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Abstract:
As one would expect, Jewish life within the German Kingdom in the high middle ages (1000-1300 CE) was fraught with instability. The micro-history of specific Jewish communities has been undertaken by historians in the past, but the Jewish experience within multiple cities has yet to be compared. Due to the diversity of German city authority structures, the restrictions and privileges put upon the community were diverse. How these laws effect the daily life of the Jewish community was subject to the gentile authority of bishops, for those inhabiting bishop-cities, or the Emperor directly, for those living in free imperial states. Thus, different cities with differing authority structures resulted in distinct Jewish experiences. A comprehensive analysis of the experience within the northern Jewish centers of Worms and the southeastern Jewish community of Regensburg is a new approach to the study of medieval Jewish communities. A case study of these cities by means of laws, rights, protections, and placement within the city, provides a variety of medieval Jewish experiences within the German Kingdom. By examining and comparing charters and laws between these cities, a mixed depiction of mutual benefit and subordination is created. An examination of this dynamic contributes to our understanding of the overall experience of Jewish communities within the medieval German realm.
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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.

Historiography
The historiography of Jewish history and medieval Jewish history are intertwined within the realm of Jewish studies. The trends that troubled historians of Jewish history in the early twentieth century, also had consequences for medieval Jewish history. The discourse between the old school of thought, and the modern tendencies are complex and heterogenous. Especially challenging is the integration of medieval Europe’s typical periodization and of medieval Jewish communities’ periodization. Particularly because Jewish historiography is often kept separate from medieval historiography, rather than integrated into the Christian narrative of the Middle Ages. From the scholarship of the late-nineteenth century to current research, I have identified three schools of thought on the topic of periodization of medieval Jewish history - alternate history, integration, and timeless concepts. It should be noted that these categories, however, are in no way a comprehensive examination of medieval Jewish historiography; and, as seen below they are organized based on concepts rather than chronology.

First, the alternate history, which is rooted in the early to mid-twentieth century, is the separation of the Jewish medieval period from the European medieval period. Specifically, Salo Baron and later Robert Chazan subscribe to this approach; since they are scholars who were focused on specifically Jewish history, and not how Jews fit into the world around them. Furthermore, their aim was to better display the experiences of the Jewish community, and its Jewish intellectual, social and religious trends, that are often overlooked in integrated Jewish-European history.

The antithesis of Baron’s and Chazan’s approaches is the integration of Jewish history into the European periodization. Alfred Haverkamp represents the newer (circa 1980s-present) inclusive Jewish history, which examines Jewish history and experiences inside the Jewish community and the non-Jewish society and authorities. The integration of Jewish history into
medieval European history attempts to combat marginalization of Jewish history in scholarship. This means, Jewish history is discussed within the framework of the widely known European Middle ages (early Middle Ages, high Middle Ages, and late Middle Ages).

Lastly, the work of Ivan Marcus and David Biale propose a timeless periodization of Jewish history based on how it was shaped by external forces, Christian or Muslim. Their periodizations are rooted in “unifying factors,” where periods were determined by consistent political and social conditions of Jews. ¹ Both of historians examined the social position of Jews, and based upon their power and powerlessness they crafted a chronology that rejected fixed periodization.

These categories illustrate that one’s approach to Jewish history influences how one periodizes the past. The interpretation and study of Jewish history has also changed over time. Scholar Salo Baron described a revisionist history, where Jews of the past were not solely characterized as suffering victims. His contribution to the field is seen in current research, his students and in those who wish to build upon Baron’s historiographical concept. Baron among many others were part of a movement called “Wissenschaft des Judentums,” where Jewish history was examined in great detail, yet the momentum of Jewish studies in the twentieth century saw a break in progress during World War II. The persecution of Jews in Europe in the 1930s and 1940s disrupted Jewish scholars studying Jewish history. The Holocaust not only disrupted the path of Jewish studies in Germany, since many scholars fled to America, but the Holocaust acted as an unavoidable event that is ever present in the post-holocaust consciousness.

Ironically, the Holocaust also sparked interest in Jewish studies, scholars in the 1960s and even more so in the 1970s, thus fueling the revival of Jewish studies in Germany. Nearly thirty

years after the Holocaust, medieval Jewish scholarship returned to Germany. The current scene in medieval Jewish studies is diverse, studying a variety of Jewish history subjects (demography and intellectual history, etc.), Jewish-women’s studies, and the scholars themselves are a more diverse group of Jews and non-Jews.

Periodization

History is often discussed and prefaced by the period in which the event takes place. The middle ages, antiquity, post-industrialization era, etc., all bring to mind a specific narrative focused on single religions or social groups. As Patricia Skinner states, “Periods give meaning to historical narratives,” whose narrative and how it is told is typically determined by mainstream historians. Periods, which were sometimes designated because of a theological event or art movement, cannot possibly encompass all of the social and political events in every corner of society and geographical region. Scholars of Jewish history debate where and how Jews exactly fit into the larger narrative of medieval Europe. Additionally, scholars question whether Jewish history should have its own timeline outside of the traditional framework—the typical periodization of the Middle Ages from 500 CE to 1500 CE. Salo Baron in the 1920s stated, “Only in the last centuries of the European Middle Ages did the Jewish Middle Ages set in.” Baron defined the Jewish medieval period as from the sixteenth through eighteenth centuries. He offers an alternate periodization in which the intricacies and complexities of Jewish intellectual, political, social and religious histories are showcased. Later in 2010, Robert Chazan, a student of Baron,

---

2 Skinner, "Confronting the 'Medieval' in Medieval History,” 222.
3 Ibid., 219.
argues the time period presented by Baron is more appropriately set in the eleventh through fifteenth centuries, but Jewish history is nonetheless separated from the period of medieval Europe. While Jewish history is often separated from European history, as seen with Baron and Chazan, Alfred Haverkamp argues that Jewish history in Europe is also European history. For Haverkamp, excluding Jewish history from European medieval history is an exclusion of “important aspects” of history and such accounts of European medieval history that overlook Jewish history “are in need for revision.” Havercamp represents the trend in the second half of the twentieth century for historians to think of European history as encompassing both Jews and Christians, a concept ignored by mainstream academic historical research in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

For many, there are problems with merging minority histories into the majority scheme of periodization. Such problems have led to proposals of alternatives, many of which suggest Jewish history is shaped by external forces. In 1938, Jacob Marcus proposed a long medieval period in his sourcebook book, The Jew in the Medieval World, 315-1791, from Constantine’s legislation in the fourth century to the post-revolutionary era in the 1790s. Other schemes are more or less not bound by time, rather by concepts or unifying factors, such as the organization of the Jewish community as a self-governing minority existing within a dominant Christian or

---

6 Chazan, Reassessing Jewish Life in Medieval Europe, xiv.
10 Skinner, "Confronting the 'Medieval' in Medieval History," 225.
Muslim environment, as proposed by Ivan Marcus in 1990. Marcus defines the Jewish Middle Ages as a scheme of “corporate subordination to a dominant monotheistic and, hence, exclusivistic religious majority in power over them.” Marcus’ period is evidently not specifically tied to time, the start and end date have a variety of possibilities, and the dates fitting one geographical region or community may not fit another. David Biale in 1986 proposed a politically centered periodization, which he defined as when the Jewish political center was no longer in the land of Israel, but the dispersed Jews in different areas still enjoyed autonomy in their self-government and special privileges. Both Marcus and Biale offer a medieval period not tied to “absolute chronology,” which contrast the starker defined periodization schemes proposed by earlier Jewish studies scholars in the twentieth century.

Baron: Rejecting the Traditional Narratives

When examining Jewish history, the great scholar of the twentieth century Salo Baron (1895-1989) is often discussed, partially because of his radical reexamination of Jewish historiography and overall historical narrative. Baron proposed a cohesive Jewish history earning him the title – given to him by his student, Robert Chazan — of “the great synthesizer of the medieval Jewish experience.” He insisted Jewish history must include demographic, economic, political, social, intellectual, and spiritual information, which must be understood in the social context in which Jews were living, a concept not embraced by the broader scholarship until the second half of the

---

14 Skinner, "Confronting the 'Medieval' in Medieval History,” 245.
twentieth century.\textsuperscript{16} Baron also challenged the traditional dynamics of Jews to non-Jewish rulers by arguing the pre-emancipation period (defined by Baron as before the French Revolution) gave advantages to Jewish life such as internal autonomy, but these advantages were lost after emancipation.\textsuperscript{17} Baron in the early twentieth century rejected the traditional “Jewish and Christian view of medieval Jewish life” that was at the heart of early modern and modern syntheses of Jewish history.\textsuperscript{18} In the early twentieth century Baron proposed a cohesive Jewish history, one not based upon the atrocities but upon the perseverance of Jewish communities in the Middle Ages.

Part of Baron’s controversial approach to Jewish history was his rebuttal of the “lachrymose conception of Jewish history.”\textsuperscript{19} David Engel, the prolific Jewish and Holocaust Studies professor at New York University and expert on the Holocaust and history of the Jews in Eastern Europe, defines Baron’s thoughts on lachrymosity as “incorporating a blanket injection to minimize reference to ‘crises’—conflated more often than not with violence and persecution—through concentration on ‘subtler forms of change and continuities that bridge the moment’ of rupture.”\textsuperscript{20} Baron attempted to turn the historical narrative away from themes of “Jewish victimhood and insecurity” to the positive aspects of Jewish existence in Europe.\textsuperscript{21} This traditional narrative that Baron rejected came from the scholarly movement known as “Wissenschaft des Judentums” or Jewish studies that began in Germany in the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century. In 1937, Baron discourages the “modern historical treatment”

\textsuperscript{16} Chazan, ”The Historiographical Legacy of Salo Wittmayer Baron: The Medieval Period,” 36.
\textsuperscript{17} Baron, ”Ghetto and Emancipation,” 4, 63.
\textsuperscript{18} Chazan, Reassessing Jewish Life in Medieval Europe, xv.
\textsuperscript{19} David Engel, ”Crisis and Lachrymosity: On Salo Baron, Neobaronianism, and the Study of Modern European Jewish History,” Jewish History 20, no. 3-4 (2006): 244.
\textsuperscript{20} Engel, ”Crisis and Lachrymosity,” 245.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid.
that pays particular attention to wars and political conflicts.\textsuperscript{22} His assertion that “the history of the Jewish people among Gentiles, even in medieval Europe, must consist of more than stories of “sanguinary clashes or governmental expulsions.”\textsuperscript{23}

Baron’s motives behind his assertion were partially a product of its time. Besides being grounded before the Holocaust—which one could argue might have changed his optimistic view on Jewish history– Baron also chose to describe and then denounce the lachrymosity of Jewish history. Perhaps he did so to encourage Jews to seriously examine the medieval/historical socioeconomic conditions rather than dismissing possibilities to improve the contemporary Jewish situation.\textsuperscript{24} Specifically, a synthesis of “the revolutionary ideal of civil equality with the autonomy of the Jewish community under the old regime.”\textsuperscript{25} The possible plurality of motives that guided Baron to his argument was influential for modern Jewish studies.

Baron’s affect upon the Jewish studies field is seen in more modern historians. Baron’s school of thought, to which Robert Chazan subscribes, involves the examination of Jewish history as a “balance sheet of debits and credits.”\textsuperscript{26} Alfred Haverkamp takes a similar stance stating, “the increasing number of atrocities against Jews committed by Christians during the later middle ages should not blind our eyes to the fact that such atrocities by no means occurred everywhere and at all times.”\textsuperscript{27} Baron’s work guided historians like Chazan, away from the traditional views of “unmitigated Jewish suffering.”\textsuperscript{28} This was no easy task, since the popular association of barbarism and medieval Europe helped perpetuate the traditional portrayal of

\textsuperscript{23} Baron, \textit{A Social and Religious History of the Jews}, vol. 2, 40.
\textsuperscript{24} Engel, "Crisis and Lachrymosity," 254.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{26} Chazan, \textit{Reassessing Jewish Life in Medieval Europe}, xviii.
\textsuperscript{27} Alfred Haverkamp, \textit{Jews in Medieval German Kingdom}, trans. Christoph Cluse (Trier: Universität Trier, 2015), 10.
\textsuperscript{28} Chazan, \textit{Reassessing Jewish Life in Medieval Europe}, xviii.
unending persecution and Jewish suffering perceived by the masses.\textsuperscript{29} Additionally, the Holocaust and its aftermath only helped buttress these traditional views, specifically the lachrymosity of Jewish history. Many saw the persecution of Jews during the Holocaust as a direct result of “venomous medieval Christendom,” that laid the foundation for the Holocaust in the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{30} Besides undermining Baron’s revisionist efforts to transform the preconceptions of Jewish history, the horrors of the twentieth century genocides challenged Baron’s insistence upon the normalcy of Jewish life with violent outbreaks, “just punctuating this co-existence” with non-Jews. Baron’s conception became even more questionable due to the changing nature of neighborly interactions between Jews and non-Jews, which Baron wished to emphasize. Baron’s lasting impact on Jewish studies scholars can be seen in the emergence of a “neo-Baronian school” in the last few decades of Jewish historiography. These neo-Baronists seek to emphasize “continuities instead of ruptures in Jewish history, stressed Jews’ achievements over their suffering” not just in the medieval ages, like Baron originally discussed.\textsuperscript{31} Essentially, neo-Baronian school extends Baron’s rejection of the lachrymose medieval Jewish narrative to the modern period.

Baron may have changed the narrative and defined a new wave of scholars of Jewish history, but he was still not without his critics. Engel argues Baron’s school of thought is more “descriptive than prescriptive” since Baron often strayed from his critique by stressing Jewish woes and crisis, and he did not critique other scholars for doing so.\textsuperscript{32} Even more recently, Adam Teller comments on Baron’s sharp dichotomy between normalcy and persecution.\textsuperscript{33} Teller argues

\textsuperscript{29} Chazan, \textit{Reassessing Jewish Life in Medieval Europe}, xvii.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{31} Engel, "Crisis and Lachrymosity," 245.
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., 252.
for a modification of Baron’s concept, specifically a “balanced re-insertion of hatred, persecution, and violence as factors in the way “normal” Jewish life is understood in its various historical settings.”

Teller’s proposition is, as Teller himself admits, one that would be agreeable to Baron, a well-known balanced historian, since he insisted upon a balanced cross-disciplinary study of Jewish history, integrating demographic, economic, spiritual, and political studies into Jewish studies.

The concept of Jewish rights within medieval Europe, specifically servi camerae (servants of the treasury), is heavily contested by historians of medieval Jewish history. When servi camerae is discussed, the debate often involves positives and negatives of the relationship, which makes the debate an example for discussing Baron’s historiographical model.

Baron’s contribution to scholarship and stances upon Jewish history reflect his associations with pre-Holocaust Jewish studies, since many of his stances are a critic of the intellectual movement, “Wissenschaft des Judentums.”

“Wissenschaft des Judentums”

Scholars, who were primarily Jewish, in the nineteenth century began an intellectual movement known as “Wissenschaft des Judentums,” (Jewish studies) in Germany. The movement sought to critically investigate Jewish culture and religion using the methods of the Humanists — that was applied to the examination of Christian texts, causing a controversy over treating scared texts as human creations. A group of young Jewish scholars at University of Berlin in 1819 started the intellectual movement. Scholars Eduard Gans, Moses Moser, Leopold Zunz, and

34 Teller, "Revisiting Baron's "Lachrymose Conception,"” 439.
36 Peters, ""Settlement, Assimilation, Distinctive Identity,"” 238.
Heinrich Heine (amongst many others) attempted to establish Jewish history and culture as an integral part of general human history through scientific studies and practical work. The tendency of the movement was that the Jews of Europe were generally treated as a “single unit.” Jews, who were geographically separated for hundreds of years, were described as a single people with similar social and political cultures. Irving Agus attributes the generalization and “lack of scientific precision” to the “strong, pervading spirit of nationalism” of the nineteenth century that led German-Jewish historians to their undivided treatment of Jews in medieval Europe. Furthermore, these historians described Jewish life as the result of the whims of non-Jewish authorities, such as church leaders or princes, and the general public. As a result, the charters and proclamations of kings and popes have been subject to intense analysis, despite the fact that these documents “often did not reflect reality at all.” While nineteenth century Jewish historians interpreted the Jewish experience as hinging upon the whims and attitude of non-Jewish authorities, Agus argues “economic forces and rivalries” were truly the deciding factors for Jewish status and relationship to authorities. 

While the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were marked by gross generalizations and a narrative of defenseless Jewish communities in medieval Europe, this period was marked significantly by the beginnings of the *Germania Judaica*, an impressive alphabetical catalogue that aimed to identify every Jewish settlement in the German Kingdom. In 1903 the “Gesellschaft zur förderung der Wissenschaft des Judentums“ began to plan the *Germania*  

38 Agus, "Preconceptions and Stereotypes in Jewish Historiography," 242-244.  
39 Ibid.  
40 Ibid., 248.  
41 Ibid.  
42 Ibid.  
43 Peters, ""Settlement, Assimilation, Distinctive Identity,"" 239.
Judaica. *Germania Judaica* aimed to be the foundation for further research into German-Jewish history, but due to the Second World War, there was little institutional and financial support for the project before the 1960s.\(^4^4\) Despite the progress and growth of Jewish studies, non-Jewish German medieval historians largely ignored Jewish history, despite numerous prominent Jewish scholars of medieval Jewish history in Germany.\(^4^5\) “Wissenschaft des Judentums” saw significant growth in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, but the movement’s progress was cut short by mass exiles of Jewish scholars and lack of institutional and financial support for projects during the 1930s and 1940s. The 1939 annual report of *der Lehranstat für die Wissenschaft des Judentums*, the educational establishment for Jewish studies in Berlin warns its supporters and participants that this report may be the last that *der Lehranstat* will be able to publish, clearly anticipating a complete halt to further research in Jewish studies in Germany.\(^4^6\)

The Holocaust

The debate and scholarly research of Jewish history and identity in medieval Germany/Europe ended during the Holocaust, in which German-Jewish historians amongst other German and European Jews were exiled or destroyed.\(^4^7\) The role of the Holocaust in German-Jewish history is contested, yet unavoidable. In the scholarship, many modern historians utilize medieval Jewish history to foreshadow the events of the twentieth century and the Holocaust. Nevertheless, as Mitchell Hart directs, “we should not read Nazism and extermination back into

\(^{4^4}\) Peters, “”Settlement, Assimilation, Distinctive Identity,”” 239.
\(^{4^5}\) Ibid., 244.
\(^{4^6}\) “Geschäftsbericht Der Lehranstalt Für Die Wissenschaft Des Judentums, Berlin,” *Monatsschrift Für Geschichte Und Wissenschaft Des Judentums* 83 (1939): 635. „Wir müssen mit der Möglichkeit rechnen, daß dieser Jahresbericht der letzte ist, den die Lehranstalt für die Wissenschaft des Judentums in Berlin veröffentlichen kann... Wir sprechen die Hoffnung aus, daß wenn die Arbeit der Lehranstalt in Berlin aufhört, an anderer Stelle die gleiche freie Forschung für die Wissenschaft des Judentums fortgesetzt wird und daß sich Männer und Frauen finden, die, getreu der Vorschrift unserer Lehre, für die Wissenschaft des Judentums wirken.“
\(^{4^7}\) Peters, “”Settlement, Assimilation, Distinctive Identity,”” 238.
the primary texts themselves.” 48 Jacob Katz echoes Hart’s sentiment, by reminding historians to avoid “viewing the earlier stages from the perspective of the unforeseen and unforeseeable future.” 49 The cautionary warnings reflect what Patricia Skinner describes as the trend in medieval studies to take up the “teleological approach to Jewish history, which sees all anti-Jewish hostility as in some way prefiguring the Holocaust itself.” 50 The multiple urgings of scholars on the treatment and influence of the Holocaust upon research indicates that scholars have tended to correlate and connect medieval Jewish history to the history of Jews during the Nazi era. Such correlation is arguably anachronistic and troubling, due to the implications of the Holocaust as a direct result of medieval anti-Jewish sentiments. Additionally, such correlations paint the Holocaust as an unavoidable event, trivializing the horror of the Holocaust.

Although scholars like Katz (in 1995) and Hart (in 2005), warn against the influence of the Holocaust on objective research and analysis, the Holocaust cannot be extracted from the foundation of post-Holocaust consciousness of historians. The extent to which the Holocaust influenced post-Holocaust scholars is illustrated by the new effect of certain rhetoric and new interest in the field.

An unexpected consequence of the Holocaust was the new interest in Jewish studies. The orchestrated executions of millions of Jews in Europe was the event that gained the interest of many modern historians. Katz argues that interest in medieval German-Jewish history was sparked for many historians by the Holocaust and the destruction of the German-Jewish community. 51 Perhaps the interest is due to the post-Holocaust trajectory, which allows modern

50 Skinner, "Confronting the 'Medieval' in Medieval History,” 237.
51 Katz, “Reflection on German-Jewish History,” 1.
scholars to trace the beginnings, in the Middle Ages, and the ends of Jewish communities in central Europe during the Holocaust.

The Holocaust was the foundation on which the 1960s scholarship of medieval Jewish studies was built, as well as a hurdle for modern historians to overcome in order to preserve their objectivity. The Holocaust stands today as a backdrop, the enormous monument to which all other Jewish oppression must be compared. It was unavoidable, that the attacks on medieval Jews by medieval authorities had to be reevaluated by post-Holocaust scholars.52 Rather than encouraging the complete removal of the Holocaust from historians’ interpretations, Skinner describes a more realistic approach by accepting the influence of the Holocaust on research as dualistic. On one hand, the Holocaust was a negative influence on historical narrative when viewed with a “teleological lens.”53 Therefore, reading into sources and placing the persecutions against Jews in medieval Europe as the pre-cursor to the Holocaust is flawed. With the teleological lens, historians attempt to forge a narrative of Jewish history, which is characterized as a progressive march towards an inevitable end. Viewing history with the purpose to explain or trace the path of history towards the end result of Jewish history (the Holocaust) in the teleological approach means reading and understanding events backwards (from the present to the past). Such interpretations imply an Effect/Cause relationship, with the Holocaust (the Effect) was direct result of medieval anti-Jewish sentiments (the Cause).

On the other hand, the Holocaust stimulated a more “nuanced” analysis of primary sources, like that of Alfred Haerkamp who examines the positive and negative aspects of medieval Jewish life.54 The Holocaust challenged the concept held by many historians. Such

52 Katz, “Reflection on German-Jewish History,” 1.
53 Skinner, "Confronting the 'Medieval' in Medieval History," 247.
54 Ibid., 247.
historians philosophize that history was driven by improvement, and will be ever evolving into a better, more modern society/culture, instead the Holocaust illustrates that as humans our trajectory is not always towards a better or an advanced future.  

This interpretation had the tendency to view the Middle Ages as primitive, “dark,” unintelligent. After 1945, historians would be hard-pressed to successfully defend their argument for a less barbaric society in modern age than society in the Middle Ages. Haverkamp, somewhat in the tradition of Baron, represents the post-Holocaust scholarship that focuses on medieval Jewish history with a balanced perspective, both recognizing the negative and sometimes violent interactions between Jews and Christians and the positive situation of Jews during the Middle Ages.

1960s to Present: The Revival of Jewish Studies

The great German-Jewish medieval scholars like Herbert Fischer, who worked on the continuation of the *Germania Judaica*, and Guido Kisch, a scholar of medieval law, were driven from Germany and found themselves pursuing scholarship in Israel and the United States. Universities in the United States and Israel became hubs for German-Jewish scholars in the years after World War II. However, there were very few scholarly publications in the history of medieval German Jews published by Jews and even fewer by non-Jews in the wake of the Second World War (during the two decades of the 1950s and 1960s). The continued absence of medieval German-Jewish history is evident by the lack of a separate chapter devoted to the subject in Bruno Gebhardt’s *Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte* in 1970, which detailed all of
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German history, moreover Jewish history was only briefly mentioned and appeared in “no more than three sentences in a text of 750 printed pages for the whole medieval period.”

It took nearly thirty years for German-Jewish scholarship to return to Germany, with the Israeli-German medieval history conference of 1977 at the University of Trier (1977 *Internationales Kolloquium an der Universität Trier zum Thema Zur Geschichte der Juden im Deutschland des späten Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit*). Since then other German universities and research centers have returned to focusing on medieval Jewish history. The man, who spearheaded much of this transition, was Alfred Haverkamp, who also organized the 1977 conference at Trier. He pioneered the idea of German-Jewish history to be presented as an “integral component of German and euroregional history.”

Because of the revival of Jewish studies in Germany in the second half of the twentieth century, “Wissenschaft des Judentums” continues into the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The context of this particular essay is within the resurgence of “Wissenschaft des Judentums” in the twenty-first century. R. Po-chia Hsia reports much of the current research on German-Jewish history is being carried out by non-Jewish historians, which contrasts the overwhelming Jewish majority in the scholarship of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As a non-Jewish person, I, as part of the this group of non-Jewish scholars studying medieval Jewish history, represent the return, although not physically, of research on Jews in the medieval German Kingdom.
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Current scholarship can be separated into two methodologies, the first “stresses the continuity of the Jewish experience” by exploring Hebrew and Judaic sources and view German-Jewish history “from the inside looking out.” The second group approaches the same subject from the outside looking in, by emphasizing “contextual links between Jewish and German history” and utilizes Latin and German sources. The case studies presented in this paper fall more into the second group, but not perfectly. Due to the focus upon Jewish communities and the outside authorities, the perspective of the inside looking out and the outside looking in is necessary. The goal within examining both the non-Jewish authorities and their relationship to Jewish communities through charters or decrees, and the differing experiences of Jewish communities through archaeological and Hebrew sources, is to create an objective and cumulative perspective rather than a perspective that favors one group over the other.

Furthermore, with my background of privilege, that being I was not raised within a household whose religion was as exploited or discriminated against as much as those with Jewish heritage, I stand precariously between using my platform to focus on a group often misrepresented in history and speaking over Jewish voices. Since I am a non-Jewish person presenting Jewish history, it should be mentioned that I do not believe that the voices of those on the margins are unable to represent themselves and despite many efforts to study Jewish history objectively, many other historians may not be as careful with their narrative inquiry.

While studying the same topics, scholars of German-Jewish history today are a highly “heterogeneous group,” by offering different national, historiographical, and methodological perspectives. Ultimately, Jewish studies and specifically medieval German-Jewish history has
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grown significantly since the major disruption of the 1930s and 1940s, in new and more diverse ways. Topics like periodization help expand, integrate, and acknowledge Jewish history as an independent story while also existing in the grand German medieval narrative, leading to a fuller picture of the society. Acknowledging the negatives while recognizing the privileges without the influence of devastating modern events is a difficult task. The Holocaust ultimately cannot be extracted from modern historians’ consciousness. Perhaps the best way for scholars to remain objective is to avoid connecting medieval Jewish experiences with modern Jewish experiences and medieval rulers to twentieth century dictators.

Discussion of Sources

The sources available for me to use in my research was severely limited by my linguistical strengths. While I am very proficient in German, I lack knowledge of Latin and Hebrew. Knowing Latin would open up my source base to more primary sources, charters, chronicles, legal records. Similarly, Hebrew would have allowed me to incorporate more Jewish voices in my work. Some translations like that of Robert Chazan’s in *Church, State, and the Jew in the Middle Ages*, a compilation of some translated charters and letters, and David Bachrach in *The Histories of a Medieval German city, Worms c. 1000-c. 1300: Translation and Commentary*, which translated multiple somewhat contemporary annals of the city of Worms. In some of the untranslated charters, those being from the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (MGH), I was able to find a secondary source to guide me on what words and phrases I should look for in the Latin charters.

The charters and decrees dealt with in this paper, have been handled with the utmost care. These are sources that were written by Christians and rulers. The charters are prescriptive
sources, describing how things should be done but may not entirely reflect reality. And the Annales were like the *Annals Wormatienses*, was written by a non-Jewish lay man most likely employed by the city Worms at the end of thirteenth century. Some of the entries in *Annals Wormatienses* recall events that happened in the twelfth century. The gap between the time the event occurred and when the *Annals* writer wrote them introduces the possibility for inaccuracies and fabrication in its report. The *Annals* which certainly focusing on the history of Worms, was also especially interested in the Bishop of Mainz. The *Chronicon Wormatiense*, another chronicle from Worms was penned by a cleric, this time employed by the city’s bishop and was written during the last quarter of the thirteenth century. The *Annals* and the *Chronicon* contrast each other, since the *Annals* is a fairly secular record –written by a layman for the city—although it was written in a Christian environment. While the *Chronicon* is much more focuses on the Bishopric of Worms from 1221 to the end of the thirteenth century, it also reports city occurrences.

Due to my lack of accessibility to Hebrew sources, I have chosen to fill that gap in the research by utilizing archeological evidence. Due to the nature of archeological research, as a scientific discipline --hopefully making the results more objective. Basic facts distilled from archeological work will be unbiased and not influenced by an overwhelming Christian bias as seen in the *Annals Wormatiensemtes, Chronicon Wormatiense*, and charters. The story the archeology findings describes is one from the Jewish perspective, their homes, their synagogues, their quarter unlike charters, which only provides the narrative of non-Jewish authorities.

Since the case studies were limited by my lack of Latin language skills, a secondary source, the *Germania Judiaca* provided plenty of information. The *Germania Judiaca* is organized alphabetically by town/city within German-speaking medieval Europe, contributing
scholars to the histories of individual Jewish settlements utilized Latin documents, vernacular documents, archival records and Hebrew sources. The GJ was written in German, rather than Hebrew, which due to my language limitations, makes the source invaluable when so many sources are compilations of Latin documents or Hebrew sources. The project was formulated by the Gesellschaft zur förderung der Wissenschaft des Judentums in response to Marcus Brann, a German-Jewish historian, initiative. The initial editors were Aron Freimann and Marcus Brann. The first half of Volume I (A-L) was published in 1917, and the second half was published seventeen years later in 1934 due to post World-War I difficulties, namely inflation and the death of the original editor, Marcus Brann. This volume focused on the earliest Jewish settlement to 1238, when King Frederick II granted privileges to the Jews in Vienna. Of the many scholars who contributed to the GJ, about twenty of them were later killed by the Nazis.

Ultimately the goal of the GJ project was to “prove that the Jews of Germany had a long history of settlement and maintained strong ties with the country and its people.” Despite the difficulties of a tenuous time, work for the second Volume, focusing on 1238 to the beginning of the modern period in 1500, had great progress by October 1938 hundreds of articles for the volume had been edited. A month later however after Kristallnacht, Nazis seized and most likely destroyed them. While some copies of the manuscript were confiscated by the Nazi Institut für Rassenforschung (Nazi Institute for Race Research), some manuscripts were smuggled to London where after 1954 were taken to the Jewish Historical Archibes in Jerusalem. A year
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later the Leo Baeck Institut, founded in 1955, undertook future publications of the GJ. Volume was published in 1968, a year after the death of the volume’s editor, Zvi Avenri.\textsuperscript{73}

\textbf{Part I: Introduction to Medieval German Kingdom and Jewish Communities}

The necessary context for understanding the nuances of the two case studies of Jewish communities in the German Kingdom have much to do with terminology, the authority structure in the Kingdom, and base information on Jewish communities in the Kingdom. Ever since research in medieval age in Germany commenced, presumably in the early modern-period, scholars have used a myriad of terms to describe rulers and the realms they ruled. The clarification of such terms (amongst others) need to heed, especially within an English speaking context, the possible connotations of words translated from Latin, German, or Hebrew. Additionally, basic information on the norms of medieval Jewish communities will act as a foundation for more detailed discussion of the Jewish communities of Worms and Regensburg.

\textit{The German Kingdom?}

The fall of the western Roman Empire in the second half of the fifth century, contributed to the need for a new “Empire” to take on symbols and practices associated with the Roman Empire. The authority of a \textit{Kaiser}, a title which connects the German \textit{Kaiser} with the Roman \textit{imperator caesars}. The beginning of the \textit{Heiliges Römisches Reich}, or in the English-speaking world, “the Holy Roman Empire,” is debated, the \textit{Reich} began however with the crowning of a \textit{Kaiser}, who ushered in a revival of the Roman Empire, at least in theory. The \textit{Kaiser} most often attributed to the beginning of the \textit{Reich} is often thought to be Karl der Große in 800 CE with his
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Kaiserkrönung by the pope, or Otto der Große’s crowning in 962. The new “Empire,” although drawing from the legitimacy of the Roman Empire, had very little in common with the old empire. The question remains: what to call the loose conglomeration of German territories under the head of the emperor or king that is often known as and recognized Das Heiliges Römische Reich? This question continues to plague modern medieval German historians.

Theodore Rabb stated the name “Holy Roman Empire” however is erroneous and “vague at best.” The alternative, to call the geographical region of modern-day Germany, “Germany” would be anachronistic. A simple name for this region in the middle ages would be a failure to acknowledge the complex authority structure of the region. Calling the hitherto recognized state of the Holy Roman Empire, the “German Kingdom” provides a more accurate representation of the so-called “imperial” rule. The definition of the “German Kingdom,” is described by Benjamin Arnold, as “autonomous provinces into which the kingdom divided, and the non-Roman western empire of which they all constituted parts.” Furthermore, Alfred Haverkamp continuously refers to the “German Kingdom” rather than “Germany” or “the Holy Roman Empire.” The problem of “German Kingdom” verses “German Empire” manifests itself in the title of the head of state. Should this figure be referred to as the king, “König” or the emperor, “Kaiser”? While they may seem synonymous, as they both refer to heads of states, in technical terms to be an emperor in medieval Germany, the elected king has to be crowned as Kaiser in the process referred to as the Kaiserkrönung by the pope. Conrad III was never crowned as the
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“Roman Emperor” by the pope, but often contemporaries from outside the German Kingdom referred to Conrad III as Kaiser, although he was strictly speaking, a king. After 1273, only a few German kings were every crowned by the pope. The semantics of king, “König” or the emperor, “Kaiser,” has very little relevance to the discussion of internal politics and dynamics, specifically between regional and royal authorities. The distinction would be more relevant to the political situation south of the Alps. Graham Loud argues that the dilemma of the “imperial coronation in Rome” actually adding anything to the rulers’ authority was a “moot point.” For the sake of clarity, this paper will refer to the head of the political system as “King” of the “German Kingdom,” except when quoting the source material. In these instances, the two terms are synonymous.

Authority Structure

The beginnings of the elective kingship in the German Kingdom, was primitively developed in the early middle ages (circa 500-1100 CE) when royal succession was determined by “relationship to previous ruler, designation, and election.” Usually the succession was hereditary, but often kings died without a male heir, blocking the development of a clear hereditary line. In such cases a formal election to instate a new ruler took place as evidenced by examples provided by Graham Loud, specifically the elections of 1024, 1125, 1137/8. While the medieval German Kingdom was an elective kingship, the elected king was still determined
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by divine command. The elected king (and at times papally crowned as Kaiser as well) was the head of the political system, below him were the electors who led the secular and ecclesiastical princes, and then there was the non-princely nobility, the imperial and free towns/cities, and lesser nobles, often of ministerial origin (the Ritterschaft or ministeriales).\textsuperscript{82} In this system, the princes enacted “the celestial will” in their election of the king as representatives of the gentes.\textsuperscript{83} The title of principes, “princes” went past the secular princes who ruled individual territories. The definition of principes comes from the twelfth century. In 1125, the death of Heinrich V brought about the process to select a new king. Letters of summons were sent out; the ten recipients were known as “utriuque professionis principes” (princes of both callings). The title of principes thus extended past secular princes and included archbishops and bishops.\textsuperscript{84} Bishops ruled as religious officeholders and secular rulers of cathedral cities or Bischofstädte. In the eleventh century, the bishops of the dioceses of Bremen, Auileia and Würzburg regarded their authority as both spiritual and as ducal power.\textsuperscript{85} The aforementioned bishops demonstrate the increasing independence of bishops from the king and the papacy after the eleventh century.\textsuperscript{86} Due to ongoing conflicts between the king and the papacy, the role of bishops in governance was more prominent in the German Kingdom than in any other medieval Christian kingdom. Bishops were thusly prime agents for a reorganization of the authority structure. Due to long struggles for the throne and dynastic changes in the twelfth century the presence of prevailing royal authority
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was obstructed, consequently giving more jurisdiction to local (the principes) or other smaller units of governance, such as civic councils.  

The relationship between the elected king and princes evolved during the high and late middle ages, becoming more and more disparate. While those below the king were “proud to be part of the imperial body” and be in direct relation to the head, they all desired as much freedom as possible within the kingdom. From the early eleventh century, the distinction between the realm and the ruler’s person was understood. What was in the interest of the kingdom was not necessarily what was in the interest of the king, thus members could take action on behalf of the whole body even if these actions were against the head.

Since the election of the king in 911, the most powerful of the princes, Reichfürsten had voted for the next king in the Königswahl (election of the king). Over time these princes strengthened their position as electors, increasingly becoming the final authority on the next ruler of the kingdom. Before 1125, the prince electors only confirmed the hereditary succession, this dynamic changed significantly in 1125 at the death of Heinrich V. The princes were able to strengthen their elective rights by disavowing the right of hereditary succession. The development of princely autonomy led to the increase in “regionalism,” the best example of which comes from the royal court of 1231, which gave the right for a prince to introduce new laws and regulations without the prior consent of “leading men.” Arnold argues the arrangement put forth by the royal court of 1231 did not demonstrate the incompetence of the royal court to centralize legislation, rather the adherence to maintaining pax et iustitia, “peace
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and justice” in the kingdom through the delegation of legal powers to princes within their own lands.\textsuperscript{92}

Not all princes were equal, because after the \textit{Doppelwahl} (double election) or two new kings in 1198, certain \textit{Fürsten} were given more power. Furthermore in the 1250s, the plan crafted in 1198, came to fruition when seven princes became known as the exclusive \textit{Kurfürsten} (lat. princeps elector imperii) and claimed permanent responsibility for representing the “general elector right of the Church and the aristocracy in Germany.”\textsuperscript{93} After 1273, these seven \textit{Kurfürsten} had the exclusive right to elect the German king; these were the archbishops of Cologne, Mainz, and Trier, the duke of Saxony, the Margrave of Brandenburg, and the Count Palatine of the Rhine, and the king of Bohemia.\textsuperscript{94} Within the development of regionalism, the elusiveness of a central authority like one seen in contemporary London or Paris, led to a political system that had “cracks and fissures that allowed outsiders to flourish.”\textsuperscript{95}

\textit{Foundations of Jewish Communities in the Kingdom}

Within the medieval elective kingship system 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 three conditions: the economic services of the Jews,
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the reliance on protection offered by rulers, and ultimately the permission of Jewish communities to exist within a given area/city.

1) **The Economic Factor**

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.”  

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. The terms “Jew” and “merchant” are so intertwined that they were used “quasisynonymously” in sources. 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. The Christian guild system ultimately severely curbed the business and trade opportunities for Jews, who were excluded from guilds due to religious bias. 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 moneylenders meant they could not charge interest on loans.\textsuperscript{100} The Jews were able to capitalize on loans or manage the finances of courts and administration of rulers, making them valuable financial sources.\textsuperscript{101} Jewish moneylending to Christians was also a topic at the Fourth Lateran Council. Concerned by Jews “exhausting the financial strength of Christians,” the council banned Jews from “extort[ing] heavy and immoderate usury from a Christian.”\textsuperscript{102} Despite the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, which stipulated that Jews could not be in any position of authority, Jews were still employed by royal courts and in the service of secular/non-secular rulers.\textsuperscript{103} The decree was simultaneously vague and difficult to enforce. Taking into account that the Church’s efforts to curb and ban Christian usury and opened the way for Jewish usury, the situation in the first quarter of the thirteenth century was ironic.

2) \textit{Need for Protection}

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.”\textsuperscript{104} 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. 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
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stipulations protecting Jewish lives, cemeteries, laws, and right to conduct business.\textsuperscript{105} 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.\textsuperscript{106} 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.”\textsuperscript{107} Later Duke Frederick of Austria issued a charter for all Jews in Austria in 1244, one stipulation of which allowed for Jews to pass through Austria unharmed, “…wherever a Jew shall pass through our territory no one shall offer any hindrance to him or molest or trouble him…”\textsuperscript{108}

Other rulers copied or modified Duke Frederick’s charter, making it the basis of later charters securing the rights of Jews in a jurisdiction.\textsuperscript{109} The charter also secured the economic position of Jewish business, specifically pawnbroking, which can be seen in the first four ordinances of the charter, for example:

Likewise, if a Christian should bring a suit against a Jew asserting that he had pawned his pledges with him and the Jew should deny this, and then if the Christian should not wish to accord any belief in the mere statement of the Jew, the Jew may prove his contention by taking an oath upon an object in value to that which was brought to him and shall then go forth free.\textsuperscript{110}

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
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Jewish communities. He states, “Jews sought and received the right to internal self-government, to adjudicate their own litigations, and to live in accordance with Jewish law.” While it appears Jews were willing to pay for permission to enter and live in the city and to engage in business with local merchants, they refused to surrender their personal freedom to practice their religion. 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.

The charters and privileges granted to Jewish communities secured Jewish autonomy within a ruler’s lands, but secular authorities had the right to exercise limited amounts of influence over the community. Duke Frederick of Austria in his aforementioned charter demonstrates the amount to which secular authorities could intervene in the affairs of the Jewish community, “[I]f the Jews engage in quarreling or actually fight among themselves, the judge of our city shall claim no jurisdiction over them; only a duke alone or chief official of his land shall exercise jurisdiction.”

*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, “Likewise whatever Christian shall take his pledge away from a Jew by force or shall exercise violence in the Jew’s home shall be severely punished as a plunderer of our treasury.” Duke Frederick implied that the business of the Jews in moneylending was associated with, and belongs to, the royal treasury. The idea of Jews belonging to the ruler’s treasury is known as
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Kammerknechtschaft in the scholarship surrounding the relationship between Jewish communities and German kings.\footnote{Rosensweig, \textit{Ashkenazic Jewry in Transition}, 39.} The beginning of this relationship is mentioned by King Frederick I in 1157, in his charter to the Jews of Worms, \textit{cumad cameram nostram attineant}, “subject to the Kaiser,” and \textit{qui ad imperialem cameram nostram dinoscuntur pertinere}, “belong to the imperial chamber” in the charter for the Jews of Regensburg in 1182.\footnote{Friedrich I. charter to the Jews of Worms, April 6, 1157, Worms, Monumenta Germaniae Historica Digital, vol. 10.1, 284-86, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich, https://www.dmgh.de/mgh_dd_f_i_1/index.htm#page/284/mode/1up; Friedrich I charter approving the Jews of Regensburg’s traditional trade privileges, September 1182, Regensburg, Monumenta Germaniae Historica Digital, vol. 10.4: 43-44, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich, https://www.dmgh.de/mgh_dd_f_i_4/index.htm#page/43/mode/1up; Annette Grabowsky, „Tutorium Arbeiten mit Quellen: Das Privileg Friedrich Barbarossas für die Wormser Juden (1157),“ historicum estudies.net, last modified May 5, 2015.http://www.historicum-estudies.net/etutorials/tutorium-quellenarbeit/beispielanalysen/privileg-barbarossas/#fn13.} Friedrich I’s concept was transformed into \textit{servi camerae} in Latin and in German \textit{Kammerknechte} by Frederick II in 1236.\footnote{Robert Chazan, trans., “Emperor Frederick II, 1236,” in \textit{Church, State, and the Jew in the Middle Ages}, 124-125.} 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.”\footnote{Ibid.} From these claims to the direct service of the Jews, the concept of \textit{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.\footnote{Alfred Haverkamp, “Jews and Urban Life: Bonds and Relationships,” in \textit{The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages (Tenth to Fifteenth Centuries): Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Speyer; 20-25 October 2002} (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols Publishers, 2004), 64.} The expression became commonplace when speaking of the political standing of the Jews. In scholarship the term \textit{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.\textsuperscript{120} The authority of the Jews, which the king claimed, was not without opposition from princes and feudal lords.\textsuperscript{121}

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).”\textsuperscript{122} At the same time, the king had a duty to protect them from prosecution.\textsuperscript{123} 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.

3) Permission

The invitation (and the permission of Jews into any region) suggests a need for the economic or specific occupational services offered by Jews.\textsuperscript{124} The bishop of Speyer, Rüdiger in 1084 offered Jews a series of privileges aimed at enticing the Jews to settle in the city of Speyer.\textsuperscript{125} The bishop provided the Jews with a separate district encircled by a wall that was their duty to secure and protect—which will be discussed later in this paper.\textsuperscript{126} The example of 1084 demonstrates that the ruler often decided where and how the

\textsuperscript{120} Agus, "Preconceptions and Stereotypes in Jewish Historiography." \textit{The Jewish Quarterly Review} 51, no. 3 (1961): 242-53.
\textsuperscript{122} Roth, “Servi Camerae Regis,” 317.
\textsuperscript{123} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{125} Rosensweig, \textit{Ashkenazic Jewry in Transition}, 4.
\textsuperscript{126} Ibid.
Jews could live in the city, restricting their quarter to a specific part of the city and regulating business activities. As we will see however, Jews were likely not forced to live within a certain area, known as the Jewish quarter. They possibly congregated in one place for their own purposes, safety and community.

City Life

Jewish communities lived primarily in cities, although after the fourteenth century and expulsions in the centuries to come, Jews began settling in smaller towns. Within the German Kingdom three types of cities can be identified (cathedral cities, free imperial cities, and territorial cities), two of which were most populated by Jews before the black plague and the expulsions of Jews from cities.

The first type of cities that this paper will discuss are Bischofstädte (bishop/cathedral cities). These cities are the oldest form of cities in which the Stadtherr (city ruler) combines the spiritual and worldly authority together. The German Kingdom was divided into roughly forty dioceses, with cathedral cities as the place of religious, political, military, economic, and intellectual functions. The structure of cathedral cities was similar for Jews and Christians alike. For Christians, their hub for religious and social life was centered around the cathedral church and square. This was analogous with Jews whose communal centers were in synagogues and their courtyards. Kings exerted influence upon cathedral cities with varying degrees of success depending on the region and time.
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Freiestädte or Reichstädte, known as “free imperial cities” in English, were cities that gained independence from the control of the local rulers, resulting in the direct overlordship of the king. To avoid the discrepancy between imperial and royal, “free imperial cities” will be referred to the German term, “Freiestädte” which translates literally to “free cities.” Besides having the king as overlord, Freiestädte had to swear oath of homage and pay royal taxes.\textsuperscript{130} The change from a bishop city to Freiestädte occurred with kingly privileges or charters, confirming the city’s independence from the local rulers. Frankfurt, Nürnberg, Cologne, Mainz, Regensburg, and Prague were the most important Freiestädte in the German Kingdom.\textsuperscript{131} From the perspective of the king, with freedom from the authority of the bishop or secular princes, cities essentially tied themselves directly to the kingdom.\textsuperscript{132} Despite free cities’ payment of homage to the king, cities themselves insisted that the king was not their Stadtherr, “city ruler.”\textsuperscript{133} Homage thus functioned as a way of acknowledgment of the king, not the Stadtherr.\textsuperscript{134} These cities had the full freedom from higher authority and had the power to call their own laws.\textsuperscript{135} This dynamic in practice is visible from the example of Regensburg, who first paided homage to the kingdom in 1492, after withdrawing from the rule of Bavaria.\textsuperscript{136}

\textit{Jewish Quarters}
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Despite having different systems of governance, cathedral cities and Freiestädte had a designated Jewish quarter. The location and characteristics of the Jewish quarter were a central part of the Jewish experience in cities. As discussed previously, Jewish communities in cities existed with the permission and privileges granted by the local ruler. One of the stipulations put forth by the ruler was where Jews could live. Most often Jews resided within the Jewish quarter, sometimes allotted by the ruler and sometimes a voluntary concentration on behalf of the Jews. The “Jewish quarter” is described by Alfred Haverkamp as “a specially concentrated Jewish settlement.” In the past, “ghetto” has been used to refer to the same topic. The term “ghetto” besides its negative connotations, was first introduced in 1516 Venice, so not only does it not apply to the Jews of medieval German Kingdom but also it is wholly anachronistic. The Jewish quarter can refer to the tendency of Christians to isolate the Jews, Haverkamp argues in this sense the Jewish settlement is “in a secluded quarter.” The seclusion of Jews to a specific area of a city could be both voluntary and/or enforced.

The beginning of the Jewish quarter as “compulsory institutions” is argued by Guido Kisch as beginning “at the end of thirteenth century.” Others such as Markus Wenninger argues “the creation of walled-in Jewish residential areas outside of which Jews are forbidden to live” was “relatively rare and generally did not occur until the fifteenth century.” The distinction between “voluntary” and “compulsory” forms of Jewish quarters is made difficult to determine due to Jews’ need for protection. Since Christian leaders took measures to protect
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Jews from persecution from Christians, their actions probably corresponded to the will of the Jews. Concerning the protection of the Jewish community, the measure of separating Jewish houses and settlements from Christians may have been supported if not bolstered by Jews. Jewish quarters thus appear to be in the interest of both Christian authorities and Jewish communities. For the ruler, a secluded settlement provided the needed protection for Jewish communities while fulfilling the desire of “town authorities for law and order.”

As to how far the location of Jewish homes and communal areas and their geographical position in a town was an “expression of the social economic, legal, and political position” for Helmut Veitshans has a hypothesis:

The closer their [i.e., the Jews’] residential area lay to the most important streets and squares of a town, the more significant their situation; the farther away… and forced to the periphery they were, the less important was their economic and especially their social position.

The closer the Jewish quarter was to bustling city life and key communal areas of a city, the more important the Jewish community, even if not verbally or legally, the community was acknowledged for its economic and social contributions to the city. In the fashion of Veitshans’s template the Jewish quarters of Worms and Regensburg will be compared. Although, Haverkamp concludes the “negative social gradient” proposed by Veitshans, his hypothesis cannot be applied to smaller towns, where a great deal of Jews settled in the later Middle Ages. Since the focus of this study is examining large cities, Haverkamp’s concerns are not applicable, although his argument, that sweeping generalizations do not adequately represent the reality of Jewish life in the German Kingdom, has merit.
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The First Crusade and “Pogroms”

The major upset that came at the end of the eleventh century with the First Crusade is the backdrop for the Jewish experience in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The influence of the anti-Jewish violence had on Jewish culture and history haunted medieval and modern Jewish communities. For twelfth century Jews, the aftermath of the crusade not only effected the community they lived in (their houses, buildings, synagogues) but also drastically depleted the population of the Jewish community since many were murdered or killed themselves. This devastation took cities and towns decades to recover from economically.

When Pope Urban II called for an organized military endeavor to conquer Jerusalem for the sake of Christianity in 1095, the anti-Jewish sentiment grew into violent riots in northern Europe. The fervor that elicited men to leave their homes to join the First Crusade is the same fervor that caused these crusaders (and others) to begin their ‘righteous’ fight for Christianity against Jews in the German Kingdom. The riots were widespread and brought violence to the Rhineland, Bavaria, and Bohemia. The large Jewish communities of Trier, Metz, Regensburg, Speyer, Worms, Mainz, Cologne, Prague, and the villages and towns of Neuss, Wevelinghofen, Eller, Xanten, Mehr, Kerpen, Geldern, Wesseli were all attacked during the First Crusade (c. 1096).

Although the violent attacks against Jewish communities was condemned by the pope, many Jewish communities were destroyed or badly damaged. Crusaders destroyed parts of the
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Jewish quarter by burning the synagogue or individual houses and the attackers killed Jews when they refused to convert to Christianity. The story of the violence is recorded by both Latin and Hebrew sources, and they agree with one another in most aspects. The reports differ on the reaction to Jewish self-sacrifice, or ritual suicide. The Jewish report saw this as an act of martyrdom and the Christian source found the act “horrible.”

The crusaders’ violent fight for Christianity against Jews in Europe has been described as a “pogrom,” defined as a riot or organized massacre of an ethnic or religious group. Modern usage applies the word to persecutions against Jews, even those in the Middle Ages, but “pogrom” was first used to refer to an anti-Jewish riot in Odessa in 1821. The word comes from the Russian word that means devastation or riot. Later the term pogrom was applied to more anti-Jewish riots in the Russian Empire in the late nineteenth century after the assassination of Tsar Alexander. The original usage of pogrom was thus in reference to anti-Jewish riots in Eastern Europe in the nineteenth century. Much like the term, “ghetto,” which was first used after the end of the Middle Age in 1517, pogrom is often applied anachronistically. In order to avoid the anachronistic connotations the term “pogrom” applies to events pre-dating the first use, this paper will simply refer to anti-Jewish riots, like that of the First Crusade as anti-Jewish persecution, violent, or massacre.

The Organization of Jewish Communities: The “Inside Perspective”
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This section aims to contextualize and illuminate the internal organization of Jewish communities by discussing major governing bodies, the rights of Jews within the community, and the important monuments around which Jewish communities live. The governing of Jews within the community, which were stable and granted the members of the Jewish community progressive right and opportunities, contrast with the Jews’ rights granted to them by non-Jewish authorities outside in the city. The dichotomy created an interesting environment that might have influenced the activities and inclusion of the Jewish community in the city. The Jewish community has been described as a “state within a state,” since it exercised more authority than the most powerful secular authorities.\(^{151}\) The internal autonomy was supported by non-Jewish organs of government, in charters and privileges, such as the previously discussed charter of Duke Friedrich of Austria.\(^{152}\) In the charters in which German kings refer to Jews as “belonging to the imperial chamber” they also secure the Jews’ right to govern themselves. The primary body governing the community was the council *kahal* or *haburah*. The men who sat on these councils were known as *parnasim* (singular: *parnas*), they were elected by taxpayers (who were never very numerous in any community).\(^{153}\) The *parnasim* sometimes also acted as a judicial body for the community. The council upheld the existing ordinances and took part in the “promulgation” of new ones.\(^{154}\) The *takkanah* (a rabbinic ordinance) served as a tool for the “proper development of the community and communal life” since it was through the formulation and enactment of these ordinances that Jewish communities governed.\(^{155}\) Ultimately, the *takkanah* had to be approved by a recognized Rabbi of the community before the ordinance was
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enacted. The promulgation of new ordinance and interpretations of old ones were part of the “rabbi’s unquestioned domain.”

The complex dynamics of Jewish rights in and outside the city adds another layer to the Jewish experience. The protected rights within the community are ultimately constant, but outside the community, they are uncertain and unstable due to new rulers, change in local authority, or other external conflicts (such as the Black Plague). Furthermore, the involvement of external authorities was often a threat to Jewish self-governance. The contrasts between the rights of Jews within versus the ‘privileges’ Jews saw outside of the community are not as stark as one might think. An individual member of the Jewish community had rights which were protected inside and (to a lesser extent) outside the Jewish quarter and community. A man had the right to defend himself after being accused of transgressing an enactment and he could argue against the interpretation of the takkanah. If he could not force the community to accept his difference of opinion and force them to move the case to a recognized court for resolution, the individual had the right to “utilize every means, and use any recourse, in order to gain satisfaction and justice.” This could be involving non-Jewish organs of government, despite this typically being distasteful act in Jewish law. Granted, Jews facing legal persecution within the community had more opportunities to defend themselves using any means, including involving outside authorities. Jews still had protection in trial outside the community as well, but the preexisting circumstances made their success in trial unlikely, since the laws outside of the Jewish community generally favored Christian litigants.
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The Community: Traditions and Solidarity

Despite Jewish communities living segregated from the Christian public, rulers had an understanding of the institution in Jewish religious and communal life. The importance of the synagogue as a central institution in Jewish communities was recognized by non-Jewish authorities.\textsuperscript{161} When authorities wanted to punish a Jewish community, they would often close the synagogue.\textsuperscript{162} Many communities had additional synagogues supplementary to the community synagogue, like a students’ synagogue, a women’s synagogue.\textsuperscript{163} Maintained by the allocation of community funds and contributions from those in the community.\textsuperscript{164} The synagogue played a role in additional community needs of the Jewish community. Public penance would be recited on a platform in the synagogue.\textsuperscript{165} Oaths were taken in synagogues and punishments, such as flagellation were executed there as well.\textsuperscript{166} The level of autonomy is best illustrated by the rule of majority that determined the actions the community. Any regulation “whose purpose it was to strengthen religion or to fortify the political, social and economic position of the community in its struggle for existence” became legal and was binding on all the members of the community, based on majority vote.\textsuperscript{167} Once the majority had spoken, the minority were legally bonded to fulfill the decision.\textsuperscript{168} This meant the Jewish community splintered rarely, and the community could maintain the feeling of solidarity and autonomy.
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Despite the protection of Jewish cemeteries being confirmed in charters, the Jewish community’s creation of a cemetery was not a right. While every community had a synagogue, not every community had the privilege of its own cemetery, which was significant because the cemetery was one of the most important religious institutions of the community.\textsuperscript{169} The cemetery is acknowledged as an important religious/communal cornerstone in the Jewish community, as seen by the 1244 charter of Duke Frederick of Austria, “…if a Christian, moved by insolence, shall break into or devastate the cemetery of the Jews, he shall die…”\textsuperscript{170} While some rulers protected the Jews and their religious practices, many limited Jewish cultural and religious practices, by restricting the creation of cemeteries in some cities or towns.

**Part II: The Case Studies**

In this section, the two Jewish communities of Worms and Regensburg are examined in detail. Working partially outside the intended time frame of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries provides both context for the community and displays the development of the relationship between city authorities and the Jewish community. 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 economic services such as moneylending also placed the Jewish in a financial relationship with powerful rulers. 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 Judiaca*, and archeological evidence.
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**Worms**

In the Rhineland, Worms lays south of Mainz in the state of Rheinland-Pfalz in modern day Germany. As a result of its location upon the Rhine, Worms was a well-connected city and a founding member of the *Rheinischen Städtebundes* in 1254 among Basel, Straßburg, Speyer, Oppenheim, Mainz, and Cologne.\(^{171}\) Worms was also one of the seven *Freiestädte* in the kingdom. By the tenth century records show Worms had a Jewish community.\(^{172}\)

**Relationship with Authorities and the City**

The earliest extant or significant interaction between the king and the Jewish community of Worms occurred in 1074 written by King Heinrich IV for “the Jews and other peoples of Worms,” (*iudei et coeteri Uvormatienses*).\(^{173}\) The 1074 charter, granted to the civic community of Worms, is the first of its kind (fig. 1). The charter outlined an economic incentive, namely the exemption from tolls at royal levying places.\(^{174}\) The second charter from King Heinrich IV in 1090 afforded the Jews of Speyer and Worms privileges, granting the Jews specific economic privileges. Later King Friedrich I Barbarossa in 1157, expanded and reaffirmed Heinrich IV’s charter.\(^{175}\) Both charters granted the Jews trade privileges in various goods, “they may have the free right to exchange silver with anyone… they may have the right to sell their wine and their
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dye and their medicines to Christians.” Unlike the 1090 charter, Friedrich I claims unshared rule over the Jews. He does so explicitly by negating the authority of other rulers.

Therefore we wish and command by the authority of our royal dignity, in order that they [the Jews] look to us in all matters of justice, that neither bishop nor treasurer nor count nor judge nor anyone – except one whom they [the Jews] choose – presume to deal with them or against them in any affair or extraction related to justice. Only he whom the emperor himself has appointed over them through their election, as we have said, shall do so, since they belong to our treasury, as it pleases us.177

In the interregnum years of 1254, Wilhelm von Holland, the Gegenkönig reaffirmed the Jewish community’s rights and freedoms.178 Four years later the confirming of the Jewish charter came from Wilhelm von Holland Christen’s rival, Richard von Cornwall, the other Gegenkönig. Likely, both rulers placed themselves in good favor of the Jews (by granting them certain rights) to secure their financial support in their campaigns against other elected kings. After the reissuance of their rights, the Jews of Worms gave the bishop and the burghers, “citizens of Worms,” two-hundred marks of silver, intended for the city to use towards protecting the Jewish community’s rights.179 From this transaction, it appears that the physical safety and autonomy of the Jewish community came more from local authorities and changed over time than from through a transactional relationship with the king himself.180 Nevertheless, the king’s charters protecting the Jews of Worms might not have been completely arbitrary. Rather the king served as a guarantor of Jewish protection, although he lacked the power to enforce his charters on the

---

177 “Local Charters: Emperor Frederick I, 1157,” 63-65.
178 “Worms,” Band II, 920. The Gegenkönig (literally against/contrary king) is a king who came to power during an unstable time in which there is disputed succession to the throne. Gegen meaning against, Wilhelm von Holland from 1248-1254 was against Friedrich II, who was excommunicated by the Pope in 1245, and Konrad IV in the Königswahl, before he was crowned king in 1254. After Wilhelm, the pope’s choice of king, died in 1254, Richard von Cornwall was elected by four of the seven Kurfürsten, but he was not favored by the pope nor the king of France, who supported another candidate Alfonso X of Castile, another Gegenkönig.
179 “Worms,” Band II, 920. Marks here refer to the measure of weight used for gold and silver.
180 Ibid.
local level. The legal position of the Jews, besides what is vaguely described in the various charters, was mixed. All factors influencing the legal status of Jews in Worms, created a mixed legal status. They were outside of the civic community, but they had nominal bugher (citizen) rights, except for the ability to be active in the city politics thus they were not “Vollbürger,” or full citizens.181

The Jewish Quarter

The Jewish quarter in Worms was located in the north-east curve of the interior city wall (fig. 2).182 The synagogue in Worms was built in 1034, and despite the violence of the First Crusade (1096), the synagogue survived.183 Taking inspiration in the surrounding architecture, the 1175 synagogue was rebuilt in the style of the Worms Cathedral.184 The women’s synagogue (Bet ha-Neschim) was added in 1213 onto the north side of the male synagogue.185 Likewise the female counterpart was also influenced by the surrounding architecture of the city, specifically the St. Martin Church in Worms, which was also the closest collegiate church to the Jewish quarter. 186 The church thus functioned as the main influence for the architecture of the women’s synagogue.

Following Veitshan’s hypothesis, which argues that the closer the Jewish quarter was to important streets or squares of the city the more significant of a role the Jews played in society, 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.\textsuperscript{188} 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. As we examine Worms more closely, the evidence from two contemporary chronicles and royal charters as well as the growth of the Jewish community within the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, describes the Jewish community as entangled within city politics and the economy. 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 mikvah, or Jewish bath was another staple in Jewish culture and was built probably in 1186 or sometime at the end of the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{189} The mikvah in Worms held around 700-800 liters water, it could also be used by females and males, although not simultaneously.\textsuperscript{190} Culturally, the bath fulfilled the necessary ritual of cleansing of the body after contact with the dead or the decaying, or through sexual discharge.\textsuperscript{191} For women, in particular, a bath was necessary after menstruating, before marriage, and after childbirth.\textsuperscript{192} The bath still exists today.

Like the mikvah, 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
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(Jews living in towns and villages surrounding the city). The Jewish cemetery in Worms was probably established in the eleventh century, as the oldest grave stone for “Jakob hbachur” dates from 1076 (fig. 3). 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. Like most Jewish cemeteries, the Jewish cemetery in Worms was surrounded by a wall and was carefully cared for. 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. 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. By 1260, the expansion and building of a surrounding wall was complete. The expansion of the cemetery sparked strife between the non-Jewish peoples of Worms and the Jewish community. 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. The entry reads:
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In 1278, the Jews gave the citizens of Worms 400 pounds of the money of Halle [also known as heller] for the common lands which they occupied in their two neighborhoods and for their cemetery whose fortifications the citizens wanted to break down.\(^{202}\)

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.\(^{203}\)

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 times when the Jewish community could afford to rebuild or build new structures, as well as the community’s cultural interaction with their Christian environment can be extracted from the physical history of the Jewish community of Worms.

**Economics**

After the devastating events of the crusades in Worms in 1096, the next mention of the Jews of Worms is in 1112, when Heinrich V confirmed his father’s toll-privileges, and expanded the
privilege to the Jews of Worms.\textsuperscript{204} This occurred sixteen years after the persecution in 1096, thus the loss of the Jewish community was slowly being replenished and seems to have been on the way toward consolidation. The growth of the Jewish community was not discouraged by these events, the evidence lays in the 1241 royal tax record, recording Worms paying 130 marks of silver. Worms was thus second highest paying city, behind Straßburg, who paid 200 marks of silver.\textsuperscript{205}

The moneylending conducted by the Jews of Worms was far reaching. Those who borrowed money from the Jews of Worms were the citizens of Worms, the duke Otto and Johann von Nassau, priests in Worms, the Langvogt of Niederschawaben, Konrad von Weinsberg and his son, Duke Friedrich von Leiningen, and the duke of Sponheim, the citizens of Frankfurt, mains, Oberwesel, and Strassburg.\textsuperscript{206} High church officials and princes utilized the Jews of this community for the resources they offered.

Worms was also part of the Shum community, (kehillot ShUM), consisting of the Jewish communities of Speyer, Worms, and Mainz. The alliance had various benefits for the Rhineland Jews. Between the ShUM communities were loose economic dealings, family ties, intellectual exchange, consultation on legal questions and religious matters.\textsuperscript{207} Such legal and religious questions were largely handled at the local synods of the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. The enactments of ShUM (takkanot ShUM) were decrees formulated at the synods of 1196 and 1220 in Mainz.\textsuperscript{208} Not only was the alliance socially and culturally important, the alliance was a type of solidarity and autonomy, and was parallel to and precedent for the
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‘Rhenish Union’ between the cities of Worms, Speyer, and other cities on the Rhine. The city itself formed an agreement with Speyer in 1209 and from 1254 onwards the alliance culminated in the network of the Rhenish Union.209

Violent Attacks Against the Jews of Worms

The Jewish community of Worms faced many pogroms that struck other Jewish communities in the kingdom during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Anti-Jewish violence was both crusade-inspired and seemingly random. Despite the occasional violence, the Jews of Worms are recorded as never having a repeat of the massacre of the first crusade in 1096.210 The violence of the High Middle Ages against Jews and the rulers’ reaction to such targeted violence is an important point of comparison between Jewish communities in the German Kingdom.

The First Crusade absolutely devastated the Jewish community in Worms, but they were slowly recuperating and growing to their previous size before the Second Crusade in 1147.211 The fanatical French monk, Radulf, preached throughout cities in the Rhineland a venomous campaign against the Jews. Radulf’s actions in Worms prompted a revolt against the Jewish community.212 There were –compared to the violence of the First Crusade— relatively few victims of anti-Jewish violence caused by the Second Crusade with the death toll only two Jews.213 In the face of the eerily similar danger, the Jews fled to a fortified castle, where they stayed until the crusaders finished their tirade through the city.214
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The next major incidence of violence against the Jew of Worms was nearly forty years later. The years 1187/88, brought horror to the Jewish community in Worms, but unlike other crusades, with the Third Crusade there was no blood shed.²¹⁵ Perhaps learning from the various other examples of the zealous crusader spirit resulting in massacres and untold violence towards the Jews, protection measures were undertaken by King Friedrich I and his son Heinrich.²¹⁶ For the king to engage directly with the city of Worms and the Jewish community there, he must have found the Jews an important part of his realm. 1187/88 also speaks to Kammerknechtschaft, in which the Jews belong to the king, who has explicit authority over their affairs. Within Kammerknechtschaft, the king has authority over the finances of the community, therefore in theory, the Jews belonged to the royal chamber and their money belonged to the king. This logic is later used by King Friedrich II, who granted the bishop of Worms the right to collect taxes from the Jewish community.²¹⁷

The November 15, 1196 pogrom in Worms resulted in the death of multiple Jewish persons and wounded many others.²¹⁸ Two crusaders broke into the house of the well-known Rabbi Eleasar ben Jehuda, also known as Rokeach, and killed his two daughters and his wife, Doza, injured his son, some of the Rabbi’s students, and himself.²¹⁹ A week later, one of the murderers was captured and punished.²²⁰ Further information on the two rogue crusaders is unknown. The punishment of at least one of the perpetrators demonstrates the importance of the Jewish community to the city and its commitment to upholding the stipulations of the latest charter, by Friedrich I in 1190, protecting the Jews of Worms.
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The Conflict of 1233: Jews Entangled in City Politics

In the thirteenth century the Christian civic community had “fully emerged.”221 The leaders of the community asserted control and independent rule by 1200.222 Up to the beginning of the thirteenth century the authoritarian structure was one of close accord between kings and bishops and a oligarchy of ministeriales [lesser nobles] with leading influential families.223 The emergence of the civic community certainly changed this dynamic. At the beginning of the thirteenth century, the bishop created measures that the Jews in any criminal case of trial against a Christian could only answer to a special Bishop-Jewish court.224

Unlike in Speyer, where the bishop was the crucial factor concerning Jewish rights, in Worms the king was recognized as the ultimate judge and protector of the Jews.225 Most likely, before the investiture controversy, the bishop of Worms claimed authority of the Jewish community.226 Even after King Friedrich I in 1157 and King Friedrich II in 1236 claimed, in theory, the sole legal claim control over the Jews of Worms, the bishops retained some rule over the Jewish community. Even so, gradually the bishop and city councils gained more jurisdiction over the Jewish community in addition to the king (or alongside the level of power of the king).227 Even in the thirteenth century when civic communities (councils and guilds) gained more traction in the political scene, the bishops still, at least formally, held the second ultimate authority over the city (the first being the king). The raising power thus of city councils did however challenge the status quo.
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The beginning of 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.228 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.”229 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.230 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.231 The *Chronicon* states this punishment stayed in effect for almost
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an entire year before the citizens asked for the king to act as arbitrator.\textsuperscript{232} The king apparently “favored [the citizens] in all things.”\textsuperscript{233} Thus the citizens composed an agreement with King Heinrich and it was 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.\textsuperscript{234} With this exchange an agreement was reached and in 1233 the bishop returned to Worms and church mass was re-instituted.\textsuperscript{235} The bishop named nine councils according to the agreement reached between the citizens and the bishop.\textsuperscript{236} He also named nine men who in turn chose six knights to precede over the councils.\textsuperscript{237} These fifteen men swore holding the relics of saints that:

…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…\textsuperscript{238}

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.\textsuperscript{239} 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
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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.

The relationship between the king and the bishop of Worms might be described as one of permission. The king granted measured amounts of authority to the bishop upon necessary occasions or the bishop complained in the king’s court. This transaction of authority can be seen when King Friedrich II granted Bishop Lupold von Worms in 1212 the right to collect taxes. But according to the earliest extant documents, another bishop (probably Bishop Richard of Dhaun) enacted a special bishop tax upon the Jewish community in 1255. The incident, also discussed earlier in this section, describes another instance of the relationship between the bishop and the king. The bishop was afforded a higher position in the hierarchy of Worms rulers. The new stance in the hierarchy confirmed the bishop’s jurisdiction and delegitimized the civic community’s jurisdiction. The following resistance to the letter functions as a window into the reality of kingly authority. Relying upon the charters and preconceptions of the hierarchy of the
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German Kingdom seems insufficient to fully understand the reality of daily life and authoritative relationships on a local level.

The evidence of at least a small amount of prevailing authority of the king is demonstrated by the bishop’s visiting the king’s court and asking for King Friedrich II to intervene and grant the bishop evidence of his ultimate jurisdiction. What little authority the bishop believed the king wielded, and perhaps the level of authority the bishop believed he had was challenged by the citizens. The citizen’s resistance to the sealed letter written by King Friedrich II in 1233 and the bishop’s own granted authority, demonstrates the reality of royal authority over individual communities. The bishop was no more empowered to enact reforms to the civic community despite having a written document confirming his authority.

Eventually, the bishop had his way, by reorganizing and controlling the city’s councils, but the return of the bishop to Worms was negotiated. The exact terms of their agreement was not described in Chronicon Wormatiense, however some stipulations of the citizens of Worms were met, since they willingly allowed the bishop to choose the council members. The bishop had to cede to some of the city’s demands in order for an agreement to be made. This demonstrates the level of authority the civic community held in the mid-thirteenth century.

In conclusion, the combination of the councilmen’s oath and the changing relationship between the bishop, the king, and the civic community, describes a period of domestic instability. It is within this changing political landscape that the Jewish community found themselves. The king without much power, the bishop vying for control with the civic community/councils, and the Jewish community entangled within the changing power dynamic in the thirteenth century.
Jewish Financial Aid Amidst Threats to the City of Worms

The cantor at the cathedral of Worms belonged to a family who caused problems and disruptions in the city in the 1250s, caused more strife in the city when his relatives Conrad and Werner Sulgeloch, among other accomplices, “carried out many crimes against the citizens.” The Chronicon states they were highway bandits stealing whatever they found from both Christians and Jews. In 1260 during this extended fight between the citizens and bishop of Worms and “their adversaries,” specifically the family members of Jacob of Stein, Oppenheim, Gundheim, and Alzey was attacked by Jacob of Stein and his accomplices, who burned the grain storehouses. The losses for citizens amounted to more than 2,000 marks. At this point, the Jews, assumedly of Worms, “realized in 1260 that the citizens were short of funds and gave them 300 pounds of money of Halle before Letare Sunday.” Interestingly, the Annales Wormatienses asserts the Jews of Worms gave one hundred and fifty pounds of money of Halle to assist the citizens of Worms efforts to raise money to hire mercenaries to support the peace reached between Worms and Jacob of Stein in 1255. The Annales also supports the Chronicon’s assertion that the Jews gave money to the city when the city was low on funds. The exact numbers do not coincide however, with the Annales, which states “the Jews gave a subsidiary to the city of 200 pounds of the money of Halle and an additional 50 marks of silver,” in order for the city of Worms to keep its mercenaries, who cost four hundred marks a year. The entire conflict between Worms and Jacob of Stein ended in 1261, and in November of that
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year the Jews of Worms “gave the citizens 230 pounds of money of Halle for the repair of the wall,” along with 20 pounds “as a consumption tax on wine.”

Another instance of Jews assisting in the financial needs of the city is in 1270. The canons at the Cathedral of Worms were John of Richenbach, the deacon, and Gerhard of Liechtenstein, the sub-deacon, they along with other noblemen from Löwenstein “took hostile actions against the friends of Worms and attacked them with fire and rapine.” After the matter was settled shortly thereafter, the Jews gave the citizens 250 pounds of money of Halle “as a subsidy for the expenses that the citizens had undertaken against those individuals from Liechtenstein.” The mentioned donations of silver given to the city after devastating events might not have been completely willing acts. It remains unclear from the information provided by the *Annales Wormatienses*, whether the donations were taken forcefully or if the funds were given willingly by the Jewish community.

**Regensburg**

Regensburg is a city located in central Bavaria in modern day Germany. The beginning of settlement in Regensburg began far earlier than the middle ages. The city was home to the biggest Roman camp in Germany. With the city’s roots in the Roman Empire, it is no surprise that the Jewish community in Regensburg belongs to the oldest Jewish settlements in Bavaria. Jewish tradition claims Jews already lived in Regensburg before Christ (BCE). There should be a letter, in which the Jews of Palestine informed the Jews of Regensburg of the crucifixion of

---

248 *Annales Wormatienses,* 153.
249 Ibid., 158.
250 Ibid.
Jesus, that would prove their claim.\textsuperscript{253} Although the letter is, as far as I can tell, not extant, the tradition of Jews living in Regensburg before Christ stretches back to the middle ages and continued into the nineteenth century, with Otto Stubbe’s mention of the letter in his work, \textit{Die Juden in Deutschland während des mittelalters in politischer, socialer und rechtlicher beziehung}, published in 1866.

The earliest extant record of Regensburg’s Jewish community is from the tenth century, when King Otto II “gifted” the country estate of \textit{Schierstadt} (now known as \textit{Stadtmhof}) to the St. Emmeram monastery in 981(fig. 4).\textsuperscript{254} The land of \textit{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.\textsuperscript{255} 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.\textsuperscript{256} The context of the community is the backdrop for the community’s experience during the high middle ages.
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Charters and Privileges

The rights of the community were supervised by the king and the bishop. The charter from King Friedrich I in 1182 was discussed previously in regards to the charter’s language and the concept of Kammerknechtschaft. To repeat what has been said earlier on the 1182 charter, the charter approved all the Jews of Regensburg’s rights, which “have been preserved from their ancestors by the grace of his [King Friedrich I’s] predecessors up to their time.” Later in 1216, King Friedrich II confirmed the rights his predecessor instated in Friedrich I’s 1182 charter.

An exception to his predecessors’ charters, the charter of King Philipps von Schwaben in 1207, called Philippinum, stated every resident of Regensburg (including Jews), who traded via money or goods in or outside the city must pay taxes for the sake of the city.

Then there was the charter of King Heinrich VII in 1230, which was more progressive than his predecessors, namely confirming the privileges of the community given to them by previous kings and adding that no Jew could be brought before a judge, that the Jews did not choose themselves. Additionally, Heinrich VII stipulated, no one could assert a claim against a Jew if there was not one Jew present as a witness.

The relationship between Jews and the bishop of Regensburg was – much like in Worms – facilitated by the king. Friedrich II gifted the bishop, Siegfried (1227-1246) the entire income of the royal Kammer (chamber) derived from the Jewish community of Regensburg. Furthermore, the bishop was granted jurisdiction over the Jewish community, as long as they belonged to the
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royal chamber. This right was revoked by King Heinrich VII in 1233 and granted the authority over the Jews of Regensburg to the bishop of Nürnberg.

The gifts granted to the bishop of Regensburg (then to the bishop of Nürnberg) were normal, since the dynamics mirror the relationship between the king, the bishop, and the Jews of Worms. In both cases, in which the bishop of Regensburg was gifted the income generated by the Jews from the “royal chamber,” and the bishop of Worms, where the bishop was granted the privilege to collect taxes from the Jews, Friedrich II was the reigning king. Friedrich II’s policy is a result of the development of Kammerknechtschaft, beginning in 1157 or 1182 with King Friedrich I. The logic being; since the king held full authority of the Jews of the German Kingdom, he had the right to transfer parts of rulership to local authorities.

So, despite Friedrich I’s claims of unshared rule over the Jews and King Friedrich II upholding this claim, King Friedrich II delegated the practical, local authority over the Jews to local bishops. The act of delegating reveals the reality of the kings’ total authority over the Jews of the German Kingdom. With the right to govern and tax the Jews, bishops became the primary rulers of the Jewish community, pushing the king to a status of supervisor, rather than a more hands-on position, that the charters of 1157, 1182, and 1236 implied.

With King Friedrich II’s 1245 Freiheitprivleg (Emancipation charter), Regensburg left the clutches of the Bavarian Herzog and rose to the ranks of the only Reichstadt in the southeast. King Rudolf von Habsberg, the so-called “interregnum king” in 1274 renewed Friedrich II’s Freiheitprivleg. In 1275, when the city council wanted the Jews to help in
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defense of the city, King Rudolf von Habsberg wrote to Pope Gregory X, who then replied in favor of the Jews.\textsuperscript{266} Another incident occurred in 1281, when the bishop demanded that the Jews not be seen in public during the Passover period, however Rudolf refuted these demands that would deny the rights of Regensburg Jews.\textsuperscript{267}

Relationship with Local Authorities

In this section, the focus is on the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and the experience of the Jewish community of Regensburg via their relationship to other authorities of the city.

In the wake of the First Crusade (1096), the Jewish community of Regensburg seemed to be recovered by the beginning of the eleventh century. Their regrowth was demonstrated when eleven years later, in 1107, the Jews of Regensburg were able to lend a total of 500-mark silver to the bishop of Prague.\textsuperscript{268}

Prior to the thirteenth century, since Heinrich IV, the Jews of Regensburg relied on the king for a confirmation of their rights. In the thirteenth century, especially after King Friedrich II more authority was given to the bishop of Regensburg over the Jewish community. Siegfried (1227-1246), who was both the bishop and \textit{Stadtkanzler} (city chancellor), received all profits due to the emperor.\textsuperscript{269} Such demonstrations of the bishop’s power, was exactly what led to an ultimately positive relationship between the city council and the Jewish community. Both had the same enemy, the power of the bishop and \textit{Herzog} and both relied upon the king for protection (since the city rose to the ranks of a \textit{Reichstadt} in 1245).\textsuperscript{270} The union between the council and
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the Jewish community is likely the reason for a rather late expulsion of the Jewish community at the end of the fifteenth century.

**The Jewish Quarter**

Before discussing the Jewish quarter, much of the information is derived from the archeological work on the quarter in 1995 (fig. 5). The archeological research in the area of *Neupfarrplatz* excavated the Jewish quarter, previously (and erroneously) thought to be located elsewhere. The excavation discovered, however, the twelfth and thirteenth centuries of the Jewish quarter in Regensburg stood in the middle of the city, where it continued to stay until 1519 when it was destroyed.

Beneath an air raid shelter, a fire brigade cistern of the Nazi era, and pipes, the quarter was rediscovered. Completely destroyed, the area of *Naupfarrplatz* revealed about 3,000 square yards of material for researching the Jewish community of Regensburg. The first mention of the Jews settling in Regensburg is also the oldest extant record of a Jewish quarter in modern day Germany. As discussed earlier, the actual age of the Jewish quarter in Regensburg is debated and the archeological findings did little to clarify the beginning date of the community.

Records from the time describe a, not-completely-Jewish quarter. As the twelfth century records state Christians lived “inter judeos” (amongst Jews). Italian merchants settled in
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Wahlenstraße, placing them next door to their Jewish neighbors.\textsuperscript{278} 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.\textsuperscript{279} 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.

Beginning in the twelfth century, the Jewish quarter developed into even more of a bi-religious area, since in 1350-1353 of the 39 properties, 31 belonged to Christians. At this time, the area was home to various public buildings: a barn, the well-house, the slaughterhouse, and the \textit{preuthaus} (house for weddings).\textsuperscript{280} Standing amongst these public buildings was the “synagogue and adjacent courtyard, the \textit{hospitale judeorum}, the \textit{Judenstadel} or traders’ warehouse, and even a large orchard in the Jewish quarter.”\textsuperscript{281} The \textit{Judenstadel} was located on the only broad street, the so-called \textit{Judengasse}, which lead north towards the Cathedral and the Danube bridge. The \textit{Judengasse} was the shortest connection from the inner city to the Danube crossing, the road was thus good for Jewish merchants and there is a possibility this crucial route was also used by Christian merchants.\textsuperscript{282}

Prior to the 1350-1353 report, the Jewish hospital was rented from the Christian land owning monastery of St. Emmeram.\textsuperscript{283} The agreement of 1210 between Abbot Eberhard von St. Emmeram and the Jewish community. In exchange for using the land as a hospital, the Jews were required to pay the monastery one-pound Pfennige.\textsuperscript{284} Despite the negative implications of
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the Jewish quarter ostensibly becoming a Christian-Jewish quarter by the fourteenth century — by which I mean the decreasing autonomy of the Jewish community with the loss of the power of owning land— the quarter attests to coexistence between Jews and Christians in Regensburg.

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. The synagogue was located in the southwest part of the Jewish quarter (fig. 6). The door to the first synagogue faced the Christian exterior in the southwest and another door in the northwest, facing the Jewish quarter interior. As Siegfried Wittmer speculated, the synagogue that was remodeled 1210-1220, was actually the first synagogue after 1097. If there was a synagogue in Regensburg before the crusade in 1096 it would have been either destroyed or converted to a Christian chapel. 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. 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.

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. The reasoning behind this change is unknown, not having an exact date to the
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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. Silvia Codreanu-Windauer proposed the change may have been practical and the Jews simply needed more room.

The archeological finds of the remodeled synagogue date the structure to 1210-1220 and was in early Gothic style. The Romanesque synagogue functioned at the foundation for a 16-foot expansion to the west. The second synagogue’s expansion might indicate that the annex rooms and blocked entrance of the Romanesque structure was indeed a result of the expanding Jewish community. The change included an addition of a “vaulted two-aisled hall partitioned by three columns” (fig. 7). The synagogue’s architecture, despite being destroyed by time, illustrated the stonemasonry of Regensburg. These same stonemasons also worked for the bishop on the cathedral atrium.

Similar excavations of the Jewish quarter of Vienna also revealed a synagogue built in multiple phases, the second of which was influenced by the Regensburg synagogue. 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.
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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.\(^{300}\) With this in mind, the access to the building both inside and outside the quarter demonstrates the relatively peaceful Christian-Jewish coexistence.

Besides the synagogue the Jewish quarter housed Jews, who lived in houses in neighboring Christian properties.\(^{301}\) Jewish houses showed a number of remodels, similar to the synagogue, and a great number of cellars. The building of cellars began during the Romanesque period (before 1210-1220) and the houses were likely built with wood which were either replaced with stonework or additions to the house were built with stone.\(^{302}\)

The other staple of Jewish religious and cultural life, the mikvah in Regensburg remains elusive. Unlike the mikvah in Worms, the mikvah in Regensburg, was located somewhere further south than the well-house mentioned in 1350-1355, was destroyed likely by the construction of the fire brigade cistern in 1939.\(^{303}\)

Little is known about Regensburg’s Jewish community in the second half of the thirteenth century, but at least by the mid-fourteenth century, the community had a seal.\(^{304}\) The seal would have been stamped alongside the official city-seal on contracts, both legitimizing the agreement/negotiation and preventing fake signings.
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The Cemetery

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” (Lit. Emmeran’s breadth), which was to be used as a cemetery, they must pay the Abbot 40 pounds of Regensburg’s Pfennig coins.\footnote{\textit{Regensburg},” in Bayerisches Städtbuch: Handbuch Städtischer Geschichte, 573. The cemetery was found in 2009 during construction. See, \url{https://www.regensburg-digital.de/judischer-friedhof-entdeckt-stadthallenbau-moglich/29102009/}.} With the agreement the new Jewish cemetery was now located south of Peters Tor (Peter’s Gate.) 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 \textit{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 (“\textit{Holtzwacht}”).\footnote{Wittmer, \textit{Jüdisches Leben in Regensburg: vom frühen Mittelalter bis 1519}, 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 Regenburg’s currency.\footnote{Susanne Härtel, \textit{Jüdische Friedhöfe im mittelalterlichen Reich} (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017), 55.}
The Legend of 1137

From the annals of the Monastery Egmond (in northern Holland), is the story of deception, murder, and death by fire in a tale of intermingling of the Jewish community and clerics.\textsuperscript{308} Since Regensburg lacked the pogroms that Worms experienced, the incident in 1137 provides a few details about the Jewish community and the ecclesiastical authorities in Regensburg. As the \textit{Annales Egmundani} (written between 1120 and 1315) reports, in 1137 a young man, Jakob b. Isaak, stole money from his father and went to the Archdeacon of Regensburg to ask for baptism and for the safe keeping of the stolen money.\textsuperscript{309} Apparently, Jews commonly feared poverty after converting to Christianity, therefore many went to great lengths to prevent “mendicancy.”\textsuperscript{310} And for good reason, since King Heinrich IV’s charter ruled that Jews must relinquish their rights to inheritance after converting.\textsuperscript{311} Due to the charter, Jews developed a very real fear of poverty after converting and consequently leaving the Jewish community. The son’s motives thus might have been his fear of poverty after his baptism. The archdeacon reacted to Jakob’s request as prescribed by Henry IV, which was to postpone the baptism for the hopeful convert to rethink his conversion.\textsuperscript{312}

The archdeacon bargained with the son’s father — he would give the son back to the father if the archdeacon could keep the stolen money.\textsuperscript{313} The father was not able to dissuade his son from his pending conversion, despite attempting to convince him with kindness and
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severity.\textsuperscript{314} As the story goes, the father then tied up his son, weighted him down with lead weights, and drowned him in the Danube.\textsuperscript{315} Then, in accord with the bias source material’s author, a miracle happened. A blind widow, who upon the third time being guided to the Danube, regained her eyesight, where upon she saw the corpse of Jakob in the middle of the Danube, illuminated by a supernatural light.\textsuperscript{316} Isaak confessed to the murder but also revealed that the archdeacon was blackmailing him. As a result, the Archdeacon was sentenced to death by fire.\textsuperscript{317} Lastly, at the grave of Jakob, many Jews converted to Christianity.\textsuperscript{318}

The legend of Jakob and Isaak is not novel, since the motif of an illuminated martyr in the waters, where they drowned, is a topoi of many legends. Kenneth Stow, on the motif of drowning in “baptismal waters,” stated the reasoning behind stories such as Jakob b. Isaak’s death is “syllogistic:”

The Jews kill their own rather than allow conversion; the Jews are particularly avid to kill children on the verge of converting… This is tantamount to saying Jews gladly kill Christian children and thirst to kill any Christian child…\textsuperscript{319}

The chronicler’s purpose might have been two fold, one to call upon the myth of blood libel, but also to hint at the eventual conversion of all Jews to Christianity.\textsuperscript{320} The legend of Jakob b. Isaak and the archdeacon could be one of complete fabrication, in which a benediction monk from Holland molded the events of stolen money and a drowning into an anti-Jewish narrative supporting the trend of the time, of Blood Libels and the conversion of Jews to Christianity. If we suspend our disbelief for a moment, the events of 1137, when reduced to the core, demonstrated both conflict and contact between the Jewish community and the archdeacon, as
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well as the perspective of Christians on the Jewish community in Regensburg. Placing the legend into the larger narrative of Jewish experience in Europe, the parallels between Jakob of Regensburg and the other instances of Christian (or pending Christian) children supposedly being murdered by Jews, such as William of Norwich (1144) in England, and the many blood-libel accusations in France during the 1160s, clearly illustrates that the German Kingdom had very similar view of Jews as England or France at the time.

Other Events

As a whole, throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the Jewish community of Regensburg faced very little, if any, pogroms that beset other Jewish communities in the kingdom, like the Second Crusade or other crusade-inspired violence.

Like the Jewish community of Worms, the Second Crusade had very little consequences for the Jewish community of Regensburg. The only inconvenience and destructive event that could have affected the Jewish community was the destruction of the stone bridge connecting Regensburg proper with Stadtamthof. Apparently, in 1147 King Konrad III (1138-1152) collected his troops and proceeded to besiege the stone bridge, so that he could sail his ships through Hungary and Constantinople to the Holy Land.321 Other than destruction of property, the Jewish community was relatively unaffected. However, the Jews did contribute to the crusading efforts financially, so it would have been advantageous for kings to protect the Jewish community, further demonstrating the transactional relationship between the Jews and the king.322 Best example perhaps being King Friedrich I, who swore to protect the Jews in 1182,
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maybe because he saw the financial benefits of Jewish moneylenders for the upcoming Crusade of 1189.323

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.

Similarities

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
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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.” 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. 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
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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. 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. 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. 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. 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.
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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 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.

In Worms, the Jewish community was much more involved in city affairs, defending the city and supporting it financially, either willingly or unwillingly. The events in 1250s, caused by a prolonged conflict between Jacob of Stein and the city of Worms, led to a donation of “300 pounds of money of Halle before Letare Sunday” from the Jews of Worms. This was not the only instance of Jewish donations, and these instances highlight the paramount economic role of the Jews in Worms. The Jewish community were part of the city, fighting the same fights as the city, by funding mercenaries or the repairment of the city wall.

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. 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
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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*. 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. 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.” 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*. The evidence for a cemetery of Worms in the eleventh century pre-dates the Regensburg Jewish
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cemetery, nearly two hundred years before the purchase of land in *Ermmerams 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.\(^{336}\) 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.\(^{337}\) 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
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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. 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,

338 “Regensburg,” Band I, 287.
since an analysis of these comparisons often leads to intriguing insights and an uncovering of patterns needed for understanding the medieval Jewish experience.
Figure 1. King Heinrich IV’s charter, 1074. From Fritz Reuter, Warmaisa: 1000 Jahre Juden in Worms (Frankfurt am Main: Jüd. Verlag Athenäum, 1987), 23.
Figure 4. Regensburg: Location of the Jewish Cemetery and Jewish Settlement. From Susanne Härtel, *Jüdische Friedhöfe im mittelalterlichen Reich* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017). Translated by Zoë Schwartz.
Figure 6. The medieval Jewish quarter of Regensburg. With the Synagogue in the southwest.

Figure 7. The interior of the synagogue, shown reversed. Etching by Albrecht Altdorfer, 1519.

From the Regensburg Historical Museum.
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