gentry, Christian and Jews« \textit{(durch [...] erber leut und herren chris- ten und juden fleissziger pet willen)}, which had included a ducal official. In 1354, Poll got the house, which however seems to have remained in Merchlein’s possession, which suggests a furthercompromise, see Brugger, Smoke in the Chapel, 87-89.
from the Jew’s kitchen were usually associated with smells from lavatories\textsuperscript{62} and served to
describe unpalatable food or food unfit for human consumption. A bad, unclean smell, however,
was part of an essential anti-Jewish polemical topic, both ecclesiastical and secular: the \textit{odor iudaicus} or \textit{foetor iudaicus}, the »Jewish stench« first appears as a trope in Roman
literature, such as Martial’s epigrams (4.4), and in Christian theological texts from late
Antiquity onwards.\textsuperscript{63} The »Kleiner Lucidarius«, a satirical poem from late thirteenth-century
Austria had, among other stereotypes such as the Jews’ usury, their murdering of Christians
and general maliciousness, also raised the issue of their bad smell: \textit{wê iu, verfluochte juden,
wê! wie iuwer heil verklucket/ ir stinket unde bucket}. The Jews’ stench was linked to their
ungelouben, their unbelief, for which they would eventually perish.\textsuperscript{64}

The Viennese chaplain’s charter alone might seem (and perhaps is) too scarce a proof
for postulating any such associations. Both of the abovementioned Jews, David Steuss and
Hessmann, had included the (re-)erection of a lavatory in their reconstruction plans, yet
neither was met with any undue burden, or mocking jibe, and one cannot entirely dismiss the
possibility that the Teutonic Knights’ wish that Hessmann should clean his lavatory through
his house, and not through their courtyard, was not primarily rooted in Hessmann’s religious
persuasion.

Yet the idea of links between Jews, bad smells, and generally something rotten and harm-
ful lingered, and can be traced in other economic sources. The synods of Wroclaw and Vienna
enforced lingering suspicions against Jewish poison in their warning not to dine with Jews
or buy any nourishment from them,\textsuperscript{65} and with the mid-fourteenth century’s plague, the
already existing image of the Jewish well-poisoner gained momentum.\textsuperscript{66} Town legislations
banned Jews from professions concerned with nourishment, and the selling of \textit{judenfleisch},
»Jewish meat« to Christians underwent particularly serious scrutiny.\textsuperscript{67} While many towns
(and Jewish communities) took a practical approach, such as the establishment of Jewish
slaughterhouses, or Jews being allowed to use Christian slaughterhouses, and many guild
and town regulations merely sought to recompense the Christians butchers for their presum-
ed lack of income since the Jews butchered the animals themselves, regulations from the
southern parts of the Holy Roman Empire in particular reflected the identification of Jews
with materials considered foul and harmful to Christians.\textsuperscript{68} These towns employed various

\textsuperscript{62} E.g., \textit{ungesmach und gestanchh} emanated from a lavatory next to the monastery of Göttweig’s Viennese court, and
due to seepage into the wall the malodour was noticeable in many rooms, Archives of the Monastery of Göttweig, 
Urk. 1387 VIII 22 (monasterium.net/mom/AT-StiAG/GoettweigOSB/1387_VIII_22/charter, retrieved on 11 No-
vember 2017).


\textsuperscript{64} Brugger and Wiedl, \textit{Regesten} 1, 152-154, no. 144; Schreckenberg, \textit{Christliche Adversus-Judaeos-Texte (13.-20. Jh.)},
337, 340-341

\textsuperscript{65} For Wroclaw, see Schreckenberg, \textit{Christliche Adversus-Judaeos-Texte (13.-20. Jh.)}, 224-226; for Vienna, see Brugger
and Wiedl, \textit{Regesten} 1, 59-61, no. 45.

\textsuperscript{66} Hell, »Gottesfeinde«, 285-299; Graus, Pest – Geissler – Judenmorde.

\textsuperscript{67} Wiedl, Codifying Jews, 216 (beer, wine). \textit{Judenfleisch} has been frequently interpreted as »kosher meat« in general,
but in this context the term most likely refers to the parts of the kosherly slaughtered animals the Jews were not
allowed to eat, or to animals whose slaughter was not executed according to halachic rites.

\textsuperscript{68} I thank Jörn Christophersen (Trier) for his insights into the conditions of Jewish butchers in the north-eastern
parts of the Empire.
means, from physical separation by placing the Jews’ booths on the very fringe of the market to forcing them to tag the proffered meat, or, if it was being sold by Christian butchers, having it presented differently.⁶⁹ One of the most common measures was to allot the Jews to the municipal meat stall where the pfännig fleisch was sold, which could mean meat from sick or injured animals but primarily referred to foul meat, meat that had gone bad (trichinous) and was thus potentially harmful when consumed.⁷⁰ In addition to that, potential Christian buyers should often be alerted to what »kind of meat« they were about to purchase;⁷¹ and in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, with the idea of the well-poisoning Jews prevailing, some towns resorted to even more drastic measures: any meat that had been touched by Jews was considered judenfleisch and thus of minor worth, or even unfit for Christian consumption.⁷²

It is tantamount to a commonplace to state that anti-Jewish polemics played a crucial role in the frequent outbreaks of anti-Jewish violence. The citizens of Korneuburg had murdered their Jewish neighbours, with whom they had lived peacefully in close proximity, at the merest suggestion of a »Jewish crime«, their indoctrination leaving little room for doubt;⁷³ and neither of the abovementioned documents could have contributed to their conviction about the Jews’ guilt. What, therefore, to make of the meagre findings in Austria’s abundant economic source material? Was it strictly polemical when in 1390, the Abbot of the Cistercian monastery of Heiligenkreuz (in yet another ecclesiastical setting) distinguished the interest their subsidiary monastery of Zwettl had to pay to Jews, usura, from that to Christians, honora\(\text{\textit{\textae}}}⁷⁴ Perhaps not. While the few examples presented here might not constitute polemics in the way a theological treatise, a sermon, or a statue of a Judensau did, they can be seen as a reverberation of these ideas, affirming pre-existing stereotypes and planting further suspicion. At the very least, they served as vehicles to bring polemical triggers into fields of economy and daily encounters. By this transference and the embedding of polemical thought into the language of business routine and everyday normality, the accusations, too, read as mundane and commonplace, suggesting that »Jewish crime« was an everyday occurrence that had, likewise, to be avenged on an everyday basis.
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⁶⁹ Wiedl, Codifying Jews, 214-216; for Zurich, see Gilomen, Kooperation, 177; for Munich and Ulm, see Germania Judaica III/2, ed. Maimon et al., 902, 1500.
⁷⁰ This regulation was particularly common in Bavarian towns such as Burghausen, Neuötting, Landshut, and Schärding, for many of which no Jewish settlement is known, and also the Salzburg-ruled Mühldorf (with the addition of wolfpaizig, »bitten by the wolf«), see Wiedl, Codifying Jews, 215.
⁷¹ Munich, adopted by several Bavarian towns such as Kitzbühel, Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten 2, 11, no. 1145.
⁷² E.g. in the town statute of Bolzano from 1437 that forbids any sale of meat that had been »controlled, touched, or slaughtered« by Jews, see comment to Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten 2, 11, no. 1145, with further literature.
⁷³ On the possibility of doubt (three Korneuburg citizens trying to save a Jewish victim, and the head of the clerical investigation, Ambrosius of Heiligenkreuz), see Wiedl, Host on the Doorstep, 303, 317-318, 333.
⁷⁴ Archives of the Monastery of Zwettl, Cod. 339, fol. 15r. (1390); forthcoming: Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten 4, no. 1950.
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