

Incarceration and Slavery in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Age

A Cultural-Historical
Investigation of the
Dark Side in the
Pre-Modern World

Edited by
Albrecht Classen



Incarceration and Slavery in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Age

**A Cultural-Historical Investigation
of the Dark Side in the Pre-Modern
World**

Edited by
Albrecht Classen

LEXINGTON BOOKS
Lanham • Boulder • New York • London

Published by Lexington Books
An imprint of The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.
4501 Forbes Boulevard, Suite 200, Lanham, Maryland 20706
www.rowman.com

6 Tinworth Street, London SE11 5AL, United Kingdom

Copyright © 2021 by The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without written permission from the publisher, except by a reviewer who may quote passages in a review.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Information Available

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Classen, Albrecht, editor.

Title: Incarceration and slavery in the middle ages and the early modern age : a cultural-historical investigation of the dark side in the pre-modern world / [edited by] Albrecht Classen.

Description: Lanham : Lexington Books, 2021. | Series: Studies in medieval literature | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2021033915 (print) | LCCN 2021033916 (ebook) | ISBN 9781793648280 (cloth) | ISBN 9781793648297 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: Imprisonment—History. | Slavery—History.

Classification: LCC HV8705 .I53 2021 (print) | LCC HV8705 (ebook) | DDC 365/.9—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021033915>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021033916>

∞™ The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992.

Contents

List of Illustrations	ix
Introduction: Historical, Literary, and Philosophical Reflections on the Phenomena of Imprisonment and Slavery in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Period <i>Albrecht Classen</i>	1
1 The Transformation of Gehenna: Taking the Biblical Wasteland into the Prison House of Hell <i>Warren Tormey</i>	59
2 <i>Insprinc haptbandun, inuar uigandun</i> : Magical (?) Remedies to Escape from Imprisonment in the Germanic Tradition <i>Chiara Benati</i>	89
3 Ambivalence in the Poems of the Slave-Knight ‘Antarah Ibn Shaddād: An Engagement with Historicism(s) <i>Doaa Omran</i>	109
4 Slavery and Anti-Slavery Discourse in the Qur’an: A New-Historicist Reading <i>Christiane Paulus and Magda Hasabelnaby</i>	133
5 The Tragic Incarceration and Martyrdom of Al-Hallaj: A Spiritual Passage from Suffering to Glorification <i>Amany El-Sawy</i>	155
6 Fruitless Wars and Abominable Crimes: Unfreedom in the Political Rule and Violence of Late Ninth-Century Southern Italy <i>Sarah Whitten</i>	181

- 7** Prisons That Never Were: Ruins, Churches, and Cruelty in Medieval and Modern Iberia (Eighth through Nineteenth Centuries) 197
Abel Lorenzo-Rodríguez
- 8** Tit for Tat: Imprisonment, Slavery, Torture, and Other Retribution in William IX's *Gab* of the Red Cat 217
Fidel Fajardo-Acosta
- 9** Thralls in Old Icelandic Literature: Historical Trope or Literary Device? 245
Carlee Arnett
- 10** Piracy, Imprisonment, Merchants, and Freedom: Rudolf von Ems's *The Good Gêrhart* (ca. 1220): Mediterranean Perspectives in a Middle High German Context; with Some Reflections on the Topic of Imprisonment in Other Medieval Narratives 261
Albrecht Classen
- 11** Don Juan Manuel's Long-Lost Uncle, Don Enrique: Back from Twenty-Five Years in Prison in Italy 285
Maria Cecilia Ruiz
- 12** Mamlūks, Qāḍīs, and the Local Population: A Discourse of Resistance, Power, and Liminality in Medieval Egypt 315
Sally Abed
- 13** The Education of Male Slaves in the Ottoman Empire and the Restructuring of Ottoman Social Hierarchy 327
Maha Baddar
- 14** From Imprisonment to Liberation: Chaucer's *Knight's Tale* as a Multilayered Exploration of a Paradigm for Prison Life 347
Daniel F. Pigg
- 15** How to Get Out of Prison: Imprisoned Jews and Their *Hafturfehden* from the Medieval and Early Modern Holy Roman Empire (Fourteenth through Sixteenth Centuries) 361
Andreas Lehnertz and Birgit Wiedl
- 16** Overcoming Stress in Imprisonment: How Positive Religious Coping and Expressive Writing Helped Fray Luis de León Survive His Inquisitorial Trial (1572–1576) 415
J. Michael Fulton

17	Health and Community Rescue or Soul Salvation? Incarceration as an Anti-Plague Measure in the Czech Lands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries <i>Filip Hrbek</i>	439
18	Shakespeare's Savage Slave <i>Thomas Willard</i>	461
	Index	495
	About the Contributors	507

Chapter 15

How to Get Out of Prison

Imprisoned Jews and Their Hafturfehden from the Medieval and Early Modern Holy Roman Empire (Fourteenth through Sixteenth Centuries)

Andreas Lehnertz and Birgit Wiedl

For Eyal Levinson on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday

“צריך להוציא שחדים בתפיסה. גם צריך לעשות שבועה שלא לנקום תפיסתו שקורין אורבריי”ד,
ולמחול על תביעותיו שהיו לו על העירוני”. הוא עדיין כמו תפוס, שאין לו רשות לתבעם כ”א
לפניהם.”

He must pay bribes in prison. He also must take an oath, called *Urvid*, that he will not avenge his imprisonment and will forfeit any legal claims he has against the citizens. In this way, he is still like an imprisoned man, who has no authority to sue them [the non-Jews].¹

This quote, found in a responsum (rabbinical ruling) by Rabbi Moses ben Isaac ha-Levy Minz, illustrates the importance of the legal instrument called (*Haft*)*Urfehde* among the Jews in the Holy Roman Empire by the fifteenth century. Moses Minz lived and acted in Mainz, Landau, Bamberg, and Posen (today: Poznań). In his decision, he summarized the steps taken by an imprisoned Jewish man who had gotten into a legal conflict with the municipality of an unnamed town, in order to get out of the municipal prison again. Only the (*Haft*)*Urfehde* would enable him to regain his legal rights and set him free from jail.

Various scholars have already explored the issue of Jewish captivity in the prisons of Christian authorities.² The (in)famous incarceration of Rabbi Meir

of Rothenburg by King Rudolph I from 1286 to 1293, when he died in prison, and his refusal to pay the (by then already raised) ransom in order not to create a precedent for future extortions from other Jews,³ has been subjected to several detailed studies; and there is a good number of case studies⁴ dedicated to the imprisonment and torture of Jews falsely accused of ritual murder or host desecration, such as in Trent 1475⁵ or in Regensburg 1476–1480,⁶ to name but a few. A comprehensive survey of the reasons for imprisonment, the living conditions of the jailed Jews, and the procedure of their release is however still a desideratum.

This chapter does not claim to fill that void. Rather, we aim to analyze in detail a specific type of source that has until now only been dealt with in passing in the context of Jewish imprisonment, namely the *Hafturfehde*. While this source type does provide a variety of valuable information on several aspects of Jewish imprisonment, it is important to stress that it has its limits—one of the main being the transmission of the records. Not every Jewish prisoner had to issue this specific document upon his or her release (or had the chance to issue it), and as records of the administration of rulers and municipalities, a great number of *Hafturfehden* (plural), both from Christians and Jews, has been lost. Therefore, to paint as comprehensive a picture as it is possible within the restraints of this volume, we drew on additional source material whenever necessary.

While in-depth analyses of *Hafturfehden* issued by Jewish men and women are scarce,⁷ the (*Haft*)*Urfehde* itself has come into focus of medievalists and researchers of the early modern period mainly thanks to Andreas Blauert's monograph,⁸ where he situated the *Urfehde* within the context of the emerging judicature of the late medieval and early modern period, by using examples from the southwestern part of the Holy Roman Empire. Newer studies of the *Urfehde* phenomenon following Blauert's book have approached the topic from a variety of perspectives, but hardly any of them deal with Jewish *Urfehden* in detail, and many do not mention them at all.⁹

In this contribution, we will give a wide-ranging, but representative sample of such *Hafturfehden* issued by Jewish residents of the Holy Roman Empire from the late Middle Ages to the early modern period. By drawing mainly (but not exclusively) on this specific type of source, we will explore the following questions: What were the reasons for the imprisonment of Jews? Why did the imprisoning authorities deem it necessary to have their Jewish prisoners issue these documents, and were there aspects of the *Hafturfehde* that were particular to Jewish prisoners? Which rituals and oaths accompanied the release of a Jewish prisoner, and what does this tell us about Christian knowledge and acceptance of Jewish oaths? And, of course, what did it mean for Jews to be imprisoned?

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE SOURCE: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE *HAFTURFEHDE*

The German word *Hafturfehde* is composed of two parts, *Haft* and *Urfehde*. While the former indicates “imprisonment,” the latter literally means “exiting the feud” and designates a mutual agreement to end a feud. The *Urfehde* had its beginnings in Germanic customary law in which feuding nobles took an oral oath of truce/peace (*Streiturfehde*). After losing its importance in the late Middle Ages due to a decline in feuds, the emerging judicial authority of both the secular authorities and, particularly, the cities adapted the ritual. The *Urfehde*, which meant the orally given oath and its surrounding ceremony, as well as the written document issued by the oath-taker, developed into an instrument of authoritative measures in the fourteenth century. It turned from a mutual oath of truce, taken by both parties, into a one-sided oath of reconciliation that had to be taken by those released from jail or from pre-trial custody.¹⁰ In this *Hafturfehde*, the prisoner acknowledged the rightfulness of their imprisonment, along with any already-executed punishments (including torture). They swore to abstain from any further criminal activities and to refrain from taking revenge against the other party and, more importantly, against the authority who had imprisoned them.

Many *Hafturfehden* included additional conditions, such as a preemptive agreement to any punishment that might still be carried out and the promise not to address another (higher) court on the matter. The common listing of advocates¹¹ that stood surety for the prisoner’s release before the authorities demonstrated how the delinquent had been (re)integrated into the networks of the respective city or territory. Occasionally, higher-ranking advocates attested to the prisoner’s social and political connections. Therefore, the oath—particularly the publicly enacted ceremony involved in taking this oath—could either serve as a means of reconciliation and reintegration of the former prisoner back into society or impose new sanctions.¹²

Only on rare occasions were fines imposed upon the newly released as a condition of the *Urfehde*—*Hafturfehden* were not inherently connected with monetary penalties. Late medieval *Hafturfehden* mention monetary fines that resulted from the original offence only by subsuming them under the issues for which the newly released would not seek revenge; and if penalties were still to be paid by the prisoner or newly released, they were in addition to, and not part of, the *Hafturfehde* (apart from, perhaps, having to pay the scribe). More common in the context of the *Hafturfehde* were mentions of fines that would be imposed if the newly released violated the conditions of the *Hafturfehde*, that is, breach their oath. Any those violations were considered perjury; therefore, the potential punishments imposed if these promises were broken could include removing fingers, cutting off the right hand, or

blinding, or even the death penalty.¹³ Some cases also included a ban on the individual's continued presence in the area and, as such, required the delinquent's promise that they would leave the territory or city.¹⁴

In the course of the late Middle Ages and, particularly, the early modern era, the *Hafturfehde* developed from a mutual peace treaty into the standard procedure upon the release of any prisoner in the German-speaking area.¹⁵ While in the early stages of the emerging monopoly of penal authority of state and municipalities, the *Urfehde* functioned as both an authoritative measure and a (mandatory) means of self-commitment,¹⁶ the *Urfehde* mainly from the sixteenth century onward was solely demanded and dictated by the imprisoning authority, who decided when and how to release its imprisoned subjects, thus demonstrating that political power could be exercised not only to imprison but also to restore someone's freedom.

This also meant that while the older *Streiturfehden* were reserved only for the higher social echelons permitted to enter a feud (*fehdefähig*), the *Hafturfehden* could be issued regardless of the prisoner's social standing and gender. The reason for incarceration was of secondary importance for the *Hafturfehde*, focusing solely on procuring the delinquents' renunciation of revenge for their imprisonment. The *Hafturfehde* had become a means of pardon that was applied regardless of the misdemeanor itself—from petty offenses to crimes warranting the death penalty—and also regardless of the prisoner's guilt or innocence. In the second half of the fourteenth century, *Hafturfehden* were commonly issued in the context of prison release and would soon become its precondition. Their formulae were extended to include oaths to conduct a future law-abiding life, the acceptance of additional, soon-to-be imposed punishments, and the promise not to appeal the case to a higher court or authority (which, in reality, they would not be able to prevent).¹⁷ The latter provision posed a constitutional problem for the Holy Roman Empire, since this would have included—explicitly or not—the *Reichskammergericht*, which was, together with the Aulic Council, the highest judicial institution of the Empire from its foundation in 1495 onward. In order to remain in control over this highest authority, the *Reichskammergericht* sought to centralize and regulate the *Urfehde* procedure.¹⁸

These developments raise the question: Where did the Jews fit into the use of *Hafturfehden*? Violence against Jews could result in imprisonment and, subsequently, in the issuance of a *Hafturfehde*, as examples from all over the German-speaking areas prove: Lorenz Reyban from Wösendorf (Lower Austria), who had threatened to kill, or at least beat up, several Jews of Krems in 1386;¹⁹ Hans Bossart of Merishausen (Canton Schaffhausen, Switzerland), who had injured and robbed a Jew in 1394;²⁰ the Nuremberg citizen Jakob Ortlieb who had jostled a Jew from Aschaffenburg at the Frankfurt Fair in 1405;²¹ and Gobel Schalant, a (non-citizen) participant in the Cologne pogrom

of 1349,²² whose actions against the Jews were in breach of the municipal peace. With regard to the last case mentioned, this led to their imprisonment by the respective city authorities and subsequent release upon the advocacy of “honorable people.” The document named the warrantors (thus allowing the delinquents to escape corporal punishment), in addition to the conventional requisite to prohibit any revenge against the city.²³

REASONS FOR JEWISH IMPRISONMENT

Everyday Reasons

The reasons for imprisonment were as varied for Christians²⁴ as they were for Jews and cannot be addressed here in their entirety. In many cases, the reasons stated in the *Hafturfehden* issued by Jewish men and women (see figure 15.1) remain vague: for example, Gumprecht from Bingen, a Jewish foreigner in the city of Regensburg, was imprisoned there in the year 1420 “von laichens und ansetzens wegen als ich kristen und juden in irer stat getan han” (because [he] betrayed Christians and Jews in their city).²⁵ About twenty



Figure 15.1 Hafturfehde of Sorel/Sarah, Daughter of Rabbi Meir Liberman, with Hebrew Signatures of the Rabbis Meir and Judah. Source: Charter, 1452, Regensburg/Germany (Munich, Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Reichsstadt Regensburg Urkunden, 1452 10 26); with permission.

years earlier, Smohel from Venice had been incarcerated for similarly unspecified “solich zerwürf und unpilleich handlung” (such discord and unpleasant action),²⁶ while the Jewish inhabitants of Rothenburg on the Tauber were put into prison because of their “groz missetat” (grave misdoing)²⁷ in 1401. In 1429, Solomon from Belluno swore *Urfehde* to the archbishop of Salzburg after his imprisonment because of some “merckleicher sach wegen” (distinct issues);²⁸ and Sadian, with his wife Dislaba from Regensburg, attested to their imprisonment “von ettleicher inzikcht wegen” (because of several accusations),²⁹ a formula used frequently in both Christian and Jewish *Urfehden*. Aside from these unspecified reasons, other records produced between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries attest to a mixture of common crimes that Christians would also be imprisoned for.³⁰ Theft and robbery were among the most common reasons for imprisonment and the subsequent *Hafturfehden*.³¹ Moshe from Burglauer (Franconia), for example, was imprisoned because he allegedly stole one *arras* (a bolt of cloth³²) from a merchant in 1544,³³ while Isaac from Regensburg swore *Urfehde* due to the accusations made against him because of theft.³⁴ Both cases may serve as but two “Jewish” examples among many Christian ones.³⁵

Equally common were actions relating to an offense to honor, disorderly conduct or disturbance of peace. Insults, sharp words, or even threats that were directed toward the municipal council or its citizens could send both Christians³⁶ and Jews alike to prison. For example, Moses from Dalmessing declared in his *Hafturfehde* for the city of Regensburg in 1449 that he had been imprisoned “von mercklicher drowort wegen, die ich etlich den iren mit worten fravenlich” (due to heavy threats that [he] spoke to many of them [i.e., the municipal council] with outrageous words),³⁷ while in Frankfurt, an unnamed Jewish man, when accused of theft by a young (Christian) boy, responded in a taunting manner to the city officials and was therefore arrested.³⁸ Disputes and (presumably public) discord between Jews could also result in their incarceration. In 1398, the families of Smoel of Venice, called “hochmaister” (High Master), and Pedit of Überlingen had been imprisoned in the municipal prison of Regensburg due to their “zerwürf und unpilleich handlung” (quarrel and wrongful actions) toward Chalman of Landshut and his wife, where they awaited the punishment of the city council. They were only set free by the advocacy of the Regensburg Jewish community.³⁹

In the case of a Jewish man from Frankfurt, the reason could not have been more common: in 1452, he was imprisoned for public intoxication.⁴⁰ Alcohol abuse was considered disgraceful, particularly if it was on public display and combined with brawling and swearing. This is amply evidenced in the Basel records where Christian culprits are variously described as having “sich füllen lassen, das er wie ein onvernünfftig thier do glegen” (gotten himself filled that he lay [there] like an unreasonable animal), “am kornmerkt wie ein

ploch nider gfallen” (fallen down in the corn-market like a log), “mit züchten zehören denselben [wyn] wider von im geben” (gotten that overburdened with wine that [they] quite audibly threw up).⁴¹ These and other, more vivid, images fill the *Urfehden* of the city, where public intoxication ranks second to theft as a reason for imprisonment.⁴² Many such Christian examples from both urban and rural surroundings⁴³ make the offense of the Frankfurt Jew a typical one. Therefore, when certain Jewish residents of Frankfurt, Isaac from Gingen and Gumpel, were imprisoned for gambling in 1477,⁴⁴ they found themselves in good company. Gambling, particularly with dice, was frequently frowned upon—already the Middle High German poet Reinmar von Zweter had declared that it had been invented by the devil⁴⁵—and was frequently used as grounds for imprisonment.⁴⁶

Acts of violence, be it brawling,⁴⁷ violence against spouses,⁴⁸ and, as shown earlier, assaulting Jewish inhabitants, often resulted in incarceration in the municipal prison. Violence enacted by Jews was treated no differently.⁴⁹ When the Regensburg Jew David, son of Gensel, had “in der judengassen alhie understanden Elhen jüden von Prag von wegen ettlicher brifs zuslahen vnd zestossen” (dared to punch and jab Elhan, a Jew from Prague, here in the Jewish quarter because of some records),⁵⁰ he was imprisoned, awaiting the death penalty. As stated in his *Hafturfehde*, he was released only in 1510 thanks to the advocacy of the wife of the city’s captain and the local Jewish community, and also because of his youth. The offending incident, however, had taken place several years ago: Elhan had issued his *Hafturfehde* already in 1506, in which he had admitted to brawling with David when he had tried to take several letters from David “mit gewallt vnd vber sein willen” (by force and against his will). Interestingly, the same advocates—the captain’s wife and the Jewish community—had interceded also on Elhan’s behalf.⁵¹ It is unclear whether David had been imprisoned during the interceding years, perhaps he only came of age in 1510 and therefore issued the *Hafturfehde* at this later time.

Misdeeds—presumed or real—in connection with (monetary) business could also result in incarceration. The offenses included dishonest pawn-broking, such as a certain Jewish man from Regensburg who, in 1428, admitted to having sold or repawned the pledges at a higher price,⁵² and fencing goods (again, Regensburg).⁵³ Both were precarious subjects in the context of the anti-Jewish sentiments embodied in the Statute of the Market,⁵⁴ but in individual cases could constitute a real offense. Quite surprising is the (relative) leniency shown to the Frankfurt inhabitant Isaac of Eltville, who had taken a citizen of Cologne to court over an outstanding debt. However, the main transgression was perjury: the favorable verdict obtained by Isaac had only been achieved because he had sworn to an amount of debt that had later been proven incorrectly high by witnesses and written testimony. Despite the

usually severe punishment on perjury, Isaac and his wife were released upon the issuance of a *Hafturfehde*, although he was fined the quite considerable amount of 450 *Gulden*.⁵⁵

Similarly, sexual contact between Jews and Christians, mainly male Jews and Christian women, was a punishable offense.⁵⁶ These show up in the *Hafturfehden* as well. The accusation of unchastity could cover all kinds of sexual contacts that were considered illegal. The punishable offenses ranged from “laying with her/him,” “he was/they were unchaste” and, of course, the frequently cited child born out of wedlock, to adultery; it could even include rape and solicitation of prostitution,⁵⁷ and might even be considered blasphemy for reviling the sacrament of matrimony: “Von wolverschulter inzicht und sach wegen, als wir unser baider eliche wyb mittainander verwechselt und getuschett haben” (because of self-inflicted accusations and issues, as we exchanged and swapped our two wedded wives), two Christian men were incarcerated in Vorarlberg in 1494, and only escaped severe punishment thanks to the intervention of the local priests.⁵⁸ Sexual relationships with Jews were generally considered illegal; both the prevention of those relationships and their often drastic punishment is broadly discussed in canon and secular legislation, and was also frowned upon by rabbinical authorities.⁵⁹ However, while cases of sexual relations between Jews and Christians, from occasional liaisons to long-lasting relationships, went to trial before many municipal courts—“surprisingly frequently,” as has been stated for Zürich⁶⁰—the level of punishment varied greatly, from monetary penalties⁶¹ to corporal punishment and expulsion,⁶² while incarceration was not necessarily part of the standard procedure.⁶³ Therefore, sexual relationships appear only infrequently among Jewish *Hafturfehden*. Samuel from Ehring awaited the death penalty by burning at the stake in the Regensburg prison “von bubischer unendlicher weise wegen, die ich in irer stat mit cristen frawen mich zû in zuermischen mengermal begangen” (due to [his] insolent ways, that [he], in their city, had commingled multiple times with Christian women). He escaped his fate only by advocacy of the highest order, when Henry XVI, Count Palatine of the Rhine and Duke of Lower and Upper Bavaria, intervened on his behalf. In his *Hafturfehde* from 1448, Samuel declared the rightfulness of his incarceration and stressed that his actions not only contravened (local) law but also were against the Jewish belief.⁶⁴ While Samuel was exiled from the city, the *Schalantjude* (i.e., a Jewish man of foreign origin and low income)⁶⁵ Jäckli was not only banned from Augsburg in 1359, where he had engaged in sexual encounters with a Christian woman, but was additionally branded on his cheeks. As a foreigner and in all likelihood as an individual of a low socioeconomic standing, he lacked both the support of the Jewish community and of any Christian advocates.⁶⁶

Political, Financial, and Anti-Jewish Reasons for Imprisonment

Already in its earlier form as *Streiturfehde*, the oath of truce, the *Urfehde* could be deployed as an instrument of political agendas, when the emperor or territorial rulers coerced feuding parties to concede to the truce. By repurposing the *Urfehde* as an authoritative tool (what Andreas Blauert called the “process of usurpation of the *Urfehde* by the authorities”⁶⁷), both territorial and municipal authorities began to utilize it as a means of control over their subjects (Christians and Jews), who in their oaths had not only to forswear any revenge or recompense toward the imprisoning authority but had to make promises regarding their future behavior. Jews who had “fled the territory” (i.e., left without seeking permission of their lord)⁶⁸ were, when reentering, often imprisoned for that offense. Then, upon release they were subjected to the issue of a *Hafturfehde*.

In 1370, when a certain Jew Merchel returned to the archbishopric of Salzburg, he was incarcerated, and upon his release not only forswore any claims, but had to accept a list of promises that covered both political and financial interests of the archbishop. He was not to leave the territory without explicit episcopal approval; if he did leave the territory (legally), he still had to hand over all of the archbishop’s debenture bonds; and in case of breach, all of Merchel’s belongings would be confiscated and a fine of 1,000 pounds would be enforced with the aid of whoever were to become Merchel’s new lord.⁶⁹ The latter point is particularly interesting: If Merchel left without the archbishop’s consent, his future sovereign was to assist the archbishop in collecting the penalty. This was an attempt by the archbishop to extend his control over his Jewish subjects beyond his sphere of power that ran against the common practice of new sovereigns raising claims of recompense in the name of their new Jewish subjects.⁷⁰

From the mid fourteenth-century onward, the financial exploitation of Jews increased steadily, and both territorial lords and the emperor used imprisonment as a means of extortion. Individual Jews, as well as entire communities, were incarcerated and held captive until they had paid what was demanded from them. This was sometimes labeled as additional taxes or declared blatant ransom money. Around 1385, and again in 1390, this policy peaked in the context of what is referred to as *Judenschuldentilgungen*, the royal cancellation of Jewish debt demands.⁷¹ While some rulers were demanding monetary payments for the Jews,⁷² others, as well as members of the nobility and municipalities, in collaboration with King Wenceslaus, imprisoned the Jewish economic elite to force them to hand over their debenture bonds, which were then declared null and void.⁷³ While paying the ransom or handing over their debenture bonds was the precondition for their release, many Jews who had

been incarcerated for these reasons of extortion were additionally forced to issue a *Hafturfehde*, just as Jewish men and women had to do who had been imprisoned for reasons that did not entail a monetary fine or payment. These *Hafturfehden* issued by Jewish prisoners after their release (and the preceding ransom payments to the relevant authority) became an important tool since they served as an additional insurance for the authorities to legitimize the incarceration and the ransom demands or confiscation of debenture bonds. This is confirmed by a series of *Hafturfehden* of Regensburg Jews from 1391 who had been imprisoned “von der pfant und brive wegen, di wir haben müssen wider geben und auch von ettlich anderer hanndlung wegen” (because of the pawns and debenture bonds, which [they] had to return, and several other issues).⁷⁴ While municipalities perhaps needed to justify their actions to the emperor or territorial lord, even Jewish prisoners such as Vifeli from Lower Basel or Tröstel from Villach, who had been imprisoned and “evaluated”—that is, forced to pay ransom according to their estimated wealth—by their lords (the Duke of Outer Austria and the Bishop of Bamberg respectively), had to issue a *Hafturfehde* upon their release in which they swore to the legitimacy of their captor’s actions.⁷⁵

In the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the time of the great expulsions of Jews from all over the Holy Roman Empire, it became a standard procedure in many cities and territories to imprison first the soon-to-be expelled Jews, forcing them, often under torture, to confess to what had become a catalogue of anti-Jewish stereotypes, and at the same time making them hand over their money, debenture bond, and “hidden treasures.” While many of these accusations, of well-poisoning,⁷⁶ ritual murder, or host desecration, of conspiracy and usury, and generally a combination of several, or all of these, ended in mass violence and execution of Jewish men and women, not all of them did. By employing a series of strategies that included legal representation, recourse to higher courts and (judicial) invocation of supreme authorities, and even forensic expertise,⁷⁷ Jews in the Holy Roman Empire and all over Europe managed to escape from what seemed to be certain death: in several Aragonese towns in the second half of the fourteenth century,⁷⁸ in Venetian Crete in 1451–1452,⁷⁹ and in Regensburg in 1476–1480,⁸⁰ to give but a few examples.⁸¹ These strategies were as much a testament to Jewish initiatives and active pursuit of defense (and the Jewish inhabitants of the German-speaking area could employ the *Hafturfehde* as such, see further), as they were to existing doubts among Christians about the anti-Jewish narratives. When the Passau persecutions of 1478 threatened to spill over into the archbishopric of Salzburg, Emperor Frederick III warned Archbishop Bernhard about the false testimonies Jews would give under torture: “dadurch sy in vennkhnuss pracht und so swerlich gemartert werden, daz sy solhs von marter wegen bekennen muessen, und wiewol sy des

unschuldig sein dardurch vom leben zum tod pracht" (they were imprisoned and so severely tortured that they had to confess to these [host desecrations and ritual murders] because of their torture, and, although they were innocent of it, they were brought from life to death).⁸² Both secular and ecclesiastical authorities intervened frequently (though not necessarily successfully) on behalf of imprisoned and accused Jews; regardless of possible doubts about the Jews' guilt, these interventions were mostly a testimony of political, legal, and economic considerations.⁸³

The *Hafturfehden* that have been preserved might play a rather minor role in the wide range of source materials on anti-Jewish accusations and persecutions. However, the importance that was attached to them at the time—that even in the context of acts of force and violence by the authorities, those same authorities insisted on their issuance by the victims—merits a closer look, as does their usage as a negotiation tool by those Jewish men and women affected by it. In 1469, David, Samuel, and Abraham, Jewish inhabitants in Neustadt (in Odenwald, Hesse), were imprisoned by their lord, Count William of Wertheim, because they had allegedly been offered host wafers by a Christian woman but seem to have escaped unscathed. In their charter, which they issued in a German version written in Latin letters as well as one in German with Hebrew letters, the latter written by David himself, they swore that they bore no ill will toward their lord but did not mention the accusation.⁸⁴ Generally, at the time of release from imprisonment and when issuing a *Hafturfehde*, the guilt—alleged or true—was paid off, sometimes literally. Technically, there was no need to state the reason of imprisonment since the issuing of a *Hafturfehde* testified to the former guilt and rightful imprisonment.

Similar to the Jewish inhabitants of Neustadt, the Jewish community of Ptuj (Slovenia, then Lower Styria) only addressed the fact of their incarceration in the prison of Ptuj in 1404, when, upon their release, they issued the *Hafturfehde* to their lord, Archbishop Eberhard III of Salzburg. The reason for their imprisonment is evident in the context of events: A few months earlier, the Jewish inhabitants of the two other major towns in the archbishopric, Salzburg and Hallein, had been incarcerated due to an accusation of host desecration and ritual murder for which they were burned at the stake.⁸⁵ With these events, and probably their own pending death threat in mind, the Ptuj Jews chose expulsion as the lesser evil. With the help of their *Hafturfehde*, Archbishop Eberhard (whose role in the persecution itself is still unclear) legitimized the Jews' incarceration. Furthermore, he safeguarded himself against potential claims of the Jews' future lords: Not only had they, as they stated twice in the text, given him their houses willingly⁸⁶ and waived any claims to their property and possessions within the archbishopric but also promised that both their families and helpers (which is typical for any

Hafturfehde) and “the authorities under which [they] will live in the future” would, too, renounce any future claims. The future lords were even to punish the Jews should they prove disobedient and break their promises.

Although expressed in standard *Hafturfehde* formulae, these were no idle concerns: several of the Ptuj Jews had already become members of Jewish communities of other towns, particularly of Lower Styrian Maribor, and therefore were also subjects of the Styrian Duke William, as was Itzel, explicitly called “the duke’s Jew,” from Slovenska Bistrica.⁸⁷ William was, at that time, in strong political opposition against Eberhard,⁸⁸ and might have utilized an intervention on behalf of his Jewish residents to weaken further the already precarious financial position of the archbishopric. In this context, the Jews’ repeated assurance of claim renunciation and surrender served as an additional insurance for the archbishop.

While the “crimes” of the Neustadt and Ptuj Jews were only implied in the documents, others had to attest openly to the anti-Jewish fantasies of their imprisoners in their *Hafturfehden*. “[V]on der ubeltat und handlung wegen an eym crucifix” (because of misdeed and action on a crucifix),⁸⁹ Lebe and his son Joseph were imprisoned in Eger in 1485, and in 1510, a group of fifteen Jewish men in Braunschweig confessed to “van eynem cristen manne dat hillige sacramente in ore hende gekregen, dat swarliken gepricket, so dat daruth bloth gekomen sy” (having gotten hold of the holy sacrament [i.e., a host wafer] from a Christian, which they pierced so violently that blood seeped out of it).⁹⁰ The Regensburg Rabbi Israel ben Hayyim Bruna had been accused of ritual murder by a convert (who later recanted). Having been released through the intervention of Emperor Frederick III and the Bohemian King Vladislav II, the rabbi retold the details in his *Hafturfehde*, albeit in a subjunctive form: He *was said* to have bought a seven-year-old boy from the convert, and *was said* to have brought the boy from life to death.⁹¹

A few years later, in the context of the Regensburg persecutions of 1476/80, the Jewish man Gütel and the Jewish woman Pelein (on her see also further) confessed in their *Hafturfehden* that they had been imprisoned “von des hochwurdigen Sacraments wegen” (because of the holy sacrament [i.e., the host wafer]) which they had mistreated by buying and selling it, and for which they had “das leben verworckt vnd den tod verschuld” (forfeited [their] life and caused [their] death). They thanked Emperor Frederick III for his intervention but also acknowledged the rightfulness of the death penalty and the “mercy” of the municipality.⁹²

A few decades earlier, in 1429/30, an accusation of ritual murder brought about the end of the Jewish community of Ravensburg and led to persecutions in several cities of the Lake Constance area. Like in Regensburg, the *Hafturfehden* issued by the imprisoned Jewish men and women offer only a section of the complex and tumultuous events that involved a lost, and found,

pupil: a Christian carter and his vehicle leaving the *Judengasse*; a discussion between physicians whether missing genitalia had been forcibly removed (i.e., by the now incarcerated Jews), eaten away by animals, or simply decayed; obligatory wonders and a bishop's misgivings; a bereaved mother who employed servants to collect the pilgrims' donations and had the main witness abducted; episcopal, ducal, and imperial intervention; and several made, withdrawn, and remade confessions.⁹³ On June 24, 1429, the Jews of Ravensburg were released after about two months in prison,⁹⁴ and recounted in their *Hafturfehde* the course of events, neither denying nor acknowledging their responsibility: "Von des knaben wegen der ettwielang zit verloren gewesen und laider an ainem baum naechst bi Ravenspurg in ainem holtz hangent funden worden ist" (because of the boy, who had been lost for a long time and unfortunately was found hanging on a tree close to Ravensburg in a copse), the mayor and city council of Ravensburg had subsequently imprisoned the Jews, and if (as they stressed) they had been found guilty of the boy's death, they would have paid for this crime with their lives. However, they went on in their *Hafturfehde*, to state that the municipal authorities had decided to set them free, for which they expressed their gratitude—one of the many examples that clearly illustrates that not only imprisonment itself but also the release from it was considered a demonstration of power.

The remainder of the lengthy record follows typical *Hafturfehde* formulae only in parts: while the oath on abdication of revenge for the imprisonment is fairly standardized; the issuers added a list of Jewish warrantors from Ravensburg (which suggests that not all of them had been imprisoned) and from the surrounding cities who had to stand as surety with their properties should any further damage occur—a clause more common with business transactions. The promise not to reach out to "papal, imperial, royal, ducal or other potentates" or other courts asserted the municipal authority and their (future) verdicts, which included the possibility that the Jewish prisoners would, after all, be found guilty eventually: if that were the case, they were to be considered perjurious and outlawed with immediate effect.⁹⁵

About a year later, these threats turned out to be the least of the Jewish prisoners' worries. After another, lengthy, imprisonment during which the city council of Ravensburg further investigated the case, the Jewish inhabitants of Ravensburg as well as those of nearby Lindau were burnt at the stake in July 1430. The Jewish communities of Überlingen and other, smaller, cities still awaited their fate in prison, while the Jewish inhabitants of Constance had been freed following the intervention of Emperor Sigismund, who claimed jurisdiction (and taxation) over them.⁹⁶

Hafturfehden of Jewish men and women share many similarities with those issued by Christians who had been accused of aberrant religious beliefs, from heretics to those accused of witchcraft and sorcery.⁹⁷ Generally, accusations

against Jews share many features with both heresy and magic/witchcraft, regarding both the procedural aspect as well as the accusations themselves.⁹⁸ In our context, the predominance of *Hafturfehde* examples stemming from witchcraft trials is mainly a question of source material: Given the chronological development of the *Urfehde*, more *Hafturfehden* were issued in the course of witch trials than in trials of heresy. It is tantamount to a commonplace that these accusations, grounded in actual “aberrant” beliefs or in mere fantasy (or political agenda) of the accuser, meant an immediate life-threatening situation.⁹⁹

Christians whose beliefs and behavior were interpreted as divergent from what was, at that particular time, seen as the rightful Christian faith, were subjected to a plethora of punishments. Imprisonment was but one remedy, or, rather, the precursor to trial and execution. Religious issues therefore appear in various accusations among *Urfehden*, from smaller misdeeds such as the theft of church objects or the uttering of blasphemous words,¹⁰⁰ to more serious, life-threatening (and soul-threatening) “offenses” that showed a more in-depth engagement of the delinquent with religious matters and thought. Hans Ryzner, for example, was incarcerated in the Bregenzerwald (Vorarlberg) prison for accusing the local priests of performing baptism ceremonies inaccurately;¹⁰¹ Laurenz Pürgel and his wife Margret were imprisoned in Vienna in 1421 for promoting Hussite and Wycliffian ideas, and were set free on behalf of Duke Albrecht V¹⁰²—the same duke who had the Viennese Jews incarcerated for the entire duration of his campaign against the Bohemian Hussites (with whom he suspected the Austrian Jews of conspiring) and who had exiled (the poor) or burned at the stake (the wealthy) only eleven days after releasing Pürgel and his wife.¹⁰³

Our examples share the perhaps most striking similarities with *Hafturfehden* issued by survivors of witchcraft trials.¹⁰⁴ Like the Jews, those accused of witchcraft, both female and male, developed survival strategies, among which the refusal to confess (if possible under torture) was the main tool.¹⁰⁵ Even when tortured several times and confronted with the confession of a co-accused during her interrogation in 1597, Anna Tschuggmellin from Bludenz (Vorarlberg, Austria) “objected and did not confess at all,” as she stated twice in her *Hafturfehde*; as did Anna Sandrellin, who emphasized that she had been slandered, and had been set free after having spent thirty days “in iron bands.”¹⁰⁶ The former *Landammann* (the elected judge and leader of the community) Caspar Erhart confessed to transgressing religious rules (e.g., working and misleading others to work on Sundays), bad-mouthing his fellow countrymen, violating the rules of oath-taking as a sworn judge, and profiting off his wife’s and daughter’s witchcraft (for which they had already been executed), but he refused to admit to having participated in their rituals. Thus, after several days in prison, he was set free; like in the women’s cases,

local noblemen had intervened on his behalf.¹⁰⁷ As in trials against Jews, denunciation of others was one of the main goals of the interrogation.

The Jewish men of Regensburg, for example, were incarcerated after a convert in the Trent trial had confessed additional, earlier ritual murders, including one in Regensburg,¹⁰⁸ and in many host desecration trials, Jews were forced to name the Jewish communities of other cities to which they had sent the stolen hosts.¹⁰⁹ Likewise, many witch trials gained (often unpredictable) momentum once the interrogations had started: “So wirdt die ganze Burgerschafft verbrenndt” (thus, the entire citizenry will be burnt), the former Bamberg mayor Johannes Junius, who had been named by six people under torture, he wrote in his farewell-letter to his daughter.¹¹⁰

In the context of persecution, the *Hafturfehde*, however much imposed upon Jewish men and women, could also become a means of negotiation and rescue. In April 1478, Zacharias of Salzburg issued a *Hafturfehde* for Bishop Ulrich of Passau in which he swore to abstain from any claims concerning the incarceration—not of himself however,¹¹¹ but of his son Jacob, who had, “along with other Jews” been imprisoned by the episcopal marshal.¹¹² Although the text of the *Hafturfehde* itself does not give the reason for Jacob’s imprisonment, it is evident that he was one of the victims of the Passau persecutions that had been triggered by a host desecration accusation a few months earlier, and had already claimed the lives of several Jews of the city. While the wording of the charter suggests that Jacob was still alive—and thus had survived the first wave of executions a few months earlier—he was presumably also still incarcerated, and with the oath to the bishop, his father tried to negotiate his son’s release. A few months later, the surviving Jews of Passau were released from prison and expelled, but it is unclear whether Jacob was among them.¹¹³

Even after surviving a persecution, (former) Jewish inhabitants could be incarcerated on religious grounds, of both being former Jews and former inhabitants. Jewish men and women who had opted for baptism to save their lives would face imprisonment and death upon their wish to return to their faith (see below). Expelled Jews were not allowed to return to their former residence; if they did so, they faced incarceration and—in the best of cases—were expelled again. In 1520, the year following the expulsion of the Jews from Regensburg, the Jewish man Michel Boberlitz was imprisoned there, confessing in his *Hafturfehde* that he had “vergangner tagen verdeckter argkweniger weise mit unwarem angeben, ich sey ain criste, in die stat Regenspürg gesleicht” (weaseled [his] way into the city of Regensburg in the last few days in a hidden and distrustful manner telling the lie that [he] was a Christian).¹¹⁴ For the remaining Jewish communities of the Holy Roman Empire, the early modern era would become a time of ghettoization. Derogatory markers, particularly the yellow badge, were more and more

introduced and made mandatory,¹¹⁵ and refusal or neglect to adhere to these regulations were punished, although the repeated issuance of the instructions suggest a potentially only limited compliance. In Frankfurt, the city council ordered in 1541 that any Jewish man or woman, local or foreign, was to wear the yellow badge outside the Jewish quarter, since many of them wore it covered or not at all. Nine years later, Moshe Cohen of Pfungstadt was fined for covering the yellow badge on his garment, and when he refused to pay the fine, he was sent to prison from which he was released upon the issuance of a *Hafturfehde*.¹¹⁶

BEFORE THE RELEASE: ASPECTS OF JEWISH LIFE IN PRISON

When the Jews of Ptuj signed their *Hafturfehde* with their Hebrew signature, they did so under the impression of the fate of their coreligionists in the archbishop's residential city. A few months earlier, before June 1404, the Jewish inhabitants of the city of Salzburg had been thrown into prison on the grounds of host desecration and ritual murder, the deadliest accusations Jews could face in the late Middle Ages. While in prison, the two "leaders" committed suicide, quite possibly under the threat of torture: The one who had bought the host wafers "snaid im selber in der vanchnusse die chel ab mit einem glas" (cut his throat in prison with a glass), and the other one, responsible for buying and killing the child, "hieng sich selber an sein gurt!" (hanged himself with his belt). The Captain of Salzburg, the episcopal council, and the cities of the archbishopric, who wrote to other German cities to warn them of the Jews' manifold crimes, state these two suicides rather matter-of-factly in their letter, yet, despite the briefness of the text, still manage to mention these details.¹¹⁷

Being imprisoned, both incarcerated in jail and detained at home, not only limited the individual range of movement and personal freedom but always constituted a life-endangering situation the prisoner was only barely in control of. The wish to get out of prison—by issuing a *Hafturfehde* as one of the methods employed—naturally resulted from these less than desirable circumstances. However, *Hafturfehden* usually concern themselves more with the release from and the time after prison and therefore only rarely allow for glimpses into prison life, in instances such as when they mention torture or harsh conditions. Therefore, to be able to give a more comprehensive account of Jewish imprisonment, and also in accordance with the general topic of this volume, we decided to go further beyond the limitations of our main focus (and source material) for this particular chapter.

Like the Jewish *Hafturfehden*, Jewish prison life has only been explored in a few, mostly localized, studies, an academic void we, again, do not claim

to fill. Instead, we intended to explore a few aspects of Jewish life in prison by drawing on additional source material and illustrate the hardship Jewish prisoners had to endure, which made them willing to acquiesce to any conditions demanded of them in the *Hafturfehden*. Additionally, we want to show what challenges Jewish men and women faced once imprisoned, how they coped with the situation, and if they found ways to alleviate the effects of imprisonment.¹¹⁸

Many prisoners did not manage to do that. The combination of torture, the fear of being forced to betray others, hopelessness, and solitude often proved unbearable, for both Christian and Jewish prisoners, and it is therefore no surprise that suicide,¹¹⁹ however much frowned upon, was, and still is, an escape strategy for prisoners throughout time.¹²⁰ Jews were no exception to this: the Rabbi of Wrocław, imprisoned and tortured together with his community on grounds of an alleged host desecration in 1453,¹²¹ not only hanged himself in prison on the eve of the execution but also encouraged his fellow sufferers to follow suit.¹²²

Prisoners could face a long stay in jail. Rabbi Meir of Rothenburg, for example, was incarcerated from 1286 to 1293, the Jewish men from Regensburg were stuck in prison from 1476 to 1480, and several other Jews from Regensburg stated that they came “in irer stat vankchnüss [. . .], darinne wir lange zeit gewesen und gelegen sein” (into their city’s prison [. . .], in which [they] had been for a long time).¹²³ Such a prolonged stay, torture, and impending execution drove some Jewish prisoners to suicide, even if the “crime” they committed was not as grave as the blood libel and host desecration accusations. Seventeen-year-old Joseph, who had been incarcerated in Colmar in 1546 on grounds of stealing silver chalices and a horse, as well as assuming several false identities, attempted suicide after prolonged torture, under which he had proceeded to confess other misdeeds.¹²⁴ Particularly in ritual murder and host desecration trials, Jews were—just as witches—not only urged to confess during their interrogations, but also forcibly encouraged to denunciate others who had partaken in their crimes, adding shame and guilt to fear and pain. In Schlettstadt in 1349, with the persecutions on grounds of alleged well-poisoning only just abating, an unnamed (and perhaps already baptized) Jewish man, who had under torture confessed that the Jews in general had sought to poison the Christians, hanged himself in his prison cell.¹²⁵ However, a prisoner’s suicide did not necessarily stop, or even change, the procedural process: corpses of convicted felons could be subjected to the same trial and punishment as their living counterparts,¹²⁶ and, again, Jewish men and women were no exception. In Nuremberg in 1484, a certain Jew, who had been incarcerated, interrogated, and tortured on grounds of stealing (mainly books), committed suicide in prison. His corpse was burned at the stake, just as it would have been the case had he still been alive;¹²⁷ and the

eighty-year-old Moses, who had been found dead in prison either as a direct result of the extended torture or (less likely) from suicide, was “executed” a day later as one of the victims of the Trent persecution of 1475.¹²⁸ The high number of sources mentioning Jews committing suicide in prison raise the question if, at least in some of these cases, Jews were impacted by the powerful and well-known narratives about the Jewish martyrs from the period of the crusades.¹²⁹ If so, they would have understood committing suicide in such desperate situations and under immense pressure as an act of “kiddush ha-shem” (Sanctifying the Name of God).¹³⁰

Just as those incarcerated for aberrant religious beliefs could recant, baptism was another escape route for Jewish prisoners, albeit at enormous costs. Under canon law, any baptism accepted under force was considered invalid, and, as the papal protection bull *Sicut Iudeis* stated, forcibly baptized Jewish men and women should be allowed to return to their Jewish faith.¹³¹ However, these theoretical provisions did not necessarily work out in everyday reality—in 1421, only a few months after the Viennese Gezera, Jacob of Krems, “etwann genant Ytsekl Jud” (formerly called Isaac the Jew), was incarcerated “von abtretung kristenleichts gelaubens wegen wider zu treten in judischen und chetzerleichen gelawben” because [he] had intended to leave the Christian faith and return to the Jewish and heretic faith).¹³² He managed to escape with the issuance of his *Hafturfehde* in which he promised to remain Christian together with his family; according to a monastic chronicle, numerous other Austrian (former) Jewish men and women were burned at the stake for their wish to return to their faith.¹³³

Therefore, Jewish prisoners who freed themselves from prison by accepting the Christian faith were aware of the fact that they mostly had to abandon their Jewish life forever¹³⁴ and thus lose their social and familial net. Despite these risks, Jews seized the opportunity, such as the unnamed Frankfurt prisoner who, with the issuance of a *Hafturfehde*, was set free after his conversion.¹³⁵ They could even save themselves from life-threatening situations: two women and a wealthy and/or distinguished (*magnus*) Jewish man converted in Salzburg in 1404, which not only helped them out of prison but also allowed them to survive the pogrom.¹³⁶ Still, baptism did not necessarily mean survival: while the scribe and book-illustrator Israel managed to escape incarceration, torture, and execution in the Trent persecution of 1475 when he asked for baptism early in the case, two of his coreligionists only opted for conversion in the later stages of the trial and were still executed. As an acknowledgment of their newfound Christian faith, they were beheaded¹³⁷—the “grace” of the quicker, less painful, and more “noble” death of decapitation instead of being burned at the stake or hanged,¹³⁸ which was also the case with repentant witches.¹³⁹

Even if not every accusation that resulted in imprisonment was life-threatening, any stay in prison was a dangerous situation—economically, socially,

and for the prisoner's health. However, prisoners could negotiate for more "comfortable" conditions, particularly, but not exclusively, during long-time imprisonment, and were allowed to receive visitors, family members, and friends as well as legal representatives.¹⁴⁰ Rabbi Meir of Rothenburg, during his long imprisonment from 1286 to 1293, was not only able to receive visits from his students,¹⁴¹ but they also could, when visiting him in the prison-tower of Wasserburg (Bavaria) "on the eve of the Shabbat light a fire to warm [themselves]."¹⁴²

During long-term detention, relatives and friends of imprisoned Jews were allowed to provide them with items of daily needs, which, at the same time, also limited the costs for the imprisoning city.¹⁴³ A "bed, blanket, and one pillow" was brought to the Regensburg prison for Simon of Worms, presumably by his wife, in 1476; despite the emperor's intervention on his behalf, Simon would stay in prison for another four years.¹⁴⁴

The observance of religious rituals during prison time was a particular concern. Access to *kosher* food and beverages¹⁴⁵ and partaking in religious rituals was essential to a Jewish lifestyle, and had, as Sophia Schmitt has pointed out for Regensburg, to some extent been rendered possible for the imprisoned Jews there with at least partial knowledge of the city council: *Mazzot* could be provided for Pessach and the *sukkah* constructed in prison for the eponymous holiday.¹⁴⁶ Also from a rabbinical perspective, leniency toward religious rules was advocated for the benefit of prisoners: Israel ben Petachja Isserlein, one of the most respected rabbis of the mid-fifteenth-century, testifies to a larger discussion of the question of whether Jews were allowed to ask a non-Jew to bring (heated) food to the prisoners on the Shabbat, since the Jews themselves were prohibited to do so due to the limitations of movement (*eruv*¹⁴⁷) during the Shabbat.¹⁴⁸

Regardless of these concessions however, the control over the Jewish prisoners remained important to the Christian prison staff. Jewish as well as Christian prisoners had to pay bribes if they wanted to ease their time in prison—this is what Rabbi Moses Minz meant in our quote in the very beginning of this chapter. The city council of Frankfurt dictated in 1474 that Jewish visitors who brought food and beverages to the Jewish prisoners should consult with the gate keeper on how to behave;¹⁴⁹ and in 1502, they ordered that whenever the wife of Joseph of *Zynonge* visited her husband in prison, they were to speak German so that the prison guards could understand them.¹⁵⁰

Like Christians, Jews were sometimes able to smuggle secret written messages (German/Rotwelsch *kassiber*, derived from the Hebrew *katav*) in and out of prison.¹⁵¹ In 1430, for example, Fivis from Aschaffenburg, accused of sexual contact with a prostitute in Frankfurt, managed to write seven notes from his prison to (presumably) his wife and two other Jews, wishing to know the state of the negotiations for his release, asking to inform his father-in-law,

and disclosing that he had been tortured and had not seen anybody in sixteen days.¹⁵² Wanting to know about the ongoings outside one's prison cell, particularly a desire to inquire after what had been set in motion on one's behalf, was of course essential to any prisoner, and might have been the background of the small note of encouragement sent to the Jewish woman Pelein, wife of Rabbi Jacob of Donauwörth.

In 1478, she had been incarcerated in Regensburg due to accusations of host desecration against the Jews of Passau, in which she was said to have been involved. Pelein received a *kassiber* from an unnamed writer, who promised to talk to a city official or citizen on her behalf and asked their "liebe vrundin, du kron; דו קרון, ליבי ורודין, דו קרון" (beloved friend, you crown) to write back since she "kasven vil; כתבן ויל" (wrote [her] so much) but "du entven mir nichtzit; דו ענטן מיר ניכציט" ([she] does not answer [her] anything). Labeled as "hat man in der Jacob Judin vancknüs gefunden" (found in the prison cell of the Jewish woman Jacobin [her husband's name]) on its envelope, the small note was attached to the court file the city council kept, and thus survived.¹⁵³ The note is not nearly as extensive as the (in)famous *kassiber* of the late sixteenth to early seventeenth centuries witch trials, such as the heart-wrenching letters to and from Rebecca Lempin from Nördlingen (1590), and the long rendition of torture and farewell to his daughter of the former mayor of Bamberg, Johannes Junius (1628),¹⁵⁴ yet still speaks of the hardship and challenges prisoners had, and sought, to overcome. It is unclear whether the actions of her unnamed ally had any influence on the outcome of Pelein's trial. Unlike Lempin and Junius, and many of Pelein's coreligionists in Passau, she managed to regain her freedom. Her release happened mainly due to the intervention of Emperor Frederick III, as it is recorded in her *Hafturfehde* from 1487 (see earlier), and thus might have been a result of her ally's actions. However, it is unclear whether she had been imprisoned for these entire nine years, or if she had actually been accused, and imprisoned, again.¹⁵⁵

One question remains: *Where* were the Jews imprisoned? Medieval prisons took many shapes, such as the prison towers depicted in illuminated medieval manuscripts (both Jewish and Christian, see figure 15.4) and in *realiter*, from cells in fortresses, in fortification towers and in the city walls, to improvised detention rooms in cellars and the municipal prisons, which came into being as a result of the emerging city judicature in the fourteenth century.¹⁵⁶ The sources, however, do not always allow for conclusions regarding the location of (Jewish) imprisonment—the standard phrases "in vanchnuss genommen" (taken into custody/arrest) or "in ir vanchnuss gewesen" (having been in their detention) refer more to the state of being in someone's captivity than being a descriptor of a specific location. For both Jews and Christians, the location of their imprisonment depended on the

imprisoning authority as well as their social position and, so it seems, their ability to bribe. Rabbi Meir of Rothenburg, as a prisoner of King Rudolph I, was incarcerated first in Wasserburg and then in the castle at Ensisheim (Alsace), which Rudolph, still as Count of Habsburg, had had erected as the seat of (his) local power.¹⁵⁷ The Jews of Trent were incarcerated in the *torre Vanga* (see figure 15.5), a fortified tower of the city wall and in possession of the Bishop of Trent. They were tortured alternately there or in the episcopal fortress.¹⁵⁸ Likewise, as a ducal prisoner, David Steuss, the wealthiest Jewish businessman of the Austrian Duchy in the fourteenth century, was detained in the fortress Mödling where Duke Albrecht III held him at ransom for basically all of David's monetary value in 1383.¹⁵⁹ In Nuremberg in 1385, during the infamous debt cancellations (*Judenschuldentilgungen*¹⁶⁰), the Jews were imprisoned by the city according to their economic standing: the wealthy Jewish inhabitants were detained in the (imperial) fortress,¹⁶¹ the poorer ones were put into a cellar at the city hall, which, as the city noted meticulously, accumulated to costs of 782 pounds *Haller*.¹⁶² Also during the debt cancellations of 1390, certain Jews in Regensburg were imprisoned and released only in the summer of 1391, tellingly from the "stat vankhnüss" (city's prison).¹⁶³ Although the captivity of the Regensburg Jews in 1476 was a concerted action of bishop, duke, and the city, the latter took the initiative and imprisoned the Jews—not all of them, though: Only those who had been named as coconspirators by the Jews of Trent or by other Regensburg Jews were thrown into prison, the remainder of the community was put under house arrest, with guards watching over the Jewish quarter.¹⁶⁴ House arrest was usually employed if a larger crowd had to be detained out of which only a part (mostly the men) would, or could, be imprisoned (often also due to spatial constraints); in addition to watching the Jewish houses, the guards at the city gates would be fortified to prevent its Jewish inhabitants from fleeing.¹⁶⁵

THE RITUAL OF RELEASE FROM PRISON

The core formulae of *Hafturfehden* describe complex rituals that ensured a legal tool for the imprisoning addressee—that is, the municipality or a local lord. Issuers of such records often euphemistically stressed that they did so willingly.¹⁶⁶ Therefore, Bonifant, a Jewish citizen in Alzey, declared in his *Hafturfehde* for the Count Palatine Ruprecht the Younger II, that he did so "willechlich und unbetwungen" (willingly and unconstrained). Similarly, Rabbi Meir Halevi's charter in Frankfurt from 1392 mentions that he did so "mit guden, frihen, unbetwungen willen; [in the Hebrew letters:] מײט גוטם, ורײן, אונבטװונגן ווילן" (in good, free, and unforced

will).¹⁶⁷ Additionally, Jews often mentioned the fact that their release was initiated through the plea of a third party like the city's mayor, the Jewish community, or even a high nobleman.¹⁶⁸ But release could also be argued upon the integration of a Jewish family into the community and as members of the city. In 1384, members of an important Jewish family from Regensburg declared the pardon was given because "si haben angesehen, das wir von ir stat geborn sein vnd von alter mit in her komen vnd gewont haben" (they [i.e., the city council] have realized, that we [i.e., the Jews] are born in their city and have lived here with them for ages).¹⁶⁹ Possible reasons for pardon, however, are not always apparent, even when they were given in cases grave enough to require the death sentence.

Hafturfehden protected municipalities or local lords against the revenge of released prisoners, among them Jews. In 1498, several Jews of the city Stein on Rhein (Switzerland) declared with their release from imprisonment that they rejected

aller der gnaden frighaiten schirms und aller gericht und recht, so wir von bapsten, römischen kaisern odr künigen, fürsten, heren und stetten haben, furso uberkämen odr gewinnen möchten, verziehen und begeben auch kainerlay vordrung noch ansprach zu gemainer statt Stain noch den iren zu haben.

[all general and specific privileges of protection and all kinds of laws and rights that (they) receive from popes, Roman emperors or kings, lords, and cities. (They) shall neither stake any claim nor make demands to the urban commune of Stein or to their inhabitants in any way].¹⁷⁰

This formula illustrates how lords and municipal officials tried to make sure no one, not even higher authorities, would have the right to take steps against the imprisonment the Jews had endured. No legal outlet for revenge remained after such declarations and consents. Here, the municipal council of Stein used the *Hafturfehde* as a powerful tool to ensure their Jews would finally accept their imprisonment, leaving them no other choice if they wanted to be released.

Such a procedure of release required oath-taking along with the written record of a *Hafturfehde*. In most cases, the oath is mentioned explicitly in *Hafturfehden*, and even if not, there is little doubt that it had still taken place.¹⁷¹ It is therefore the ritual of both the oral oath and the issuance (and corroboration) of the written document, performed under the watchful eyes of Christian officials and judges in public places (see figure 15.2) that allowed the person to go free from prison.

In the case of Jews, this oath, the so-called *Judeneid* or Jewry-oath, bridged the gap between Jewish law and customs and the local Christian common



Figure 15.2 Jewry-oath, with the Byline “Feifelein der Juden church” (Feifelein the Jews’ King) and Several Anti-Jewish Gibes in the Accompanying Text. Source: *Amtsbuch*, 14th century, Landshut/Germany (Landshut, Stadtarchiv, Bd. 11, fol. 57r).

law by implementing customs and rituals of both, Christians and Jews. The texts of such *Judeneide*, therefore, call up biblical themes such as Datan and Abiram, who got punished for breaking their oath. These motifs aimed at binding both Jews and Christian to a formula they could agree upon. Taking into consideration that this form of oath continued being used from the Middle Ages far into the nineteenth century,¹⁷² it seems to have been trusted enough to work for the Jewish oath-takers as well as the Christian addressees of the oath.

Such oaths, however, were used in quotidian interactions between Jews and Christians, in business dealings, court cases, and taxation, to name a few.¹⁷³ Whenever Jews had to take an official oath before Christians, such a

Judeneid was used. Therefore, in Frankfurt, Rabbi Meir Halevi declared in his *Hafturfehde* in 1392:

han ich Meiher vorgeant mit guden, frihen und unbetwungen willin globet und myn hant ingelacht in hern Moises buch uff die zehin gebode und als hohe, al sein jude geswern mag, gesworn nij dem eide, da myde her Moyses beswur die judischeid Israhel, und bij dem bann, den Joseus det der judischeid, die selbin vurgeschriben stuckem puncte und artickele semplich und besundern stede, feste und unverbrochlich zü halden.

[I, the aforementioned Meir, have vowed in good and free will the aforementioned points and articles altogether and every single one in particular. And (I have) put my hand onto Master Moses' book upon the Ten Commandments and [sworn] as serious as a Jew may swear the oath, with which Master Moses confirmed "the Jewishness of Israel," and with the ban, which Hosea imposed on the Jews, to hold true, observe, and keep these points and articles altogether as well as in particular].¹⁷⁴

In Braunschweig, fifteen Jews emphasized in 1510 that they "to Gode gesworen hebben else Joden von rechteswegen vorpflichtet syn to donde" (have sworn to God as Jews are prescribed according to the law);¹⁷⁵ the Jew Michel Behem from Zwickau took the oath in 1532 "bey dem waren Got Adonay und den gepot des gesetzes" (by the true God *Adonay* [Hebrew for "my Lord"] and on the "commandments of the law").¹⁷⁶ These examples show slight variation in the common formulae of Jewish oath-taking from the late Middle Ages into the early modern period.

What about the possible consequences of Jewish oath-breaking? When a certain Jew Bonifant issued a release record in 1384, he even mentioned—alongside the oath—the Jewish ban (Hebrew *herem*) as a consequence of perjury:

Und ich, Bonifant obegenant, han alle und yglich obegenante stücke gelobt und off her Moises buche gesworne als ho, als ein iude billich sweren sal, und beherim und bisfuhe, daz ist of mynen iudischen bann und eyd, ewiglich feste und stete zu halden in aller masze, als vorgeschrieben stet.

[And I, the aforementioned Bonifant, have vowed all and every single one of the aforementioned sections (of the *Hafturfehde*) and I have sworn on Moses's book as serious as a Jew may swear rightfully. And (this is) upon the *herem* and upon the *shvua*, which is (translated into German) "upon my Jewish ban and oath," to keep it steady and everlasting in all the ways as mentioned earlier].¹⁷⁷

In a *Hafturfehde* issued by the whole Jewish community of Regensburg from 1374, Jews even bound themselves to the repercussions of breaking their oaths by saying:

Es sullen zû aller pen di vorgeschriben stet über uns gen alle di flûche, di got geret hat und di geschriben stent im pûche der straffe und sol auch dann unser dheiner nymer ein jud sein noch heizzen, wir noch alle unser erben noch geslächtt, und was wir dann fleyschs ymmer verziren, wir unsere chint und nachkomen, daz daz sweynein fleichs sey, und allen den wein, den wir trinchen, di weil wir leben unserew chind und nachkomen, daz daz sey christen wein, gezogen auz einem zapfen uns und christen menschen, und wo wir hin chomen oder sein, so sol und mag man uns vor allen ebrayschen maystern auf heben für panprüchig laût di jar und tage den pan übervaren haben.

[To all the sanctions which are aforementioned, to all the curses God spoke and which are written in the book of curses (that is, Lev 26:14–38 and Deut 28:15–68) that may come upon us. Moreover, not a single one of us shall neither be a Jew anymore nor be called a Jew, nor shall any of our heirs and descendants be called Jews. And when it comes to what kind of meat we, our children and offspring will eat, then it shall only be pig meat. And all the wine we will drink while we, our children and offspring live shall be Christian wine, sprung from one tap for us and the Christian people. And wherever we go or wind up in the eyes of the Jewish masters (that is, the rabbis) one will call us oath-breakers as long as we are breaking the oath].¹⁷⁸

This is evidence for Christian knowledge of Jewish identity and ritual practice. It is also remarkable that such grave consequences on Jewish identity would be dictated by Christian authorities.

Similar consequences of oath-breaking could also apply to individuals who would subsequently lose their entire “Jewish existence.” A Jewish *Hafturfehde* issued in the year 1448 sanctions the oath-breaker by being

ein vervrtailter, verpannter jude hayssen und sein und es sol auch dann kein jud mit mir nit essen noch trincken noch noch [*sic!*] in die ver ell zu mir nicht geen und ich wil auch dann gantz abgeschaiden sein von allen judischen gemainscheften, gewonheiten und rechten. Und wil aûch dann zu anndern juden nicht begraben werden sünnder so sol sich auch dann kein jud noch judin zu mir noch zû meinen kinden nicht heireten sünnder zû mir, so das zu schûlden kumpte on alle gnade gericht werden also zu einem trewlosen maynayden ûerpanten juden.

[named a condemned, exiled Jew. And no Jew shall eat nor drink with me nor get any closer to me than four cubits (a term that appears in rabbinic sources since

antiquity). And I shall be isolated from all Jewish communities, customs, and laws. And I also shall not be buried with other Jews and no other Jews nor Jewish women shall marry me nor shall my children marry. And if I break the oath, I shall be an unfaithful, oath-breaking, and exiled Jew without any further trial].¹⁷⁹

Again, the local authorities dictated these consequences.

While *Hafturfehden* for Christian oath-takers voice a similar threat of being outlawed (in Christian laws referred to as *vogelfrei* from the fifteenth century onward), they did not mention any religious consequences for oath-breaking. Let us contrast Jewish *Hafturfehden* with that of the Christian physician Hans Wagenschuh in Regensburg from 1448, who, in the case of oath-breaking, was simply deemed as

ain übersagter veher mann haissen und sein und sy. Und dye iren mügen dann nach mir greiffen und hintz meiner leib und leben on gnade richten dar innen ich kains frids noch gelaits noch kainer herren noch frawen bett noch kaines annders urtails in dem nicht genyessen wil in kainer weise.

[a lawless, trapped man. And they may take me and my body and life without mercy and judge me that, in these (points), I will not gain peace or safe conduct anymore, neither by lords nor by noble women's pleas nor shall I enjoy any other's judgment in any way].¹⁸⁰

The consequences for perjury for a Christian do not significantly differ from the examples seen in Jewish *Hafturfehden*: in both cases, the perpetrator would be excluded from their former life. The procedures of release, oath-taking, and the records that were drawn up, therefore, seem not to have discriminated Jews in any way.

The oath-taking was accompanied by a complex combination of gestures in detailed choreography. In Wrocław in 1435, for example, the Jew Kussiel made his statement “upon my Jewish law and oath with (my) fingers raised toward to the sun”¹⁸¹—a practice commonly mentioned in *Hafturfehden* of Christians (see figure 15.3).¹⁸²

Jews from Regensburg repeatedly declared in their *Hafturfehden* from the fifteenth century that they have taken

einen gelerten judischen aide in disen briefe und in hern Moyses puche geschworen und dartzu auch deszhalbten nach der judischen gewonhait an den mantel gerurt.”

[an oath upon the (*Hafturfehde*) record and upon Moses' books. And while doing so, (they) also touched the coat (with which the Torah scroll is covered) according to the Jewish custom].¹⁸³



Figure 15.3 A Christian Takes an Oath with Upright Fingers (second panel from the top). Source: *Sachsenspiegel* (Customal), Early 14th Century, Germany (Heidelberg, University Library, Cod. Pal. germ. 164, fol. 8v).

Traditionally, Jews do not touch the Torah scroll (written on parchment) with their bare fingers, and therefore, the oath-takers had to touch the cover the Torah scroll was wrapped into instead.

The given examples contain references to central elements of Jewish life, rituals, and customs. How did this detailed knowledge of Jewish life, customs (*minhagim*), and religious law (*halakhah*) enter the formulae of *Hafturfehden*? Jews were not strangers in the cities. Christian authorities, who often were in close contact with Jews, seem to have known a great deal of such details since the Jews communicated their needs, customs, and laws to them. However, many of these sanctions would not have been possible without the self-enforcement of the local Jewish community as well as its authorities. In several *Hafturfehden*, we see proof that either the rabbis or the Jewish court (*beit din*) were involved in the oath-taking process. In these cases, the rabbis witnessed the oath, read the oath, and made the oath-taker



Figure 15.4 Depiction of a Prison Tower, Murphy Haggadah, Joel ben Simeon, ca. 1455, Italy. *Source:* Jerusalem, National Library of Israel, Ms. Heb. 4°6130, fol. 31v.

confirm it, for example, by saying “amen.” A case from Regensburg (see figure 15.1) dated to 1452 contains—as in some other cases—the following Hebrew confirmation:

השבעתי מ' שרה בת ר' מאיר הנזכרת לעיל בכתב גלחות דלעיל והניחה ידה בתורת משה ונשבעה ברצון נפשה ובבטול כל מודעות בשבועת התורה לקיים כל הכתוב בכתב גלחות זה לעיל וזה נעשה במעמד ר' מאיר ב"ר משה הלוי ז"ל ור' יודה ב"ר ישראל ז"ל שנתיחדו לכך להיות עדים בדבר ואחר שנשבעה בכל חומר שאיפשר לישבע לקיים כל הכתוב לעיל חתמתי שמי פה לעדות ולראיה.

[The oath-taker Miss Sarah, daughter of Rav Meir who is mentioned in the non-Jewish record above, put her hand on the books of Moses and took the oath willingly on the Torah barring all objections, to keep all that is written in the non-Jewish record. And this happened in the presence of Rav Meir, son of Rav



Figure 15.5 *Torre Vanga, the Location of the Imprisonment of the Jews during the Trent Blood Libel Trial in 1475.* Source: Fortification tower, 13th century, Trent/Italy © Matteo Ianeselli / Wikimedia Commons / CC-BY-SA-4.0 & GFDL.

Moses ha-Levi, of blessed memory, and Rav Judah, son of Rav Israel, of blessed memory, who gathered for this reason to testify. And after she earnestly took an oath that she will keep all that is written above, I have signed with my name as witness and proof].¹⁸⁴

This is followed by the rabbi's Hebrew signature, who acted in communal matters. According to the German record, Sarah stated that she had "den aide mit gutem willen und mit eingelegter der rechten hant bis an den risten in die fünf bucher Moises gesworen" (taken the oath in good faith and placed [her] hand up to the wrist upon the five books of Moses).¹⁸⁵ This example attesting to oath-taking by Jewish women is by no means a single case. Jewish women are documented taking oaths and issuing *Hafturfehden* quite frequently—and so did Christian women at times.

The choreography Sarah followed, however, was fixed through a law of the city council in Regensburg from the second half of the fifteenth century. There we find the following formulation:

So ain jud ain brief über sich gibt, darein er swert das geschicht also: Das ich die wort halten well die in dem brieff verschriben sind von anfang piß an das end des pitt ich mir gott zehelffen und pe der ee und pe den potten die Gott herren Moyses gab auff dem perg Synay also helff mir Gott—und der jud legt die ganczen hand in den brieff.

[When a Jew issues a (*Hafturfehde*) record, he shall swear upon it in the following manner: “That I will keep the words written in the record from the beginning until the end. This I ask God to help me with the law and with the commandments God gave Moses on Mount Sinai. So help me God.”—And the Jew places his whole hand over the document.]¹⁸⁶

These records illustrate that oath-taking was a performative act, and the formula was kept short and simple to ensure the ritualistic procedure everyone involved—oath-taker, judge, addressee, and so on—had to adhere to. The choreography of oath-taking required ritual objects like a Torah scroll or a Pentateuch, it included special gestures and speech acts. The *Hafturfehden* usually mentioned these rituals rather offhandedly (or not at all): it was considered relevant to emphasize that oath-taking had taken place but only of secondary importance to describe the detailed choreography in the written word.

The diplomatic formula of the *Hafturfehden*, however, also required authentication through seals or signatures as well as a date. The Hebrew confirmation and signature of the Regensburg rabbi for Sarah and her record was one way to gain authentication from the Jewish issuer. Other ways were the Hebrew signatures of the imprisoned Jews, which could also be in Yiddish/German with Hebrew letters, and Jewish seals,¹⁸⁷ which we find sometimes, especially in the Regensburg *Hafturfehden*. Additionally, the Jewish issuers of *Hafturfehde* charters asked a third party to seal their records as well, and these usually were Christian judges, mayors, or other high-ranking communal members of the cities, which sometimes were those who pleaded for the imprisoned Jews to have them released from jail.

CONCLUSION

Hafturfehden, as presented here, are to the best of our knowledge a phenomenon of the German-speaking area where, by the early modern era,

they had been transformed by the various authorities from a mutual oath of settlement to a hierarchical one of submission. As a judicial instrument of the sovereign disciplinary state, they were in use in almost any context with prison release in the German-speaking area up until the eighteenth century. In addition to sanctioning the imprisoning authorities' past actions and thus strengthening their position of power, the *Hafturfehde* with its included threat of perjury and the subsequent punishments of oath-breaking served as a means of control of the prisoner's future behavior to which the imprisoning authority attached a much greater relevance than the past reasons for imprisonment and the process of release itself. In this form, the *Hafturfehde* enabled municipal councils and territorial lords to use it against any of their subjects they wished to subdue, including the Jewish inhabitants, which subsequently led to its implementation in blood libel and host desecration affairs as well as expulsions.

However, despite its use as a tool for authoritative control and subjection of Jews under Christian authority, the *Hafturfehden* and its accompanying oaths show shared rituals, since its issuance was mandatory for both Christians and Jews. Even more so, *Hafturfehden* and oaths can serve as examples of cultural transfer between Christians and Jews. They show Christians in acceptance of Jewish religious elements such as in the aforementioned oaths, which were considered valid by Christians because of their validity in Jewish law, and thus point to an at least partial understanding of Jewish legal customs by Christians, achieved by communication. Furthermore, as the quote from Moses Minz we cited at the beginning shows, *Hafturfehden* are also a testimony to the understanding the Jewish inhabitants of a territory had for the legal customs of their Christian authorities.

Like Christians, they would make use of their political and social connections by having figures of authority intervene on their behalf, and would try to utilize *Hafturfehden* as a means of negotiation. With the weakening of the legal and economic position of many Jewish communities in the Holy Roman Empire at the end of the Middle Ages, their scope of action became more and more restricted. As long as no other party such as rival lords, bishops, or the emperor would intercede, Jews had increasingly less agency in the process of imprisonment and the release from it. In the context of the expulsions of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the *Hafturfehden* issued by the (former) Jewish inhabitants had become a mere token of acceptance of the ruler's or city's power, their main function being to serve as the ruler's insurance toward the new lord of the expelled Jews.

NOTES

* We wish to thank Hannah Teddy Schachter, Albert Kohn, Eyal Levinson (all in Jerusalem), Gerd Mentgen (Trier), Michael Schlachter (Trier, now in Aschaffenburg), and Dean Anthony Irwin (Canterbury) for their suggestions or reading our draft chapter. Andreas Lehnertz also thanks the Martin Buber Society of Fellows at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem for funding him as a Postdoctoral fellow. Birgit Wiedl's part was funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF): P 32396 and preceding projects P 28610, P 24405, P 21237, P 18453, and P 15638. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, we were not able to consult all the records we have quoted in this chapter in their respective archives. Instead, in some cases, we had to rely on older editions.

1. *Maharam Minz. She'elot u-teshuvot* (Hebrew; Przemysla: Knoller & Hammerknecht, 1883), #74. Many thanks to Aviya Doron (Jerusalem) for drawing our attention to this source.

2. We will use the terms "prison" and "prisoner" since recent scholars have emphasized the validity of these terms for the late Middle Ages already although those had been challenged by earlier scholarship. For an overview, see Patricia Turning, "Competition for the Prisoner's Body: Wardens and Jailers in Fourteenth-Century Southern France," *Crime and Punishment in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Ages. Mental-Historical Investigations of Basic Human Problems and Social Responses*, ed. Albrecht Classen and Connie Scarborough. *Fundamentals of Medieval and Early Modern Culture*, 11 (Berlin and Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2012), 281–98; Guy Geltner, *The Medieval Prison: A Social History* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008); and Jean Dunbabin, *Captivity and Imprisonment in Medieval Europe, 1000–1300* (Houndmills and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002); the latter emphasizes the blurred lines between coercive and punitive imprisonment.

3. See, for the most recent discussion, Simcha Emanuel, "Did Rabbi Meir of Rothenburg Refuse to Be Ransomed?" *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 24.1 (March 2017): 23–38; and also Ephraim E. Urbach, *The Tosaphists: Their History, Writings and Methods*, Vol. 2 (Hebrew; Jerusalem, Machon Bialik, 1980), 541–46. For short biographical overviews, see Israel Jacob Yuval, "Meir ben Baruch aus Rothenburg (um 1220–1293), supremus Magister," *Geschichte und Kultur der Juden in Bayern—Lebensläufe*, ed. Manfred Treml and Wolf Weigand (Munich: Haus der Bayerischen Geschichte, 1988), 21–24; Johannes Heil, "Der Maharam—Rabbi Meir von Rothenburg und seine Schule," *Geschichte und Kultur der Juden in Rothenburg ob der Tauber*, ed. Andrea M. Kluxen and Julia Krieger. *Franconia Judaica*, 7 (Würzburg: Ergon-Verlag, 2012), 33–46.

4. Gerd Mentgen has done a case study on Josel of Rosheim in which he covers (albeit only briefly) Josel's incarceration and release upon the issuance of a *Hafturfehde* in 1512; see id., "Josel von Rosheim und die Juden des Elsass im Übergang vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit," *Zeitschrift für Geschichte des Oberrheins* 164 (2016): 173–204; here 189–90.

5. Wolfgang Treue, *Der Trienter Judenprozeß: Voraussetzungen—Abläufe—Auswirkungen (1475–1588)*. Forschungen zur Geschichte der Juden, A 4 (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1996).

6. Moritz Stern, “Der Regensburger Judenprozeß 1476–1480,” *Jahrbuch der Jüdisch-Literarischen Gesellschaft* 20 (1929): 157–79; Sophia Schmitt, “‘In eisernen Ketten’: Die Regensburger Judengemeinde unter Ritualmordanklage (1476–1480),” PhD diss., Ludwig Maximilian University, Munich, 2019; eadem, “Die Regensburger Öffentlichkeit und der Ritualmordvorwurf gegen die jüdische Gemeinde (1476–1480),” *Jüdische Lebenswelten in Regensburg—Eine gebrochene Geschichte*, ed. Klaus Himmelstein (Regensburg: Pustet, 2018), 46–66; eadem, “Höre meine Stimme—Verteidigungsstrategien der Regensburger Juden gegen reichsstädtische Gewalt,” *Reichsstadt und Gewalt*, ed. Helge Wittmann. Studien zur Reichsstadtgeschichte, 8 (Petersberg: Michael Imhof-Verlag, forthcoming 2021), 93–124. Many thanks to Sophia Schmitt for granting us access to her manuscript before it was published.

7. Andreas Lehnertz, “Hafturfekten von Juden in der Stadt Regensburg (14. bis 16. Jahrhundert): Städtische Autonomiebestrebungen zwischen Wandel und Kontinuität,” *Die Stadt des Mittelalters an der Schwelle zur Frühen Neuzeit. Beiträge des interdisziplinären (Post-)Doc-Workshop des Trierer Zentrums für Mediävistik im November 2017*, ed. Inge Hülpes and Falko Klaes. Mittelalter. Interdisziplinäre Forschung und Rezeptionsgeschichte, Beihefte, 1, 134–72; online at: <http://mittelalter.hypotheses.org/files/2018/09/Lehnertz-Hafturfekten.pdf> or at <https://mittelalter.hypotheses.org/15761> (without page numbers) (last accessed on March 15, 2021).

8. Andreas Blauert, *Das Urfehdedwesen im deutschen Südwesten im Spätmittelalter und in der Frühen Neuzeit*. Frühneuzeit-Forschungen, 7 (Tübingen: bibliotheca academica, 2000).

9. Only Steffen Wernicke, “Von Schlagen, Schmähen und Unendlichkeit. Die Regensburger Urfehdebriefe im 15. Jahrhundert,” *Kriminalitätsgeschichte: Beiträge zur Sozial- und Kulturgeschichte der Vormoderne*, ed. Andreas Blauert and Gerd Schwerhoff (Constance: Universitätsverlag, 2000), 379–404, briefly mentions Jewish *Urfehden* (387–88). See further the study (without mentions of Jews) by Günter Jerouschek and Andreas Blauert, “Zwischen Einigungsschwur und Unterwerfungseid. Zur obrigkeitlichen Usurpation des Urfehdedwesens,” *Herrschaftliches Strafen seit dem Hochmittelalter*, ed. Hans Schlosser, Rolf Sprandel, and Dietmar Willoweit. Konflikt, Verbrechen und Sanktion in der Gesellschaft Alteuropas, Symposien und Synthesen, 5 (Cologne, Vienna, and Weimar: Böhlau, 2002), 227–46; a good overview is also provided by Joachim Wild, “Urfehden,” *Historisches Lexikon Bayern*, online at <https://www.historisches-lexikon-bayerns.de/Lexikon/Urfehden>, and Casimir Bumiller, *Südwestdeutsche Archivalienkunde*, online at <https://www.leo-bw.de/web/guest/themenmodul/sudwestdeutsche-archivalienkunde/archivaliengattungen/urkunden/urfehden> (both last accessed on March 15, 2021). See also the latest studies (which cite further literature) by Johannes Kaska, “Die Urfehdebriefe des Wiener Stadtrichters Mert Enthaimer (1466–1472),” *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 124 (2016): 53–81; Oebele Vries, “De ‘Hafturfehde,’ in bysundere foarm fan de ‘freedeed,’ ”

De taal van recht en vrijheid: studies over middeleeuws Friesland, ed. id., Goffe Jensma, Han Nijdam, and Anne Popkema. Estrikken, 91 (Gorredijk: Bornmeer, 2012), 180–86. Selected *Urfehde* collections have been edited, for example, by Alois Niederstätter, *Vorarlberger Urfehdebriefe bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts. Eine Quellensammlung zur Rechts- und Sozialgeschichte des Landes*. Forschungen zur Geschichte Vorarlbergs, 6 (13) (Dornbirn: Vorarlberger Verlagsanstalt, 1985); Christine Bührlen-Grabinger, *Urfehden für den Raum Pforzheim. Württembergische Quellen zur Kriminalitätsgeschichte 1416–1583*. Der Enzkreis. Schriftenreihe des Kreisarchivs, 7 (Heidelberg, Ubstadt-Weiher, and Basel: verlag regionalgeschichte, 2003); and Tommy Schmucker, “‘mitt handtt vnd Mondtt angelobett’—Eine Untersuchung zum Zwickauer Urfehdebuch,” M.A. thesis, Technische Universität, Chemnitz, 2004. A digital edition of municipal *Urfehde* manuscripts of Basel was created by Susanna Burghartz, Sonia Calvi, and Georg Vogeler, *Urfehdebücher der Stadt Basel—digitale Edition*, online at <http://gams.uni-graz.at/context:ufbas> (last accessed on March 15, 2021), which, even though seven documents mention Jews, does not contain *Urfehden* issued by Jews.

10. Jerouschek and Blauert, “Zwischen Einigungsschwur und Unterwerfungseid” (see note 9).

11. These could range from close family members to “the municipal community”; for general comments, see Blauert, *Urfehdedewesen* (see note 8), 68–70, 81–83, and *passim*.

12. Blauert, *Urfehdedewesen* (see note 8), 74; Jerouschek and Blauert, “Zwischen Einigungsschwur und Unterwerfungseid” (see note 9), 233.

13. Niederstätter, *Vorarlberger Urfehdebriefe* (see note 9), 12–13. Lorenz Reyban for example, whose case is discussed below, was threatened with blinding.

14. Blauert, *Urfehdedewesen* (see note 8), 74, and 136–52, considers the ban as “die sozialpolitische Allerwelts-Maßnahme des 18. Jahrhunderts” (the social-political commonplace means of the eighteenth century, 74) that was mainly aimed at the lower sections of the social strata, particularly vagrants.

15. To differentiate further between these stages, Wilhelm Ebel had distinguished in his work on the *Urfehde* from 1938 between *Streit-*, *Gefangenschafts-*, and *Hafturfehde*, the former two of which are mentioned in the *Sachsenspiegel* and refer to *Urfehden* resulting from a (noble) feud; for the latter, see Wilhelm Ebel, *Die Rostocker Urfehden. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Deutschen Strafrechts*. Veröffentlichungen aus dem Archiv der Seestadt Rostock, 1 (Rostock: Carl Hindstorff-Verlag, 1938), 42; see also Kaska, “Urfehdebriefe” (see note 9), 60–62.

16. Blauert, *Urfehdedewesen* (see note 8), 74; Kaska, “Urfehdebriefe” (see note 9), 62.

17. Niederstätter, *Vorarlberger Urfehdebriefe* (see note 9), 12.

18. Sigrid Jahns, *Das Reichskammergericht und seine Richter. Verfassung und Sozialstruktur eines höchsten Gerichts im Alten Reich*, Teil I: *Darstellung*. Quellen und Forschungen zur Höchsten Gerichtsbarkeit im alten Reich, 26 (Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna: Böhlau, 2011), 169–209.

19. Eveline Brugger and Birgit Wiedl, *Regesten zur Geschichte der Juden in Österreich*, Vol. 3: 1366–1386 (Innsbruck, Vienna, and Bolzano: StudienVerlag, 2015), 422–23, no. 1857.

20. Oliver Landolt, “‘Wie die juden zû Diessenhofen einen armen knaben ermurdend, und wie es inen gieng.’ Ritualmordvorwürfe und die Judenverfolgung von 1401,” *Schaffhauser Beiträge zur Geschichte*, 73 (1996): 161–94; here 170–71, who states that the verdict was a lenient one compared to those involving Christians being robbed.

21. Dietrich Andernacht, *Regesten zur Geschichte der Juden in der Reichsstadt Frankfurt am Main*, Vol. 1: 1401–1519; Part 1: 1401–1455, Part 2: 1456–1496, Part 3: 1496–1519, Part 4: *Personen- und Ortsregister*. Forschungen zur Geschichte der Juden, B 1/1–4 (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1996 and 2007); *Regesten zur Geschichte der Juden in der Reichsstadt Frankfurt am Main*, Vol. 2: 1520–1616; Part 1: 1520–1585, Part 2: 1585–1616, ed. Helga Andernacht, Institut für Stadtgeschichte Frankfurt, and the Arye-Maimon-Institut für Geschichte der Juden. Forschungen zur Geschichte der Juden, B 2.1–2 (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2007); here 1/1, 15, no. 39.

22. Tanja Potthoff and Michael Wiehen, “‘da man die Juden zu Colne sluch [. . .] inde die hus in der Judengassen verbrannt wurden’. Das Kölner Judenpogrom von 1349,” *Archäologie des Glaubens. Umbrüche und Konflikte*. Mitteilungen der deutschen Gesellschaft für Archäologie des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit, 31 (2018): 21–36; here 25; Matthias Schmandt, “*Iudei, cives et incole*”: *Studien zur jüdischen Geschichte Kölns im Mittelalter*. Forschungen zur Geschichte der Juden, A 11 (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2002), 90 and 92–93. The citizens of Cologne denied any participation in the pogrom, in Schalant’s *Urfehde* (who was not a citizen of Cologne), it was stated that the fire in the *Judengasse* was set by (Christian) intruders, while in a later treaty between the city of Cologne and the Margrave of Jülich (who claimed recompense for his *Schutzjuden*, who had perished in the fire), the citizens claimed that the Jews had, as a form of mass suicide, burnt themselves (id., 90). On the topic of Jewish (mass) suicides see further.

23. Other examples: Andernacht, *Regesten Frankfurt* 2.1 (see note 21), 108, no. 589 (injuring a Jew); the city of Nuremberg, which had received the Jews as a fief from the Emperor (for a fee) and thus was the Jews’ lord and protector, punished a series of Christian offenders for several misdeeds against Jews, from theft and fraud, verbal abuse and anti-Jewish diatribes to rape, bodily harm, and attempted murder; see *Germania Judaica*, Vol. 3, Parts 1–3: 1350–1519, ed. Mordechai Breuer, Yacov Guggenheim, and Arye Maimon (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987–2003) [from here on: GJ]; here GJ 3.2, 1008 (art. Nürnberg).

24. See, for example, the categories listed in the Basel database (see note 9), <https://gams.uni-graz.at/o:ufbas.kategorien> (last accessed on March 15, 2021).

25. Lehnertz, “Hafturfehden” (see note 7), 142.

26. Munich, Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv [from here on: BHStA], Reichsstadt Regensburg Urkunden [from here on: RRU] 3741. In 1446, the count of Hanau imprisoned a Jewish family of moneylenders for similar unspecified “crimes”; see GJ 3.2 (see note 23), 1650 (art. Windecken).

27. Michael H. Wehrmann, “Die Rechtsstellung der Rothenburger Judenschaft im Mittelalter (1180–1520). Eine rechtsgeschichtliche Untersuchung,” Ph.D. diss., Julius-Maximilian University, Würzburg, 1976, 89.

28. Vienna, Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Abt. Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv [from here on: HHStA], AUR 1429 X 10. See Birgit Wiedl, “Der Salzburger Erzbischof und seine Juden” *Aschkenas. Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Juden* 32.2 (forthcoming 2021]).

29. Munich, BHStA, RRU 3737 and 3718; Lehnertz, “Hafturfehden” (see note 7), 140.

30. For Christian *Hafturfehden* and their manifold reasons, see, for example, Wernicke, “Von Schlagen, Schmähen und Unendlichkeit” (see note 9); Vries, “De ‘Hafturfehde’” (see note 9); Niederstätter, *Vorarlberger Urfehdebriefe* (see note 9); Kaska, “Urfehdebriefe” (see note 9).

31. Kaska, “Urfehdebriefe” (see note 9), 56–57, states theft as the main reason, a similar conclusion can be drawn from the edited records by Niederstätter, *Vorarlberger Urfehdebriefe* (see note 9). The Basel database (see note 9) yields seventy-nine hits for “Diebstahl” (theft), thus making it also the most common reason for imprisonment, while Wernicke, “Von Schlagen, Schmähen und Unendlichkeit” (see note 9), 390, ranks theft only in seventh place (7.5 percent).

32. Arras is the name of a light wool cloth, produced exclusively in the eponymous town of Arras (Hauts-de-France), see *Frühneuhochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, online at <https://fwb-online.de> (last accessed on March 15, 2021), lemma *arras*.

33. Andernacht, *Regesten Frankfurt* 2.1 (see note 21), 122, no. 665.

34. Lehnertz, “Hafturfehden” (see note 7), 142, no. 42.

35. On Jewish thieves, see also Ephraim Shoham-Steiner, *Jews and Crime in Medieval Europe* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2021), 35–114; Jörg R. Müller, “Eine jüdische Diebesbande im Südwesten des Reiches in der ersten Hälfte des 14. Jahrhunderts,” *Beziehungsnetze aschkenasischer Juden während des Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit*, ed. id. *Forschungen zur Geschichte der Juden*, A 2 (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2008), 71–116.

36. See, for example, Hermann Specker, “Urfehden und Urteilssprüche: eine neu erschlossene Urkundenabteilung im bernischen Staatsarchiv,” *Berner Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Heimatkunde* 23 (1961): 137–46; the category “Beleidigung, Verleumdung” (insult, slander) in the Basel database (see note 9) yields 50 hits, “Drohung” (threat) 35 hits. Wernicke, “Von Schlagen, Schmähen und Unendlichkeit” (see note 9), 390, splits into general insults (15.8 percent) and those against authorities (14 percent), taken together, they are almost as frequent as violence (30 percent). See also Schmucker, “‘mitt handtt vnd Mondtt angelobett’” (see note 9), 49–51.

37. Munich, BHStA, RRU 1449 November 28. For another case in Nördlingen in 1487 see *GJ* 3.2 (see note 23), 984 (art. Nördlingen).

38. Andernacht, *Regesten Frankfurt* 2.1 (see note 21), 187, no. 945 (1554).

39. Munich, BHStA, RRU 3741, 1398 June 25; Lehnertz, “Hafturfehden” (see note 7), 140–41. The *Urfehde* of Sarlein, Chalman’s wife, from two days later does not mention incarceration (RRU 3742).

40. Andernacht, *Regesten Frankfurt* 2.1 (see note 21), 111, no. 607; for another example, see id., *Regesten Frankfurt* 1/2, 457, no. 1779 (letting a drunk Jewish man out of prison upon *Urfehde*).

41. All quoted from the Basel database (see note 9), category “Alkoholmissbrauch” (unfortunately, it is not possible to link to the individual categories or individual entries).

42. There are 71 hits, for the category of “Alkoholmissbrauch” (alcohol abuse) in the Basel database (see note 9).

43. For example, Hans Lädlin, who was imprisoned in Bregenz in 1473 due to public intoxication, brawling (*uffrur uff ir trinkstuben*), peace-breaking, insults (*mit groben, boesen scheltworten mißhandlet*), and swearing; two students at the University of Tübingen were imprisoned by their rector due to *excessus enormes*, see Niederstätter, *Vorarlberger Urfehdebrieft* (see note 9), 44, no. 35 and 49–50, no. 44.

44. Andernacht, *Regesten Frankfurt* 1.2 (see note 21), 499, no. 1936. On Jews and gambling, see further Gerd Mentgen, “Alltagsgeschichte und Geschichte der Juden. Die Juden und das Glücksspiel im Mittelalter,” *Historische Zeitschrift* 274 (2002): 25–60; on a Jewish dice-maker, id., “Über die jüdische Hochzeitsfeier in Münster bei Bingen (1495) und die ausrichtende Ärztefamilie,” *Ashkenas. Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der Juden* 26.1 (2016): 117–55; here 127; Eyal Levinson, “Youth and Masculinities in Medieval Ashkenaz” (Hebrew) Ph.D. diss., Bar Ilan University, 2018, to be published in print in 2022, 99–101.

45. Chiara Benati, “*Behüde mich vor vngerechtem gude*. Were Goods Won in Game ‘Unjustified’? Medieval Gambling,” *Pleasure and Leisure in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age. Cultural-Historical Perspectives on Toys, Games, and Entertainment*, ed. Albrecht Classen. Fundamentals of Medieval and Early Modern Culture, 23 (Berlin and Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2019), 225–40; here 228–29.

46. Thirteen cases in the Basel database (see note 9); Niederstätter, *Vorarlberger Urfehdebrieft* (see note 9), 31–32, nos. 14 and 15 (evil cardsharpping). Wernicke, “Von Schlagen, Schmähen und Unendlichkeit” (see note 9), 390, subsumes intoxication and gambling, along with many other delicts, under “moral conduct” which at 17.1 % is the second most common offense; on intoxication and gambling specifically, see id., 395. For a specific example, see Krems, Stadtarchiv, Urk. 1398 VIII 16, online at <https://www.monasterium.net/mom/AT-StAKrems/Krems/StaAKr-009/6/charter> (last accessed on March 15, 2021): Hans Wisanangst from Perchtoldsdorf (Lower Austria) was imprisoned in Krems because of “unpilleich ein würffel spil” (an illegal game of dice).

47. The Basel database (see note 9) lists brawling (“Schlägerei”) among the offenses but refers to no entries; however, the category “bewaffnete Auseinandersetzung” (armed dispute) yields ten hits.

48. For example, the Viennese coppersmith Perchtold, who had been imprisoned “darumb das ich Kathrein mein hausfrawn unverschulter Sachen mit unziemleichen slegen gestrafft hab” (because [he] had punished [his] wife Kathrin, without her fault, with wrongful blows); Vienna, Stadt- und Landesarchiv, H.A. Urk. 2531 (1435).

49. Legal regulations on violence by and against Jews in medieval German territories and cities are manifold, see Christine Magin, ‘*Wie es umb der iuden recht stet.*’ *Der Status der Juden in spätmittelalterlichen deutschen Rechtsbüchern* (Göttingen: Wallstein-Verlag, 1999).

50. Lehnertz, “Hafturfehden” (see note 7), 142, with no. 40. For a similar case in Nördlingen in 1499, see *GJ* 3.2 (see note 23), 984 (art. Nördlingen); in Halle a. d. S., the Jewish perpetrator who had assaulted another Jewish man was first imprisoned (and tortured) in the municipal prison but was then handed over to the Jewish court, see *GJ* 3.1 (see note 23), 500 (art. Halle).

51. Munich, BHStA, RRU 1506 Mai 26.

52. Lehnertz, “Hafturfehden” (see note 7), 142. It has to be stressed that money-lending and pawnbroking were neither a Jewish monopoly nor the only options for Jews to make a living, see for the Holy Roman Empire the overview by Christoph Cluse, “Jüdische Arbeitswelten in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit” *Neues Trierisches Jahrbuch* 58 (2018): 55–80 (with further literature).

53. Lehnertz, “Hafturfehden” (see note 7), 142–43.

54. The right of the Jewish pawnbrokers to clear themselves of the suspicion of having accepted stolen goods as pledges by taking an oath, which had first been granted in Emperor Henry IV’s privilege for the Jews of Worms in 1090 and had been adapted by most territorial rulers of the Holy Roman Empire throughout the Middle Ages; see in lieu for the vast literature Michael Toch, *Die Juden im mittelalterlichen Reich*, 3rd rev. ed. (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2013), 109–10; and particularly Magin, “*Wie es umb der iuden recht stet*” (see note 49), 352–400.

55. Andernacht, *Regesten Frankfurt* 1.1 (see note 21), 47, no. 161. For comparison, a house of a patrician at that time would have cost about 800 *Gulden*; Eike Pies, *Löhne und Preise von 1300 bis 2000* (Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 2008), 18.

56. For an overview of these “criminal charges,” see Jörg R. Müller, “Sexual Relationships between Christians and Jews in medieval Germany, according to Christian sources,” *Iggud. Selected Essays in Jewish Studies*, Vol. 2: *The History of the Jewish People and Contemporary Jewish Society*, ed. Gershon Bacon et al. (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 2009), 19–32; Norbert Schnitzler, “*Contra naturam*—Sexuelle Devianz und christlich-jüdische Koexistenz im Mittelalter,” *Wechselseitige Wahrnehmung der Religionen im Spätmittelalter und in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Teil 1, ed. Ludger Grenzmann, Thomas Haye, Nikolaus Henkel, and Thomas Kaufmann. Abhandlungen der Akademie zu Göttingen, Neue Folge, 4 (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 251–81; Susanna Burghartz, “Juden—eine Minderheit vor Gericht (Zürich 1378–1436),” *Spannungen und Widersprüche. Gedenkschrift für František Graus*, ed. eadem, Hans-Jörg Gilomen, and Guy Paul Marchal (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1992), 229–44; Robert Jütte, “‘Bey solcher Gelegenheit treiben sie oft selber mit Christinnen Unzucht’. Verbotene Sexualekontakte zwischen Juden und Christen in der Frühen Neuzeit,” *Sexualität vor Gericht. Deviante geschlechtliche Praktiken und deren Verfolgung vom 14. bis zum 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Gerhard Ammerer, Gerhard Fritz, and Jaromir Tauchen. Beiträge zur Rechtsgeschichte Österreichs, 9.1 (2019): 227–44; online at <https://austriaca.at/0xc1aa5576%200x003aaad3.pdf> (last accessed on March 15, 2021).

Shoham-Steiner, *Jews and Crime* (see note 35), refers to sexual relations on several occasions, for example 195–96; see further Levinson, “Youth and Masculinities” (see note 44); most recently, Albrecht Classen, “Ungewöhnliche Perspektiven auf Juden in der deutschen und italienischen Literatur des Spätmittelalters. Feinde oder bloß nicht-christliche Nachbarn in der Mærendichtung,” *Aschkenas: Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der Juden* 31.1 (2021): 1–28; here 14–22.

57. There are sixty-nine hits in the Basel database (see note 9), including solicitation; Kaska, “Urfehdebriefe” (see note 9), records four cases of adultery (out of thirty-six); Wernicke, “Von Schlägen, Schmähen und Unendlichkeit” (see note 9), 390, has *inzicht/Leumund* in sixth place (7.7 percent), but has “moral conduct” as a separate category.

58. Niederstätter, *Vorarberger Urfehdebriefe* (see note 9), 55–56, no. 53.

59. Müller, “Sexual Relationships” (see note 56), 21–22.

60. Burghartz, “Juden vor Gericht” (see note 56), 233.

61. For example, *GJ* 3.1 (see note 23), 384 (art. Frankfurt): in Frankfurt in 1441, a Jew was fined 600 *Florin* (2.5 times the amount of the annual municipal tax of the Jewish community) for sexual relationships with several Christian women; for Nuremberg, see *GJ* 3.2 (see note 23), 1012 (art. Nürnberg): usually fines, one ban from the city.

62. Burghartz, “Juden vor Gericht” (see note 56), 234–35; and Müller, “Sexual Relationships” (see note 56), 23–24 and 26 noted that the Christian women, usually from lower social strata, were punished more severely.

63. Müller, “Sexual Relationships” (see note 56), 23–24.

64. Munich, BHStA, RRU 1448 Juli 17; Lehnertz, “Hafturfehden” (see note 7), 142, with no. 41. In Nuremberg, two baptized Jews were put into prison because they tried to bring Jews to Christian prostitutes; see *GJ* 3.2 (see note 23), 1031 (art. Nürnberg); see also Shoham-Steiner, *Jews and Crime* (see note 35), 197–244 (on both Jews as patrons of Christian prostitutes, and the question of Jewish prostitutes).

65. In the high Middle Ages, *Schalantjuden* were Jewish merchants traveling on barges; in the late Middle Ages the term was used for foreign, underprivileged, and predominantly poor Jews; see Yacov Guggenheim, “Von den Schalantjuden zu den Betteljuden. Jüdische Armut in Mitteleuropa in der Frühen Neuzeit,” *Juden und Armut in Mittel- und Osteuropa*, ed. Stefi Jersch-Wenzel (Cologne, Vienna, and Weimar: Böhlau, 2000), 55–69; here 55.

66. Jörg R. Müller, “‘Sex and Crime’ in Augsburg. Das Komplott gegen den Juden Johelin im Jahr 1355,” *Campana pulsante convocati. Festschrift anlässlich der Emeritierung von Prof. Dr. Alfred Haverkamp*, ed. Frank G. Hirschmann and Gerd Mentgen (Trier: Kliomedica, 2005), 395–419; here 408–09, with an edition of the *Urfehde* in no. 54; id., “Sexual Relationships” (see note 56), 24–25.

67. Jeroschek and Blauert, “Zwischen Einigungsschwur und Unterwerfungseid” (see note 9).

68. Like Christians, Jews could obtain a safe conduct (right of escort, *Geleitrecht*), which allowed them to travel under the respective lord’s protection, see Markus Wenninger, “Geleit, Geleitsrecht und Juden im Mittelalter,” *Aschkenas. Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der Juden* 31.1 (2021, in print). For a general

overview, see Martin Kintzinger, “*Cum salvo conductu*. Geleit im westeuropäischen Spätmittelalter,” *Gesandtschafts- und Botenwesen im spätmittelalterlichen Europa*, ed. Rainer Christoph Schwinges and Klaus Wriedt. Vorträge und Forschungen des Konstanzer Arbeitskreises für Mittelalterliche Geschichte, 60 (Stuttgart: Jan Thorbecke, 2003), 313–63. The breach of such a *geleit* was a punishable offence and given as the only specific reason for the arrest of the Jewish wedding party in Münster in 1495, as stated in the *Hafturfehde* of the 41 incarcerated Jews, see Mentgen, “Über die jüdische Hochzeitsfeier” (see note 44), 134.

69. Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten* 3 (see note 19), 95–96, no. 1300 (with further literature); Wiedl, “Salzburger Erzbischof” (see note 28). While the wording of the text suggests that Merchel might have contravened the arrangements of an earlier privilege, he also knew the threats to be true from his own experience: his father Häslein had been financially ruined a few years earlier by the Austrian Duke whose territory he had left without permission, see Eveline Brugger, “Loans of the Father: Business Succession in Families of Jewish Moneylenders in Late Medieval Austria,” *Generations in Towns. Succession and Success in Pre-Industrial Urban Societies*, ed. Finn-Einar Eliasse and Katalin Szende (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009), 112–29; here 119–21. Similar cases, but without the explicit mention of imprisonment, are the *Urfehden* of Gndel and Chalman of Regensburg (1384), who had tried to escape from the city with their belongings; see Munich, BHStA, RRU 2524; Lehnertz, “Hafturfehden” (see note 7), 138 and 140; Andreas Lehnertz, *Judensiegel im spätmittelalterlichen Reichsgebiet: Beglaubigungstätigkeit und Selbstrepräsentation von Jüdinnen und Juden*. 2 vols. Forschungen zur Geschichte der Juden, A 30 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2020), 201–28; and of Chalman and Süßel, Munich, BHStA, RRU 2947 (1390); see Lehnertz, *Judensiegel im spätmittelalterlichen Reichsgebiet* (see above), 235–36.

70. For example, Emperor Sigismund’s claims to Albrecht V of Austria after the expulsion of the Austrian Jews, many of whom had fled to Hungary, see Eveline Brugger, “Die Wiener Gesera von 1420/21,” *Dialog* 119 (April 2020): 21–32; here 21.

71. Karel Hruza, “‘Anno domini 1385 do burden die iuden [. . .] gevangen’: Die vorweggenommene Wirkung skandalöser Urkunden König Wenzels (IV.),” *Wege zur Urkunde, Wege der Urkunde, Wege der Forschung. Beiträge zur europäischen Diplomatik des Mittelalters*, ed. id. and Paul Herold. Forschungen zur Kaiser- und Papstgeschichte des Mittelalters, Beihefte zu J. F. Böhmer, Regesta Imperii, 24 (Vienna, Cologne, and Weimar: Böhlau, 2005), 117–67; Arthur Süßmann, *Die Schuldentilgungen unter König Wenzel* (Berlin: L. Lamm, 1907). Some earlier and many later such cancellations of debt demands took place on a smaller scale within the Holy Roman Empire; see, for example, for Austria, Eveline Brugger, “‘So sollen die brief ab und tod sein.’ Landesfürstliche Judenschuldentilgungen im Österreich des 14. Jahrhunderts,” *Aschkenas. Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der Juden* 20 (2019): 329–42.

72. The Austrian dukes had their Jews incarcerated already in the 1370s; see Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten* 3 (see note 19), 116, no. 1300, 138–39, no. 1368, 245–46, no. 1550 (with further literature), and 369, no. 1763 on the 1383 incarceration of David Steuss, the wealthiest Jewish man of the duchy. In addition to extorting money,

they tried to convince the Jews to accept baptism. The enormous amount of 40,000 pounds taxes paid by the Jewish community of Krems (the second largest of the duchy) suggests that at least part of this sum was ransom money; see Eveline Brugger, “Hetschel und wer noch? Anmerkungen zur Geschichte der Juden in Herzogenburg im Mittelalter,” *900 Jahre Stift Herzogenburg. Aufbrüche—Umbrüche—Kontinuität. Tagungsband zum wissenschaftlichen Symposium vom 22.–24. September 2011*, ed. Günter Katzler and Victoria Zimmerl-Panagl. Sonderpublikation des NÖ Instituts für Landeskunde (Innsbruck, Vienna, and Bolzano: StudienVerlag, 2013), 119–37; here 121. David Steuss was said to have paid the staggering sum of 50,000 pounds (the amount is, however, only recorded in ecclesiastical chronicles). The Archbishop of Trier, Werner of Falkenstein, forced “his” Jew Menchin in 1397—most likely through imprisonment—to agree to paying him 12,000 *Gulden* because of his “breaking and transgressing” (*bruche und umbergriffe*); Lehnertz, *Judensiegel im spätmittelalterlichen Reichsgebiet* (see note 69), 164.

73. Hruza, “Anno domini 1385” (see note 71); on the incarceration of the Jewish inhabitants of Nuremberg according to their economic status, see further.

74. Munich, BHStA, RRU 3041; Lehnertz, “Hafturfehden” (see note 7), 140.

75. Munich, BHStA, Tirol Urkunden 202 (Vifeli, 1384), and Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten 3* (see note 19), 425, no. 1863 (Tröstel, 1386). The bishops of Bamberg were lords of the Carinthian town of Villach from 1007 to 1759.

76. A *Hafturfehde* issued after well-poisoning accusations could not be found since such accusations usually ended with a death sentence. In 1397, the Alsatian Jews were once again accused of having poisoned urban wells and were subsequently imprisoned; see Gerd Mentgen, *Studien zur Geschichte der Juden im mittelalterlichen Elsaß*. Forschungen zur Geschichte der Juden, A 2 (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1995), 394–97. Earlier such accusations had already been voiced in Schlettstadt, for example, in 1349, where one Jew committed suicide in prison; see David Schnur, “Quellen zur Geschichte der Juden in Frankfurt und der Wetterau (1348–1390),” *Corpus der Quellen zur Geschichte der Juden im spätmittelalterlichen Reich*, ed. Alfred Haverkamp and Jörg R. Müller (Trier and Mainz: Mainzer Akademie der Wissenschaften und Literatur, 2016), no. 123, online at <http://www.medieval-ashkenaz.org/FW02/FW-c1-002y.html> (last accessed on March 15, 2021); Mentgen, *Studien* (see above), 381.

77. See, for example, the case of Ravensburg, Stefan Lang, “Die Ravensburger Ritualmordbeschuldigung von 1429/30 und ihre Auswirkungen,” *Kaftan, Kreuz und Kopftuch. Religiöse Koexistenz im urbanen Raum (15.–20. Jahrhundert)*, ed. Andreas Schmauder and Jan-Friedrich Missfelder. Stadt in der Geschichte, 35 (Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2010), 21–64; here 34–35; for Trent: Treue, *Trienter Judenprozeß* (see note 5), 79; generally on “medieval forensics,” see Romedio Schmitz-Esser, *Der Leichnam im Mittelalter. Einbalsamierung, Verbrennung und die kulturelle Konstruktion des toten Körpers*. Mittelalter-Forschungen, 48 (Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2014), 414–22 (an English translation by Albrecht Classen and Carolin Radtke was published by Brepols/Harvey Miller in 2020).

78. Yonatan Glazer-Eytan, “Jews Imagined and Real: Representing and Prosecuting Host Profanation in Late Medieval Aragon,” *Jews and Muslims Made*

Visible in Christian Iberia and beyond, 14th to 18th Centuries. Another Image, ed. Borja Franco Llopis and Antonio Urquizar-Herrera. *The Medieval and Early Modern Iberian World*, 67 (Leiden and Boston Brill, 2019), 41–69; Miri Rubin, *Gentile Tales. The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews* (1999; Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 109–15.

79. Rubin, *Gentile Tales* (see note 78), 115–16.

80. Schmitt, ““In eisernen Ketten”” (see note 6); eadem, “Die Regensburger Öffentlichkeit” (see note 6), 49–50; and eadem, “Höre meine Stimme” (see note 6), 104–06. Their “success” was, however, short-lived: after a lengthy struggle with the city of Regensburg, they were expelled in 1519; see Veronika Nickel, *Widerstand durch Recht. Der Weg der Regensburger Juden bis zu ihrer Vertreibung (1519) und der Innsbrucker Prozess (1516–1522)*. *Forschungen zur Geschichte der Juden*, A 28 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2018).

81. For further examples, see Rubin, *Gentile Tales* (see note 78), 106–09.

82. Joseph Chmel, *Monumenta Habsburgica. Actenstücke und Briefe zur Geschichte des Hauses Habsburg im Zeitalter Maximilian's I*, vol. 2 (Vienna: Kaiserl[iche] Staatsdruckerei 1855; rpt. Hildesheim: Georg Olms 1968), 342, no. 307.

83. See, for example, Trent: Treue, *Trienter Judenprozeß* (see note 5), particularly 185–203; Ravensburg: Lang, “Ravensburger Ritualmordbeschuldigung” (see note 77), 36–37.

84. Friedrich Battenberg, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Juden im Hessischen Staatsarchiv Darmstadt 1080–1650*. *Quellen zur Geschichte der Juden in hessischen Archiven*, 2 (Wiesbaden: Kommission für die Geschichte der Juden in Hessen, 1995), 284, no. 1070; Rubin, *Gentile Tales* (see note 78), 106, with ill. 107. For other bilingual *Urfehden*, resp. records in both German and Hebrew letters, see further and Florence Guggenheim-Grünberg, “Ein deutscher Urfehdebrief in hebräischer Schrift aus Zürich vom Jahre 1385,” *Zeitschrift für Mundartforschung* 22 (1954): 207–14.

85. Eveline Brugger and Birgit Wiedl, *Regesten zur Geschichte der Juden in Österreich*, Vol. 4: 1387–1404 (Innsbruck, Vienna, and Bolzano: StudienVerlag, 2018), 291–93, nos. 2310–11.

86. Vienna, HHStA, AUR 1404 IX 5; see also Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten* 4 (see note 85), 293–94, no. 2312. Only a few months later, Eberhard handed the house of two of the issuers, Smoel and Aron, over to his brothers Sigmund and Andreas (Salzburg, Salzburger Landesarchiv, Hs. 3 [Registrum Eberhardi], fol. 22v, no. 72, and Vienna, HHStA, AUR 1405 II 2). Sigmund, at the time Captain of Salzburg, had coissued the letters to Munich and Linz that contained the story of the alleged host desecration and ritual murder of the Salzburg Jews (see further).

87. On the “double membership” in Jewish communities, see Martha Keil, “Juden in Grenzgemeinden: Wiener Neustadt und Ödenburg im Spätmittelalter,” *Studien zur Geschichte der Juden in Österreich*, Vol. 3, ed. eadem and Eleonore Lappin (Berlin-Bodenheim and Mainz: Philo, 1998), 9–33.

88. Just a few months earlier, William had persuaded Pope Boniface IX to overturn the election of Eberhard in favor of his chancellor Berthold of Wehingen, who would remain Eberhard’s rival to the archiepiscopal seat until 1406; see Heinz Dopsch, “Salzburg im 15. Jahrhundert,” *Geschichte Salzburgs, Stadt und Land*,

Vol. I, Part 1: *Vorgeschichte—Altertum—Mittelalter*, ed. id. and Hans Spatzenegger (Salzburg: Pustet 1983), 487–593; here 492–94.

89. Gottlieb Bondy and Franz Dworsky, *Zur Geschichte der Juden in Böhmen, Mähren und Schlesien von 906 bis 1620*. Vol. 1: *906 bis 1576* (Prague: G. Bondy, 1906), 164–66, no. 281.

90. Friedrich Holtze, *Das Strafverfahren gegen die märkischen Juden im J. 1510*. Schriften des Vereins für die Geschichte Berlins, 21 (Berlin: E. S. Mittler, 1884), 76–77, no. d. For this affair, see also Rotraud Ries, *Jüdisches Leben in Niedersachsen im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert*. Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission für Niedersachsen und Bremen, 35.13 (Hanover: Hahnische Buchhandlung, 1994), 80–81 and 87–89. A second record issued by three more Jews mentions only briefly the “desecration of the sacrament”; Holtze, *Strafverfahren* (see earlier), 77–78, no. e: *miszhandelinge dem sacrament*.

91. Aron Freimann, “Aus der Geschichte der Juden in Regensburg von der Mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts bis zur Vertreibung im Jahre 1519,” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Juden. Festschrift zum siebenzigsten Geburtstag Martin Philipppsons*, ed. Vorstand der Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaft des Judentums (Leipzig: Gustav Fock, 1916), 79–95; here 90–92, no. 1; Lehnertz, “Hafturfehden” (see note 7), 142; Schmitt, “Höre meine Stimme” (see note 6), 103–04. Israel Bruna left Regensburg the same year for Prague.

92. Munich, BHStA, RRU 1478 November 26/1 (Gütel, quotes: and 26/2 (Pelein); Lehnertz, “Hafturfehden” (see note 7), 142–43; Stern, “Der Regensburger Judenprozeß” (see note 6).

93. Lang, “Ravensburger Ritualmordbeschuldigung” (see note 77); Karel Hruza, “König Sigismund und seine jüdischen Kammerknechte, oder: Wer bezahlt des Kaisers neue Kleider,” *Kaiser Sigismund (1368–1437). Zur Herrschaftspraxis eines europäischen Monarchen*, ed. id. and Alexandra Kaar. Forschungen zur Kaiser- und Papstgeschichte des Mittelalters, Beihefte zu J. F. Böhmer, Regesta Imperii, 31 (Vienna, Cologne, and Weimar: Böhlau, 2012), 75–136; here 86–105.

94. The exact date of arrest is unclear, see Lang, “Ravensburger Ritualmordbeschuldigung” (see note 77), 39.

95. Ravensburg, Stadtarchiv, A 02 Urkunden aus Stadt und Spital, Nr. 945; Lang, “Ravensburger Ritualmordbeschuldigung” (see note 77), 38–39.

96. Lang, “Ravensburger Ritualmordbeschuldigung” (see note 77), 47–50.

97. See, in place of the vast literature on medieval heresy and witchcraft, the overviews by Jennifer Kolpacoff Deane, *A History of Medieval Heresy and Inquisition* (Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, and Plymouth/UK: Rowman & Littlefield, 2011); Louise Nyholm Kallestrup and Raisa Maria Toivo, *Contesting Orthodoxy in Medieval and Early Modern Europe. Heresy, Magic and Witchcraft*. Palgrave Historical Studies in Magic and Witchcraft (London: Palgrave Macmillan via Springer, 2017); and Reima Välimäki, *Heresy in Late Medieval Germany. The Inquisitor Petrus Zwicker and the Waldensians* (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press/Boydell & Brewer, 2019), all with further literature.

98. Again, the literature focusing on the connections of Jews with heretics cannot be discussed in extenso here. See, by way of example, (Anti-)Pope Alexander

V's commission to the Inquisitor Ponce Feugeyron (1409) that included among the targets the supporters of Popes Gregory XII and Benedict XIII (his rivals for the papal seat), heretics, Jews, sorcerers, and all those who made use of sacrilegious and forbidden arts, see Kathrin Utz Tremp, *Von der Häresie zur Hexerei. "Wirkliche" und imaginäre Sekten im Spätmittelalter*. Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Schriften, 59 (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2008), 427–35 (the list is on 428–29), who also examines the connection of heresy and witchcraft and its broad overlap. Recently, David J. Collins, SJ, has argued for a more "permeable frontier" between holy and unholy in medieval culture, *The Sacred and the Sinister. Studies in Medieval Religion and Magic*, ed. Collins (University Park, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019), Introduction, 1–2; see, for our context, particularly the contribution by Michael David Bailey, "Was Magic a Religious Movement?," 143–62.

99. Wernicke, "Von Schlagen, Schmähen und Unendlichkeit" (see note 9), 390 has magic/witchcraft at the bottom of the list (only murder/manslaughter is listed further), at 0.6 percent.

100. Niederstätter, *Vorarlberger Urfehdbriefe* (see note 9), 73, no. 84 and 82, no. 96. The Basel database (see note 9) lists the category "Gotteslästerung" (blasphemy) but has no entries for this lemma.

101. Niederstätter, *Vorarlberger Urfehdbriefe* (see note 9), 36–37, no. 22 (1448, the first recorded "aberration from the ecclesiastical norm" in Vorarlberg, and in what was to become a later hotspot of the Anabaptist movement).

102. Vienna, Stadt- und Landesarchiv, H.A. Urk. 2152.

103. The motives of Duke (later King) Albrecht to incarcerate and subsequently murder the wealthier Viennese Jews and expel the poorer ones along with the entire Jewry of the duchy are manifold and still subject of debate; see Brugger, "Wiener Gesera" (see note 70). Petr Elbel and Wolfram Ziegler argue for a predominantly financial motive; in addition to the rather problematic single-cause explanation, they base their main argument—that Albrecht would gain rich spoils from the Jews' wealth—on mere speculation; see id., "Am schwarzen suntag mardert man dieselben juden, all die zaigten vill guets an under der erden. . . Die Wiener Gesera—eine Neubetrachtung," Avigdor, Benesch, Gitl—*Juden in Böhmen und Mähren im Mittelalter. Samuel Steinherz zum Gedenken*, ed. Helmut Teufel, Pavel Kocman, and Milan Řepa (Brno, Prague, and Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2016), 201–68. On the connection of Jews and Hussites, see Heil, *Gottesfeinde* (see note 104), 302–97, and Israel Jacob Yuval, "Juden, Hussiten und Deutsche: nach einer hebräischen Chronik" *Juden in der christlichen Umwelt während des späten Mittelalters*, ed. Alfred Haverkamp and Franz-Josef Ziwes (Berlin: Duncker&Humblot, 1992), 59–102 (Hebrew version in *Zion. A Quarterly for Research in Jewish History* 54 [1989]: 275–319).

104. The practicing of magic appears frequently as an anti-Jewish accusation and is particularly closely tied to the blood libels, see *From Witness to Witchcraft: Jews and Judaism in Medieval Christian Thought*, ed. Jeremy Cohen. Wolfenbütteler Mittelalter Studien, 11 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996), in particular the contribution by Anna Foa, "The Witch and the Jew: Two Alikes That Were Not the Same," 361–74; see further Johannes Heil, "Gottesfeinde—Menschenfeinde." *Die Vorstellung von jüdischer Weltverschwörung (13. bis 16. Jahrhundert)*.

Antisemitismus: Geschichte und Strukturen, 3 (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2006), 211–24.

105. As representatives of the immense amount of literature on witchcraft, magic, and witch-hunts, see the surveys by Jonathan Durrant and Michael David Bailey, *Historical Dictionary of Witchcraft* (Lanham, Maryland; Toronto; and Plymouth: The Scarecrow Press, sec. ed. 2012); Brian A. Pavlac, *Witch Hunts in the Western World. Persecution and Punishment from the Inquisition to the Salem Trials* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2009); the series *Palgrave Historical Studies of Witchcraft and Magic*, and the Witchcraft Bibliography Project Online, online at <http://witchcraftbib.blogspot.com/> (last accessed on March 15, 2021). See also *Magic and Magicians in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times. The Occult in Pre-modern Sciences, Medicine, Literature, Religion, and Astrology*, ed. Albrecht Classen. *Fundamentals of Medieval and Early Modern Culture*, 20 (Berlin and Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2017).

106. Niederstätter, *Vorarlberger Urfehdebriefe* (see note 9), 172–74, no. 220 and 175, no. 222: “das ich aber widersprochen und gar nit gestendig sein wöllen [. . .]. Ich aber weder guottlich noch peinlich nichts confitieren und bekhenen wollen, sondern des alles widersprach” (but I, neither under questioning nor torture, wanted to confess and admit, but contradicted all of it). On the refusal to confess as a survival strategy, see also Pavlac, *Witch Hunts* (see note 105), 141.

107. Niederstätter, *Vorarlberger Urfehdebriefe* (see note 9), 136–38, no. 175 (1552). Interestingly, Erhart served again as a *Landammann* in later years.

108. The Bishop of Regensburg had, on his way to Rome, requested a copy of the court transcripts of the ongoing trial; upon his return, he was handed an excerpt that included a testimony of the convert Wolfgang who had confessed to these earlier ritual murders; see Treue, *Trienter Judenprozeß* (see note 5), 98; Schmitt, “Regensburger Öffentlichkeit” (see note 6), 49.

109. For example, Salzburg, Passau (see earlier).

110. A facsimile is provided by Elvira Topalović and Iris Hille, “Perspektivierung von Wirklichkeit(en) im Hexenprozess,” currently accessible online at <https://langzeitarchivierung.bib-bvb.de/wayback/20190716084903/https://www.historicum.net/themen/hexenforschung/thementexte/unterrichtsmaterialien/hille/> (last accessed on March 15, 2021); in their edition, they misread *Burgerschaft* as *Schwagerschaft* (relatives, kinship); the latest edition by Johannes Hasselbeck and Robert Zink, “*So wirdt die ganze Burgerschaft verbrenndt . . .*” *Der Brief des Bamberger Bürgermeisters Johannes Junius aus dem Hexengefängnis 1628*. Veröffentlichungen des Stadtarchivs Bamberg, 15 (Bamberg: Stadtarchiv, 2013).

111. For another example of a Jewish man issuing a *Hafturfehde* for his imprisoned child, see Munich, BHStA, RRU 1805 (1371: David of Straubing swears *Urfehde* to the city council of Regensburg and promises not to take [legal] action because of the imprisonment of his child by the knight Pärbingen).

112. . . . *mit ander judischkait*. Munich, BHStA, Hochstift Urkunden Passau, Nr. 2301 (1478 IV 7).

113. Wiedl, “Salzburger Erzbischof” (see note 28). Unfortunately, there is no recent analysis of the Passau persecutions; see Moritz Stern, “Der Passauer

Judenprozeß 1478,” *Jeschurun. Monatsschrift für Lehre und Leben im Judentum* 15 (1928): 541–60 and 647–76, also as a separate print; briefly mentioned likewise by Wolfgang Maria Schmid, “Zur Geschichte der Juden in Passau,” *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland* 2 (1929/30): 119–35; here 129 and 133–35.

114. Lehnertz, “Hafturfehden“ (see note 7), 172, no. 171.

115. While those derogatory markers (yellow or red badge or wheel, felt tables), to be worn on the outer garment, had been introduced by both ecclesiastical and secular law in England, France, and Hungary (and also Spain) already during the thirteenth century, the main identifier in the Holy Roman Empire was the Jewish hat, a pointed headgear. For the origins of which are still discussed, see Sara Lipton, *Dark Mirror. The Medieval Origins of Anti-Jewish Iconography* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2014), 16–45. While it acquired a more derogatory connotation as the mandatory attribute of church law and was used as a symbol of shame also in the Christian context, it not only served as a neutral, even appreciatory indicator of a person’s Jewishness in Central European Christian art (e.g., the poet Stübkind of Trimberg, see Birgit Wiedl, “Jews and Anti-Jewish Fantasies in Christian Imagination in the Middle Ages,” *Imagination and Fantasy in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Time. Projections, Deams, Monsters, and Illusions*, ed. Albrecht Classen. Fundamentals of Medieval and Early Modern Culture, 24 [Berlin and Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2020], 573–606; here 585–88), but it was also used by Jewish men and women as a self-identifier in manuscripts and on seals; see Lehnertz, *Judensiegel im spätmittelalterlichen Reichsgebiet* (see note 69); for coins, see Eva Haverkamp, “Jewish Images on Christian Coins: Economy and Symbolism in Medieval Germany,” *Jews and Christians in Medieval Europe: The Historiographical Legacy of Bernhard Blumenkranz*, ed. Philippe Buc, Martha Keil, and John V. Tolan (Turnhout: Brepols, 2016), 189–226. The woodcuts that spread the host desecration allegations of Passau in 1478 (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Host_desecration#/media/File:Host_desecration1.jpg, last accessed on March 15, 2021) and a portable altar from Lower Austria from around 1470 (Wiedl, see earlier, 596, Figure 6) were among the first that showed the circular badge as an identifier of the respective person’s Jewishness.

116. Andernacht, *Regesten Frankfurt* 2.1 (see note 21), 109, no. 595 and 163, no. 858.

117. Munich, Stadtarchiv, Urk A VII e Nr. 602 (letter to Munich), and Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, Hs. 480, fol. 111v (copy of letter to Linz), see Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten* 4 (see note 85), 291–93, nos. 2310 and 2311.

118. See generally Guy Geltner, “Coping in Medieval Prisons,” *Continuity and Change. A Journal of Social Structure, Law and Demography in Past Societies* 23.1 (2008): 151–72 (predominantly Italian examples).

119. See the survey by Alexander Murray, *Suicide in the Middle Ages*. Vol. 1: *The Violent against Themselves*, Vol. 2: *The Curse on Self-Murder* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999, 2000).

120. In 2007, the World Health Organization issued a paper called “Preventing Suicides in Prison,” online at https://www.who.int/mental_health/prevention/suicide/resource_jails_prisons.pdf (last accessed on March 15, 2021), in which they stated that “suicide is often the single most common cause of death in correctional settings”

(1). For medieval examples, see Murray, *Suicide I* (see note 119), particularly 185–91 (example Paris).

121. On the pogrom of Wrocław, see Willy Cohn, “Capistrano, ein Breslauer Judenfeind in der Mönchskutte,” *Menorah. Jüdisches Familienblatt für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Literatur* 4.5 (1926): 263–65; Marcus Brann, “Geschichte der Juden in Schlesien IV: 1437–1526,” *Jahresbericht des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars Fraenckel’scher Stiftung 1907* (Wrocław: Schatzky, 1907), 105–50 and LXXI–LXXVI; here 115–38 (from Capistrano’s arrival in Breslau/Wrocław until the aftermath of the persecution); generally, see Jürgen Heyde, *Transkulturelle Kommunikation und Verflechtung. Die jüdischen Wirtschaftseliten in Polen vom 14. bis zum 16. Jahrhundert*. Deutsches Historisches Institut Warschau, Quellen und Studien, 29 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2014).

122. Brann, “Geschichte der Juden in Schlesien” (see note 121), 130–33.

123. For Meir of Rothenburg and the Regensburg imprisonment from 1476–1480, see above notes 3 and 6; for the incarceration from 1391, see Lehnertz, *Judensiegel im spätmittelalterlichen Reichsgebiet* (see note 69), 240.

124. Gerd Mentgen, “Der Würfelzoll und andere antijüdische Schikanen in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit,” *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung* 22 (1995): 1–48; here 45–46; Norbert Schnitzler, “Judenfeindschaft, Bildnisfrevl und das mittelalterliche Strafrecht,” *Bilder, Texte, Rituale. Wirklichkeitsbezug und Wirklichkeitskonstruktion politisch-rechtlicher Kommunikationsmedien in Stadt- und Adelsgesellschaften des späten Mittelalters*, ed. Klaus Schreiner and Gabriela Signori. *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung, Beihefte*, 24 (Berlin: Duncker&Humboldt, 2000), 111–38; here 133–35.

125. Mentgen, *Studien* (see note 76), 380–81, with no. 203. Another example is the suicide of Michael of Magdeburg in the prison of Trier in 1527, see *GJ* 3.1 (see note 23), 783 (art. Magdeburg).

126. Mitchell B. Merback, *The Thief, the Cross, and the Wheel. Pain and the Spectacle of Punishment in Medieval and Renaissance Europe* (London: Reaktion Books, 1999), 135–36. On the corpses of executed persons in general, see Schmitz-Esser, *Leichnam im Mittelalter* (see note 77), 492–95.

127. *GJ* 3.2 (see note 23), 1012 and 1031.

128. Treue, *Trienter Judenprozeß* (see note 5), 85, 104, 176, 182, with no. 20, who argues that the Christian authorities wanted to make Moses’s death look like a suicide. In Frankfurt in 1522, the corpse of a Jew who had hanged himself was brought outside the city by the executioner and burned there, Emperor Charles V claimed his property; see Andernacht, *Regesten Frankfurt 2.1* (see note 21), 16–17, nos. 83–84.

129. *Hebräische Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen während des Ersten Kreuzzuges*, ed. Eva Haverkamp. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Hebräische Texte aus dem mittelalterlichen Deutschland*, 1 (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2005); eadem, “Martyrs in Rivalry: the 1096 Jewish Martyrs and the Thebean Legion,” *Jewish History* 23 (2009): 319–42; Susan Einbinder, “The Jewish Martyrs of Blois,” *Medieval Hagiography. An Anthology*, ed. Thomas F. Head (New York, NY: Garland Pub., 2000), 537–60; eadem, “Pucellina of Blois: Romantic myths and narrative conventions,” *Jewish History* 12 (1998): 29–46; Simha Goldin, *The Ways*

of *Jewish Martyrdom* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008); Israel J. Yuval, *Two Nations in your Womb: Perceptions of Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. Trans. from the Hebrew by Barbara Harshav and Jonathan Chipman (2000; Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2006). Even in the fifteenth century, we still find similar narratives; see id., “Juden, Hussiten und Deutsche” (see note 103).

130. See Simha Goldin, “The Socialization for Kiddush ha-Shem among Medieval Jews,” *Journal of Medieval History* 23 (1997): 117–38; Ivan G. Marcus, “A Pious Community and Doubt: Qiddush ha-Shem in Ashkenaz and the Story of R. Amnon of Mainz,” *Studien zur jüdischen Geschichte und Soziologie. Festschrift für Julius Carlebach* (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1992), 97–114; Menahem Ben-Sasson, “Remembrance and Oblivion of Religious Persecutions: On Sanctifying the Name of God (Qiddush ha-Shem) in Christian and Islamic Countries during the Middle Ages,” *Jews, Christians, and Muslims in Medieval and Early Modern Times: A Festschrift in Honor of Mark R. Cohen*, ed. Arnold Efem Franklin, Roxani Eleni Margariti, Marina Rustow, and Uriel Simonsohn. Christians and Jews in Muslim Societies, 2 (Boston, MA.: Brill, 2014), 169–94; Gerd Mentgen, “Kiddusch ha-Schem—Selbstopferung als Glaubenszeugnis der Juden im Mittelalter,” *Zeugnis und Zeugenschaft: Perspektiven aus der Vormoderne*, ed. Wolfram Drews and Heike Schlie. Trajekte (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2011), 151–66.

131. Forced baptism was condemned by Pope Gregory I in the sixth century; the papal protection bull *Sicut Iudeis* was first issued by Calixt II in ca. 1120 and re-issued by most medieval popes; see Shlomo Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews, Documents: 492–1404* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1988), 68, 143, 211, 242, 245–46, 249, 254, 260, 265, 396, 430, 507. However, according to a papal decree in 1267, the relapse to Judaism—theoretically, only of “voluntary” converts—was equaled to heresy and punishable by death, which was adapted in many customary and municipal laws; see Magin, “*Wie es umb der iuden recht stet*” (see note 49), 164–84; during the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, theologians argued for an acceptance of forced baptism as a legitimate means of conversion. For the vast amount of literature on Jewish converts, see Simha Goldin, “*Are You Still My Brother?*” *Apostasy and Identity in High Middle Ages Northern Europe* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014); for an overview over the academic discussion, see Franziska Klein, *Die Domus Conversorum und die Konvertiten des Königs. Fürsorge, Vorsorge und jüdische Konversion im mittelalterlichen England*. Europa im Mittelalter. Abhandlungen und Beiträge zur historischen Komparatistik, 37 (Berlin and Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2021), 8–13, with a summary of the research literature.

132. Krems, *Stadtarchiv*, Urk. 1421 IX 27.

133. Martha Keil, “What Happened to the ‘New Christians’? The ‘Viennese Geserah’ of 1420/21 and the forced Baptism of the Jews,” *Jews and Christians in Medieval Europe: The Historiographical Legacy of Bernhard Blumenkranz*, ed. Philippe Buc, eadem, and John V. Tolan. Religion and Law in Medieval Christian and Muslim Societies (Turnhout: Brepols, 2016), 97–114; here 113–14.

134. On the possibility of returning to Judaism after conversion see Ephraim Kanarfogel, “Returning to the Jewish Community in Medieval Ashkenaz: History and

Halakhah” *Turim. Studies in Jewish History and Literature Presented to Dr. Bernard Lander*, Vol. 1, ed. Michael A. Shmidman (New York, NY: Touro College Press, 2007), 69–97; id., “Returning Apostates and Their Marital Partners in Medieval Ashkenaz,” *Contesting Inter-Religious Conversion in the Medieval World*, ed. Yaniv Fox and Yosi Yisraeli (London and New York: Routledge, 2017), 160–76.

135. Andernacht, *Regesten Frankfurt* 1.2 (see note 21), 457, no. 1777 (1472). For other examples see, Frankfurt, *GJ* 3.1 (see note 23) (art. Frankfurt), 359, and Cologne, id., 222–23 (art. Köln), both 1513 (reason for incarceration is unclear in these cases).

136. Wiedl, “Salzburger Erzbischof” (see note 28).

137. Treue, *Trienter Judenprozeß* (see note 5), 85 and 112; another convert was executed even more painfully since he had “confessed” to additional crimes such as poisoning during his interrogation. On fire as a specific way of execution for (among others) heretics, witches, and sodomites (but without mentioning of Jews), see Schmitz-Esser, *Leichnam im Mittelalter* (see note 77), 555–91; Kolpacoff Deane, *History of Medieval Heresy* (see note 97), 114–15.

138. On the “Jewish punishment” of being hanged upside down and between dogs, see Mentgen, “Würfelf Zoll” (see note 124), 46–47; Schnitzler “Judenfeindschaft” (see note 124); id., “Juden vor Gericht. Soziale Ausgrenzung durch Sanktionen,” *Herrschaftliches Strafen seit dem Hochmittelalter*, ed. Hans Schlosser, Rolf Sprandel, and Dietmar Willoweit. *Konflikt, Verbrechen und Sanktion in der Gesellschaft Alteuropas, Symposien und Synthesen*, 5 (Cologne, Vienna, and Weimar: Böhlau 2002), 285–308; here 293 and 302–03; Winfried Frey, “‘Woelt Gott man hing sie wie die Hund.’ Vergleiche von Juden mit Hunden in deutschen Texten des Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit,” *Das Mittelalter: Perspektiven mediävistischer Forschung*, Vol. 12, Part 2: *Tier und Religion*, ed. Thomas Honegger and W. Günther Rohr (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2007), 119–34; Irven M. Resnick, “Good Dog/Bad Dog: Dogs in Medieval Religious Polemics,” *Enarratio: Publications of the Medieval Association of the Midwest* 18 (2013): 70–97; here 72–73; Wiedl, “Jews and Anti-Jewish Fantasies” (see note 115), 599–601; generally, Kenneth Stow, *Jewish Dogs: An Image and Its Interpreters. Continuity in the Catholic-Jewish Encounter*. *Stanford Studies in Jewish History and Culture* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006).

139. Wolfgang Behringer, *Hexen und Hexenprozesse in Deutschland*. Seventh rev. ed. (1988; Munich: dtv, 2010), 157. On the reverse practice, the disinterment and burning of suspected witches’ corpses, see Marita Genesis, “Archäologie der Angst. Apotropäische Praktiken auf den Richtstätten des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit als Zeichen von Aberglauben,” *Archäologie des Glaubens. Umbrüche und Konflikte*. *Mitteilungen der deutschen Gesellschaft für Archäologie des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit*, 31 (2018): 123–34; here 128–29.

140. Generally, Geltner, “Coping in medieval prisons” (see note 118), 152–53 and 161–62.

141. Irving A. Agus, *Rabbi Meir of Rothenburg. His Life and his Works as Sources for the Religious, Legal, and Social History of the Jews of Germany in the Thirteenth Century* (Philadelphia: The Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1947), 27.

142. Barbara Mattes, *Jüdisches Alltagsleben in einer mittelalterlichen Stadt*. Studia Judaica—Forschungen zur Wissenschaft des Judentums, XXIV (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2003), 30, with no. 100 (German translation of the Hebrew source). For the case of a Jewish woman who was imprisoned in Toledo and for whom the whole community plead to obtain her release for Sabbaths and holidays, see Shlomo Dov Goitein, “Autographs of Rabbi Yehuda Halevi” *Tarbiz* 25 (1955): 393–420; here 400 (Hebrew).

143. Schmitt, “Höre meine Stimme” (see note 6), 108–09.

144. Wilhelm Volkert, “Das Regensburger Judenregister von 1476,” *Festschrift für Andreas Kraus zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Pankraz Fried and Walter Ziegler. Münchner Historische Studien, Abt. Bayerisches Geschichte, 10 (Kallmünz: Verlag Michael Laßleben 1982), 115–141; here 120 and 135.

145. For example, Frankfurt in 1474, see Andernacht, *Regesten Frankfurt* 1.2 (see note 21), 461, no. 1793.

146. Schmitt, “Höre meine Stimme” (see note 6), 109.

147. Micha J. Perry, “Imaginary Space meets actual space in thirteenth-century Cologne: Eliezer ben Joel and the eruv,” *Images* 5 (2011): 26–36.

148. *Sefer Leket Joscher*, Vol. 1, ed. Joel Katan (Hebrew; Jerusalem: Machon Yerushalayim, 2010), #64. While some rabbis allowed to bring the food, others did not—and also Isserlein was reluctant to allow it.

149. Andernacht, *Regesten Frankfurt* 1.2 (see note 21), 461, no. 1793.

150. *GJ* 3.1 (see note 23), 377 (art. Frankfurt). The wealthy and well-respected physician had been incarcerated because he had claimed that aldermen had been lending money to Jews at interest, id., 362; on Salman, see further Mentgen, “Über die jüdische Hochzeitsfeier” (see note 44), 144–47. *Zynonge* remains unidentified, see id., 144–45.

151. Ber Boris Kotlerman, “‘Since I have learned of these evil tidings, I have been heartsick and I am unable to sleep.’ The Old Yiddish and Hebrew Letters from 1476 in the Shadow of Blood Libels of Northern Italy and Germany,” *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 102.1 (2012): 1–17. On Jewish literary activity in prison and about the time in prison, see Susan Einbinder, “Prison Prologues: Jewish Prison Writings from Late Medieval Aragon and Provence,” *The Journal of Medieval Religious Cultures*, 38.2 (2012): 137–58; for Christian examples, see: Joanna Summers, *Late Medieval Prison Writings and the Politics of Autobiography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004); Katherine Frances, “Memory and Identity in the Late Medieval Prison,” PhD diss., University of Manchester, 2013.

152. Andernacht, *Regesten Frankfurt* 1.1 (see note 21), 100, nos. 352 and 353. The Vitztum (steward, vicedominus) of Aschaffenburg advocated angrily on Fivis’s behalf, complaining to the Frankfurt city council about Fivis’s torture. He threatened to catch any person from Frankfurt “he could find” and keep them imprisoned until Fivis’s release.

153. Munich, BHStA, RRU 1478 Gemeiners Nachlass, Karton 12, fol. 1; Raphael Straus, *Urkunden und Aktenstücke zur Geschichte der Juden in Regensburg 1453–1738*. Quellen und Erörterungen zur Bayerischen Geschichte, Neue Folge, XVIII (Munich: C.H. Beck’sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1960), 170, no. 502 (with some mistakes in his reading).

See Schmitt, “Höre meine Stimme” (see note 6), 11–12; Kotlerman, “Since I have learned” (see note 151), 2–3; Jerold C. Frakes, *Early Yiddish Texts 1100–1750* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 79–81, no. 21 (with edition).

154. Behringer, *Hexen* (see note 139), 306–11, nos. 185 (Lempin) and 186 (Junius), see also Lempin’s letters, online at https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rebekka_Lemp (transcripts and originals; last accessed on March 15, 2021); for Junius’s letter see the latest edition by Hasselbeck and Zink, “*So wirdt die gantze Burgerschaftt verbrenndt . . .*” (see note 110); Topalović and Hille, “Perspektivierung von Wirklichkeit(en) im Hexenprozess” (see note 110) provide facsimiles of the originals and editions of Junius’s and other trial protocols and *Kassiber*. Generally, see Britta Gehm, *Die Hexenverfolgung im Hochstift Bamberg und das Eingreifen des Reichshofrates zu ihrer Beendigung*. Sec. rev. ed. (2000; Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 2013).

155. Munich, BHStA, RRU 1487 XI 26, see above; Schmitt, “Höre meine Stimme” (see note 6), 111, with no. 66.

156. Geltner, *Medieval Prison* (see note 2), 28–29.

157. See above note 3.

158. Treue, *Trienter Judenprozeß* (see note 5), 104.

159. Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten* 3 (see note 19), 369, no. 1763, with further literature.

160. See above for more.

161. The *Kaiserburg* was a bone of contention between the burgrave and the city from the fourteenth century onward (the latter in accordance with the Emperor), in 1427, the last burgrave sold the fortress to the city, see Birgit Friedel, *Die Nürnberger Burg. Geschichte, Baugeschichte und Archäologie*. Schriften des Deutschen Burgenmuseum, 1 (Petersberg: Imhof-Verlag, 2007).

162. Hruza, “Anno domini 1385” (see note 71), 139; Michael Toch, “Der jüdische Geldhandel in der Wirtschaft des deutschen Spätmittelalters: Nürnberg 1350–1499,” *Blätter für deutsche Landesgeschichte* 117 (1981): 283–310; here 285.

163. Lehnertz, *Judensiegel im spätmittelalterlichen Reichsgebiet* (see note 69), 240. Another *Hafturfehde* from Regensburg issued by Smoel and his family in 1398 mention the prison of the city’s cammerarius, see id., 254.

164. Schmitt, “Regensburger Öffentlichkeit” (see note 6), 49.

165. For example, Nuremberg, see Hruza, “Anno domini 1385” (see note 71), 139.

166. Gerd Mentgen, “Quellen zur Geschichte der Juden im Erzbistum Mainz (1348–1390),” *Corpus der Quellen zur Geschichte der Juden im spätmittelalterlichen Reich*, ed. Alfred Haverkamp and Jörg R. Müller (Trier and Mainz: Mainzer Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, 2016), no. 338, online at <http://www.medieval-ashkenaz.org/MZ02/MZ-c1-0091.html> (last accessed on March 15, 2021).

167. Isidor Kracauer, *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Juden in Frankfurt am Main von 1150 bis 1400*, Vol. 1 (Frankfurt a. M.: Kauffmann, 1914), 187–91, nos. 408 (German) and 409 (German in Hebrew letters/Yiddish).

168. See the examples above, further *GJ* 3.1 (see note 23), 614 (art. Kerpen): in 1476, for example, Count Johann V of Nassau plead Duke William III of Jülich-Berg to release the Jewish physician Master Jost.

169. Munich, BHStA, RRU 3741 (1384 July 22); Lehnertz, “Hafturfehden” (see note 7), 144.

170. Melchior Kirchhofer, “Beitrag zur Geschichte der Juden in der Schweiz,” *Der Schweizerische Geschichtsforscher* 4 (1821): 343–49; here 348.

171. In 1452, the Jew Semman from Treffurt issued a *Hafturfehde* in Mühlhausen (Thuringia) including all *formulae* we know from other *Hafturfehden*, but lacking the mention of an oath; Mühlhausen, Stadtarchiv, 0-948. This is also true for the *Hafturfehde* issued by his son Boragk (Barukh) from the same day; Mühlhausen, Stadtarchiv, 0-962.

172. Hiram Kümper, “Die Juden vor Gericht im Fürstenstaat der Aufklärung: Die Kontroverse um den Judeneid,” *Aschkenas. Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der Juden* 17 (2007): 499–518.

173. Ilona Steimann, “‘Das es dasselb puch sey:’ The Book as Protagonist in the Ceremony of the Jewry-Oath” *European Journal of Jewish Studies* 13 (2019): 77–102; Joseph Ziegler, “Reflections on the Jewry Oath in the Middle Ages,” *Church History* 29 (1992): 209–20; Amnon Linder, “The Jewry-Oath in Christian Europe,” *Jews in Early Christian Law: Byzantium and the Latin West, 6th–11th Centuries*, ed. John V. Tolan and Nicholas R.M. de Lange. Religion and Law in Medieval Christian and Muslim Societies, 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2014), 311–58; Andreas Lehnertz, “The Erfurt *Judeneid* between Pragmatism and Ritual: Some Aspects of Christian and Jewish Oath-Taking in Medieval Germany,” *Ritual Objects in Ritual Contexts*, ed. Claudia Bergmann and Maria Stürzebecher. Erfurter Schriften zur Jüdischen Geschichte, 6 (Jena and Quedlinburg: Bussert & Stadeler, 2020), 12–31.

174. Kracauer, *Urkundenbuch* (see note 167), 188, no. 408.

175. Holtze, *Strafverfahren* (see note 90), 76–77, no. d.

176. Schmucker, “‘mitt handtt vnd Mondtt angelobett’” (see note 36), 56.

177. Mentgen, “Quellen zur Geschichte der Juden im Erzbistum Mainz” (see note 166), no. 338, online at <http://www.medieval-ashkenaz.org/MZ02/MZ-c1-0091.html> (last accessed on March 15, 2021).

178. Lehnertz, “Hafturfehden” (see note 7), 148–49.

179. Lehnertz, “Hafturfehden” (see note 7), 151, with no. 83.

180. Munich, BHStA, RRU 1412 Mai 25 (1).

181. Florence Guggenheim-Grünberg, “Zur Umschrift deutscher Mundarten des 14./15. Jahrhunderts,” *Zeitschrift für Mundartforschung* 24 (1956): 229–46; here 244–45; Frakes, *Early Yiddish Texts* (see note 153), 65–67, no. 15: ביי מיינע יודישע רעכט און אייד מיט אופגירקטן בייגן קיגן דער זונע. The municipality, too, noted this practice for Kussiel’s oath-taking procedure as “sworn with fingers raised toward to the sun” (*gesworen mit uffgearcktin fingern ken der sonnen*).

182. See, for example, the *Hafturfehde* of Christian Evert “the Frisian” in Leeuwarden, who declared in 1509 that he took his oath “with [my] fingers straightened up” (*met opgerichten fingeren*); Vries, “De ‘Hafturfehde’” (see note 9), 180–86. For another example from Frankfurt a. M. in 1377, see Schnur, “Quellen” (see note 76), no. 1261, online at <http://www.medieval-ashkenaz.org/FW02/FW-c1-029c.html> (last accessed on March 15, 2021).

183. Lehnertz, “Hafturfehden” (see note 7), 157.
184. Lehnertz, “Hafturfehden” (see note 7), 168.
185. Lehnertz, “Hafturfehden” (see note 7), 168.
186. Rolf Schmidt, “Judeneide in Augsburg und Regensburg. Mit einem Quellenanhang,” *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte: Germanistische Abteilung* 93 (1976): 322–39; here 336.
187. Lehnertz, *Judensiegel im spätmittelalterlichen Reichsgebiet* (see note 69); id., “Jewish Seals and Sealing Practices in the Holy Roman Empire. Authentication and Self-Representation,” *Medieval Ashkenaz. Papers in Honour of Alfred Haverkamp. Presented at the 17th World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem 2017*, ed. Christoph Cluse and Jörg R. Müller. *Forschungen zur Geschichte der Juden*, A 31 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2021), 226–40.