Competition and Cooperation: The Ambivalent Relationship between Jews and Christians in Early Modern Germany and Pennsylvania

In 1786 Aaron Levy, a Jewish immigrant from the Netherlands, laid out a town with wide streets and a town square in present-day Centre County, Pennsylvania. Levy had settled in the frontier town of Northumberland on the east bank of the Susquehanna River in the early 1770s, where he had set up a store and started speculating in frontier lands. After the Revolution, he acted as a land agent for wealthy Philadelphians such as Robert Morris and James Wilson, on whose behalf he acquired hundreds of thousands of acres. When Levy founded the town of Aaronsburg near Pennsylvania's geographical center, he hoped that it would become a future county seat, if not the eventual state capital. While these hopes were never realized, Aaron Levy is remembered for an extraordinary incident of benevolence toward his German-speaking Christian neighbors. Levy gave land in his new town to the Lutheran and Reformed settlers for a token sum and presented them with the gift of a pewter communion set. This gift provided the historical background for the staging of the "Aaronsburg Story" in October 1949—a public meeting and historical pageant, attended by thousands of people, celebrating Aaronsburg's heritage of tolerance.¹

One might argue that this act of benevolence between a Jew and his Christian neighbors could have occurred only under the special circumstances of religious freedom and social fluidity that existed on Pennsylvania's

postrevolutionary frontier. But recent research shows that such incidents occurred in the Old World as well, even in the settled traditional estate society of the Holy Roman Empire from which Levy’s Christian neighbors had come.

Abraham Jacob, the parnass (Jewish community leader) of the village of Steinbiedersdorf in Lorraine, donated large sums of money to the Christian and Jewish poor when he made his will in 1771. 2 When the Jewish community of Ichenhausen, a country town in east Swabia, built a new synagogue in 1781, the Augsburg gold- and silversmith Samuel Bardet, a master craftsman of Huguenot origin, is thought to have donated two silver stands for the Torah scrolls. 3

None of the three benefactors was completely disinterested: Aaron Levy wanted to attract German-speaking settlers to his new town, Abraham Jacob sought to stabilize the precarious legal position of the Jewish community in Steinbiedersdorf, and Samuel Bardet repeatedly received orders for Jewish cult objects. Nevertheless, these incidents hint at a pattern of interaction and cooperation between Jews and Christians in the early modern period. Only recently have historians of early modern Jewry begun to reassess the nature and impact of Jewish-Christian relations. This essay offers a review of the relevant scholarly literature on the relationship between Jews and Christians in the Holy Roman Empire and presents three case studies—two from early modern Germany, one from eighteenth-century Pennsylvania—which demonstrate how these relationships were acted out in particular communities in the Old and New Worlds.

I

The role of Jews in early modern central Europe, and their relationship to Christian society, has long been a neglected topic of study. Until relatively recently, historians’ evaluations of central European Jewry during the period

spanning roughly two and a half centuries between the expulsions of Jews in the late Middle Ages and the Reformation and the integration of Jews into an emerging bourgeoisie (the mid-sixteenth to the late eighteenth century) lacked unity and focus. Since the 1980s, the historiographical picture has changed considerably. In 1985, Jonathan I. Israel reassessed this period, describing the two centuries between 1550 and 1750 as a distinct era in the history of European Jewry. In his view, during these two centuries Jews were reintegrated into European society largely successfully while at the same time they retained a sizable measure of cultural cohesion and distinctiveness. Since 1985, a wealth of new research has substantially revised and modified the picture for many areas of the Holy Roman Empire, and recent histories of German Jewry are likewise devoting considerable attention to developments in the early modern period.

Despite this heightened scholarly interest, the history of Jews and their relationship to Christians in the early modern period remains an era hard to characterize. The story is marked by conflicting, sometimes contradictory trends, ambiguities, and profound ambivalences. As a consequence of the early modern shift of political power in the Holy Roman Empire from the emperor to the territorial sovereigns, jurisdiction over the Jewish population was fragmented among dozens of different secular and ecclesiastical rulers.


6 Mordechai Breuer and Michael Graetz, German-Jewish History in Modern Times, vol. 1, Tradition and Enlightenment, 1600–1780 (New York, 1996); Arno Herzig, Jüdische Geschichte in Deutschland: Von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart (Munich, 1997).
large and small. These rulers often used the privileges of Judenregal and Judenschutz to bolster their territorial ambitions and obtain revenue. While the authorities sought to exploit jurisdiction over the Jews to their own financial advantage, the privileges they granted gave Jews at least a minimum of security and protection. Moreover, in places where two or more rulers disputed the lines of authority, as in the Franconian community of Fuerth or the prince-abbey of Corvey in Westphalia, Jews were able to profit from conflicting jurisdictional claims and obtain a considerable measure of autonomy. The territorialization of jurisdiction over Jews in the Holy Roman Empire has its counterpart in the evolution of Landjudenschaften, largely autonomous, self-governing organizations of the Jews of a particular principality, which became the typical form of Jewish community organization in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Germany. The territorial and legal

7 Judenregal meant jurisdiction over Jewish subjects; Judenschutz referred to the protection of Jewish subjects in return for fees and taxes. In practice the distinction often blurred.


9 Until the early eighteenth century, jurisdiction in Fuerth was divided between the margravate of Ansbach and the cathedral provost of Bamberg, with the imperial city of Nuremberg also claiming certain rights. By 1720, about 1,500 of the roughly 5,700 inhabitants of Fuerth were Jewish. See Gerhard Renda, "Fürth, das 'bayerische Jerusalem'," in Manfred Treml and Josef Kirmeyer, eds., Geschichte und Kultur der Juden in Bayern: Aufsätze (Munich, 1988), 225–36; Friedrich Battenberg, "Juden am Reichskammergericht in Wetzlar: Der Streit um die Privilegien der Judenschaft in Fürth," in Bernhard Diestelkamp, ed., Die politische Funktion des Reichskammergerichts (Cologne, 1993), 181–213; Israel, European Jewry, 42–43, 98–99, 169; Breuer and Graetz, German-Jewish History, 83, 142.

10 In this small ecclesiastical territory, the only town, Höxter, was able to preserve a large measure of autonomy from the prince-abbot until the latter half of the seventeenth century. Moreover, Höxter's traditional patrons, the Dukes of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, also sought to influence the territory's Jewish policy. See Jörg Deventer, Das Abseits als sicherer Ort? Jüdische Minderheit und christliche Gesellschaft im Alten Reich am Beispiel der Fürstabtei Corvey (1550–1807) (Paderborn, 1996).

fragmentation of the Holy Roman Empire sets apart the history of Jews in early modern Germany from that of the more centralized western European states like England, where the central governmental institutions of king and parliament set the standards for a more uniform Jewish policy.12

Jewish society in early modern Germany was also geographically dispersed and highly stratified. After Jews were expelled from most urban centers in the fifteenth century, only a handful of major cities retained significant Jewish populations. The free imperial cities of Frankfurt and Worms remained major centers of Jewish life, as did the imperial residences of Prague and Vienna (from which Jews were expelled in 1669/70 but later readmitted) and the rising seventeenth-century metropolises of Hamburg and Berlin.13 While the economic and cultural life of the Jewish communities in these urban centers had a significant impact beyond the cities themselves, the vast majority of central European Jews lived in scattered small towns and villages, where they had reconstituted their family and social life after a long and rather complex process of migration and resettlement in the wake of the expulsions.14 It is in the countryside, therefore, that most interactions between Christians and Jews in early modern Germany took place.

---


Socially, Jewish society in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was highly differentiated. At one end of the spectrum, an economic elite of court Jews arose during and after the Thirty Years' War. In an era in which princes lacked the resources and administrative capacities to rebuild their ravaged territories and fulfill their ambitions for courtly splendor and military glory, court Jews mobilized the necessary financial means through networks of kinsmen and coreligionists and obtained military supplies, precious metals, jewelry, and a variety of other goods and services. Most court Jews were more or less inevitably men of two worlds, straddling the cultural divide between baroque court society and leadership in local Jewish communities.\(^6\)

At the other end of the social pyramid, a large portion of the Jewish population had to eke out a precarious existence as transient peddlers, vagrants, and beggars. The appearance of organized bands of indigent Jews in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries caused much-exaggerated fears of Jewish crime.\(^6\)

Finally, relations between Jews and Christians in the early modern Holy Roman Empire were marked by diversity and ambiguity. To be sure, Jews virtually everywhere were subjected to legal restrictions and denied


citizenship. Christopher Friedrichs has emphasized, however, that equivalent restrictions applied to other groups in the estate society of the Holy Roman Empire including women, journeymen and apprentices, Christian confessional minorities like the Anabaptists, and transient people.17 There is also no doubt that anti-Judaic stereotypes, prejudices, and superstitions persisted into the early modern period and shaped the attitudes of many Christians. Images of Jews as blasphemers, usurers, and even as ritual murderers who used Christian blood in magical rites lingered through the centuries and were easily reactivated on many occasions.18 But despite widespread hatred and contempt for Jews among both elites and common folk, and notwithstanding the many legal restrictions circumscribing Jewish existence in early modern Germany, recent research demonstrates that interaction and cooperation between Jews and their Christian neighbors was much more frequent, widespread, and multifaceted than has long been recognized.

Thus we now know, for example, that many sick people in cities like Cologne turned to Jewish doctors rather than to university-trained, but often not very successful, Christian practitioners of medicine.19 Christian artists and artisans produced sacred objects for Jewish households and synagogues, and Jewish and Christian scholars, printers, and merchants collaborated in the production of Hebrew books.20 Friedrich Battenberg has recently argued

17 Christopher Friedrichs, "Jews in the Imperial Cities: A Political Perspective" in Hsia and Lehmann, In and Out of the Ghetto, 275–88.
that the evidence for either segregation or integration of Jewish and Christian society in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries should be seen as part of a complex picture that has to take into account the social differentiation of early modern Jewry as well as the discrepancies between official norms and religious ideologies and everyday social practice.21

Since most interactions between Christians and Jews took place in small towns and villages where members of the two religious groups lived and worked in close proximity, the extent of cooperation and conflict, integration and exclusion in village life merits particular attention. Therefore, the remainder of this essay will focus on the everyday forms of interaction at the microlevel of small communities.22 By concentrating on the southwestern part of the Holy Roman Empire, particularly east Swabia and the Upper Rhine Valley, we will show how recent local and regional studies have revealed a surprising diversity and complexity of Jewish-Christian interaction. Moreover, most German-speakers who immigrated to North America in the eighteenth century came from the small towns and villages of the southwest, a politically and confessionally fragmented area without a dominating cultural center.23 The patterns of exchange between Jews and Christians in that region are therefore likely to have had a lasting influence on their perceptions of the Jewish minority. The final portion of the essay will examine the contacts between Jews and German immigrants in the town of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, and interpret these interactions in a comparative, transatlantic perspective. While students of North American Jewry have


22 Claudia Ulbrich's study of the Lorraine village of Steinbiedersdorf, which belonged to the small principality of Kriechingen, examines the life of Christian and Jewish women in the eighteenth century. As the subtitle suggests, the focus of this innovative microhistorical study is the relationship between power, gender, and religion in a Catholic community with a large Jewish population under the jurisdiction of a distant Protestant territorial lord. Brief biographies sketch the experiences of Jewish and Christian women for different social ranks. Ulbrich, Shulamit und Margarethe.

unearthed a wealth of material on Jewish life in the colonial period, there is still a paucity of systematic community studies on Jewish-Christian—let alone Jewish-German—encounters. Thus the essay seeks to acquaint American readers with recent developments in German-Jewish scholarship and to point out the significance of this body of scholarly work for the Atlantic history of Jews and German-speaking gentiles.

II

After the Jews had been expelled from Augsburg (1438–40) and Ulm (1499), the two major urban centers of east Swabia, Jewish resettlement in the region concentrated in small principalities like the counties of Oettingen-Oettingen and Oettingen-Wallerstein or in territories in which sovereignty and jurisdictional rights were disputed between two or more parties. The most important principality in east Swabia characterized by competing claims to authority (territorium non clausum) was the margravate of Burgau, a largely rural patch of the Habsburg Vorlande, also known as outer Austria, around the small town of Günzburg. The relative weakness of Habsburg rule and the correspondingly strong position of local nobles and ecclesiastical institutions created a kind of power vacuum. Competing authorities attempted to use jurisdiction over Jews—through the instruments of Judenregal and Judenschutz—to enlarge or secure their respective spheres of influence. In the later sixteenth century, the representatives of Habsburg rule in the margravate allowed Jews to settle in a number of villages, often against strenuous resistance from local noblemen, patricians, and ecclesiastical institutions. While the expulsion of the Jews from four Burgau towns in 1617 represented a temporary backlash, both territorial and local rulers in the margravate mostly tended to favor Jewish settlement as a source of revenue and prestige during and after the Thirty Years' War. This change in local attitudes became a major factor in the stabilization and growth of Jewish communities in Burgau between 1650 and 1750.24

Characteristically, a uniform legislation regulating Jewish settlement and activity in the margravate of Burgau never developed. Police ordinances and local regulations varied from place to place and often were contractual compromises between the interests of the Habsburg rulers, local authorities, and the Jewish communities themselves. By petitioning the Habsburg government in Innsbruck against oppressive and arbitrary measures by local lords, Jewish communities were able repeatedly to trigger Habsburg intervention on their behalf. While Jewish appeals to the imperial courts, still frequent in the sixteenth century, occurred only rarely after 1600, the special protective relationship between the Habsburg emperor and the Jews that was a legacy of the Middle Ages remained an important element in the historical consciousness and self-image of the Burgau Jews. They painted the Habsburg double eagle on their houses and used imperial symbols on their cult objects. This special imperial relationship, which was perpetuated through the services which the Swabian court Jews rendered the house of Habsburg, was not, however, entirely benign. In the early eighteenth century, the emperor attempted to exploit it by reviving his long-dormant power of taxing the Jews directly.\(^{25}\)

The Jews of the margravate of Burgau conceived of themselves as a unified body, known as *Medinat Schwaben*, and had their own rabbi as early as 1525. According to Stefan Rohrbacher’s research in Hebrew sources, the country Jews of sixteenth-century Burgau were anything but provincial in their outlook. Before the Thirty Years’ War, two of their elected rabbis were Italian scholars. The prominent merchant family of Ulma-Günzburg produced several rabbinical scholars and had kinship ties to leading Jewish families in Frankfurt and Cracow.\(^{26}\) After the war, the Burgau Jews were again organized in a representative body of the territory’s household heads (Judenlandtag), but their autonomy was now curtailed and the territorial and

---


local authorities frequently intervened in intra-Jewish disputes. On the local level, the Jewish community leaders or barnossen fulfilled functions of tax collection and arbitration, which gave them a role similar to that of local officials among Christian villagers. In communities like Binswangen, Buttenwiesen, and Kriegshaber where, by the eighteenth century, Jews constituted between one-third and two-thirds of the local population, the construction of lavishly decorated synagogues and the presence of rabbis and cantors testified to the continuing vitality of Jewish spiritual life.\(^{27}\)

The margravate's self-interested but relatively tolerant economic policy enabled the Burgau Jews to carve out important economic niches for themselves as horse and cattle traders, peddlers, moneylenders, and pawnbrokers. Sabine Ullmann's painstaking research in administrative protocols has turned up a wealth of information on Jewish credit and commerce, which reveals the central importance of this religious minority in the agrarian exchange economy as well as in town-country relations. Analyzing the economic activities of Jews from the Swabian villages of Pfersee, Kriegshaber, Binswangen, and Buttenwiesen, Ullmann demonstrates that commercial specialization and the delineation of specific trade districts helped to reduce competition between Jewish traders. While traders from Kriegshaber, Binswangen, and Buttenwiesen focused on the horse and cattle trade and the provision of credit to villagers, Pfersee's pawnbrokers and jewelers were oriented toward the nearby city of Augsburg. Besides, Jewish traders offered such diverse goods as grain, fruit, flax, hides, leather, clothing, and iron goods, and they had customers among all segments of rural society, from public officials and the village elite of millers, butchers, and innkeepers, to small landholders and rural craftsmen.

Trading patterns between Jews and Christians show that the Swabian Jews were sensitive to the needs and requirements of a cash-starved agrarian population; they provided short- as well as long-term credit and accepted payment in kind as well as in cash according to the individual circumstances of the transaction. These exchange relationships, Ullmann concludes, were characterized by economic rationality and conformed to prevailing market conditions. Many peasants did business with the same Jewish traders over a number of years, and the regular dealings between Jews and Christians in private houses or public inns may occasionally have developed into cordial

social relationships. While they remained excluded from the imperial city of Augsburg, Jewish pawnbrokers living in the neighboring village of Pfersee were able to establish close economic ties with many of the city’s inhabitants. A number of restrictive mandates issued by the city council and vehement protests by Augsburg’s traders’ and artisans’ guilds blended fears of economic competition with traditional anti-Judaic stereotypes. But these did not keep urban gold- and silversmiths and craftsmen in the textile and clothing industries from doing business with Jews.  

These economic activities confirm what the social structure and topography of their settlements suggest, namely that the Jewish communities were an integral part of Swabian village society. Due to restrictions on real estate ownership, Jewish houses tended to be more crowded than those of their Christian neighbors and to be concentrated in certain areas of each village. But this did not lead to any ghettoization. Instead, Jewish and Christian villagers lived in close proximity to one another, and Jewish houses often stood in or near the village centers. In Buttenwiesen, the synagogue was erected directly opposite the Catholic church. The social structure of the Jewish communities also mirrored that of village society as a whole: there were significant wealth differences between an upper stratum of prosperous merchants and a large group of middling and small traders, peddlers, and servants. In general, the communities of Pfersee and Kriegshaber near the city of Augsburg, where several rich court Jews resided, were considerably wealthier than the more remote rural communities of Binswangen or Buttenwiesen.


One of the most significant findings of Ullmann's research is that Jewish householders in east Swabia participated in the use of communal resources such as grazing rights on village pastures and meadows (Allmenden) and the right to bake their bread in communal ovens. The precise nature of these rights was fixed in contractual agreements between the Jewish and Christian communities within the village. Ullmann characterizes this peculiar arrangement as a system of “double communities,” in which a full-fledged Jewish community with its own internal hierarchies, officers, and institutions existed parallel to the Christian community within a particular village.

But Jews remained vulnerable, and hard times left them exposed as easy targets. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the use of the communal pastures became a persistent source of conflict between Jews and Christians, with the latter complaining that cattle traders overstocked the pastures and that Jewish traders’ herds could spread infectious diseases. Although Christians sometimes used anti-Judaic stereotypes in these conflicts, they were primarily economically motivated. Population growth and the increase of the cattle trade after 1650 intensified the competition for scarce resources in agrarian society.30

Even Christian and Jewish religious life was not as rigidly separated in east Swabia as one might imagine. On their religious day of rest, many Jewish families employed Christian “Sabbath maids,” who supplemented their income by doing essential household chores. Christian musicians performed at Jewish festivals, even during the Christian Lent season. The Catholic village pastors, whose monopoly on the performance of religious services was diminished by the display of Jewish rites, frequently polemicized against these practices and sought to maintain an exclusively Christian public sphere. Clergymen and some villagers also criticized the allegedly irreverent behavior of Jews during processions on Christian holidays, their business dealings on Sundays, and their “usurpation” of public spaces through the staging of outdoor wedding ceremonies or the erection of eruw fences on the Sabbath.31

---


31 Eruw fences delineated an area in which the strict Sabbath laws were relaxed.
While openly anti-Semitic violence was very rare in east Swabia and individual anti-Judaic acts, such as the desecration of graveyards and the summoning of the infamous dice toll, were mainly committed by strangers, occasional attacks do testify to lingering prejudice. While the imperial court in Rottweil heard a case between Kriegshaber peasant Michl Bruckhay and the Jewish cattle trader Hudel Hitzig in 1658-59, for example, Bruckhay's son and several of his friends took revenge on Hitzig one night by hurling stones at his window shutters and throwing a dead pig into his well. The anti-Judaic symbolism of the latter action was so obvious that everybody in the village would have understood it. The authorities, however, showed no leniency toward this kind of aggression, and Bruckhay had to pay a stiff fine.

Altogether, the evidence for economic cooperation, social interaction, and even neighborly contacts between Jews and Christians in east Swabian villages is so overwhelming that it is no longer possible to view the Jewry of early modern central Europe merely as an outcast group on the margins of Christian society. On the other hand, the numerous conflicts and persistent stereotypes which emerge from the sources clearly show that the relationships between Christians and Jews were often less than harmonious. Thus Rolf Kießling has argued that, while Jews remained strangers in village society, the manifold forms of everyday interaction helped to reduce tensions and kept lingering prejudices beneath the surface of ritualized patterns of interaction.

III

Like east Swabia, the Upper Rhine Valley, situated in the southwestern corner of the Holy Roman Empire, was characterized by a checkerboard

---

32 The dice toll was a particular manifestation of anti-Judaism. Christians sometimes arbitrarily collected dice from Jews as a form of toll or tax, thereby symbolically indicating Jewish worthlessness. Jews frequently resisted this form of insult. See Mentgen, "Der Würfnzoll," and Ullmann, Nachbarschaft und Konkurrenz, 462-64.


34 Kießling, "Zwischen Vertreibung und Emanzipation," 179.
pattern of Habsburg territories, numerous small principalities, and free imperial cities in the early modern period. While a considerable number of Jews lived in the Alsatian territories on the west bank of the Upper Rhine, Jewish settlement on the east bank of the river after the Thirty Years’ War concentrated in the Protestant margravate of Baden-Durlach, a territory dispersed over a wide area between the region around Karlsruhe in the north and the Swiss border in the south.

Unlike the Habsburg rulers in the margravate of Burgau, the margraves of Baden-Durlach were quite successful in their efforts to centralize state authority and impose uniform bureaucratic procedures in their scattered territories. Local noblemen played a minor role, and the towns’ rights of self-government were sharply circumscribed. In the second half of the eighteenth century, a reform-minded bureaucracy and a ruler with physiocratic interests even made Baden-Durlach (which was reunited with Catholic Baden-Baden in 1771) a kind of model for “enlightened despotism” in the southern part of the Holy Roman Empire.

Throughout the century, Baden-Durlach was also an area of significant emigration. Several hundred families from the principality joined the migratory stream to colonial North America between 1730 and 1775.

The margravate’s efforts to construct its own version of the “well-ordered police state” are evident in its Jewish policy as well. Between 1600 and 1800, the government issued at least 120 mandates and ordinances regulating Jewish life and settlement. The growth of Jewish communities in Baden

---


As in other German principalities, the issuing of letters of protection to Jewish residents was the state’s main instrument for regulating Jewish settlement and tapping Jewish financial resources. Obtaining a letter of protection was a decisive step in the career of a small town or village Jew in the early modern period, a necessary precondition for marrying, establishing a household, or starting a business. According to the law, letters of protection could not be inherited and might be revoked at any time. In 1738, the Baden-Durlach government also decreed that only one child—usually the eldest son—of a resident Jew was to be granted the privilege.

André Holenstein’s analysis of over one hundred petitions for letters of protection submitted to the margrave and his government between 1723 and 1801 demonstrates, however, that the government handled its own laws rather flexibly. Jewish fathers frequently petitioned for more than one son, and the government’s decisions on these cases usually took into account the applicant’s financial prowess, his familial circumstances, and the interests of the communities where the petitioner intended to reside. In their comments on these petitions, the villages and even the local Jewish communities likewise weighed their own economic and financial interests against the petitioners’ resources and connections. Wealthy Jews could influence the government’s decision in their favor by pointing out their commercial ties, making large donations to charitable institutions, paying exceptionally high prices for real estate, or promising to support indigent family and community members. The chances of foreign, poor, or indebted Jews receiving letters of protection were considerably lower, though even they sometimes obtained
limited residence privileges. In the final analysis, Holenstein convincingly demonstrates that Jews knew the territorial law and the bureaucratic process and developed strategies to use them to their advantage. The high percentage of favorable decisions rendered on Jewish petitions testifies to their successful employment of these strategies.\footnote{Holenstein, "Bitten um den Schutz."}

A closer look at the Jewish community in the Breisgau town of Emmendingen in the eighteenth century provides further information about Jewish life and Jewish-gentile relations in the margravate. A typical southwestern small town, Emmendingen grew from just a few hundred inhabitants in the later seventeenth century to approximately thirteen hundred in 1804. The first Jews appear in the sources in the 1670s, when a certain Löw obtained the local salt trading monopoly and operated the local mint for a few years. Continuous Jewish settlement, however, only started after the War of the Spanish Succession (1701–14). After five Jewish families from Switzerland and the Alsace had been permitted to take up residence in the town in 1716, Emmendingen’s Jewish community steadily grew to 164 members, 13 percent of the total population in 1804.

A source from 1797 sheds some light on the social composition of Emmendingen Jewry toward the end of the eighteenth century. The community included fifteen married couples, two widowers, five widows, a single man, sixty-five children living with their parents, and thirteen servants. While the average property of the twenty-three Jewish households was assessed at 576 guilders, there were marked differences in household wealth. At the bottom of the social hierarchy, unmarried iron trader Abraham Weil was listed as propertyless, fifty-nine-year-old schoolmaster Jakob Braunschweig and his wife possessed a modest 100 guilders, and five widows, who had to support a total of thirteen children, were each assessed at 300 guilders. On the other hand, five families owned between 900 and 3,500 guilders worth of property and employed twelve of the thirteen servants. The Jewish community paid a total of 488 guilders annually for its status of protection—a sum that roughly equaled the price of a modest house.\footnote{Michaela Schmöla-Häberlein, “Zwischen Integration und Ausgrenzung: Juden in der oberrheinischen Kleinstadt Emmendingen 1680–1800,” in Kiesling and Ullmann, Landjudentum, 363–97, esp. 366–72.}

The pattern of real estate ownership that emerges from the sources shows
that Emmendingen, like its counterparts in east Swabia, did not confine Jews to specific quarters but permitted them to occupy houses in the very center of the town and next to Christian neighbors. In 1727, Moses Godoy acquired a house in close proximity to the administrative building of the Burgvogtei and the Lutheran church. For the remainder of the century, Godoy's house was also used as the synagogue. In 1794, in order to enlarge their synagogue, the Jews of Emmendingen and neighboring Niederemmendingen acquired a neighboring house, borrowing 1,000 guilders from a local nobleman to finance the transaction. While some Jews rented their houses to Christians, as Baruch Weil did to the vinegar maker Autenrieth in 1787, others rented rooms in houses belonging to Christians.

As the enlargement of the synagogue indicates, a Jewish community structure had evolved by the last decades of the eighteenth century. The Jews of Emmendingen and neighboring Niederemmendingen had their own communal officers. The Judenschultheiss or Parnass acted as a civic leader and the Vorsinger (cantor) played a leading role in the spiritual life of the Jewish minority. The spacious Jewish graveyard of Emmendingen also served as the burial place of several communities in the countryside.  

A transaction which took place in 1785 reveals how closely Jews and Christians cooperated in the local real estate market. When Baron von Zink, a nobleman and public official, offered his house and land in the neighboring village of Niederemmendingen for sale, Andreas Mbringer and an Emmendingen Jew, Wolf Isaac Wertheimer, came forward and jointly offered to buy the property for the considerable sum of 1,650 guilders. Von Zink reserved the right to sell the estate to a higher bidder at public auction, but no higher price was offered. Mbringer was the son of a local magistrate (Stabhalter) and certainly not a poor man, but in order to acquire this prime piece of real estate near the village center, it made sense for him to join forces with a wealthy Jewish cattle trader from the neighboring town.  

The cattle trade was the mainstay of Jewish economic activity in Emmendingen, as in east Swabia, but Jews also exchanged grain, meat,

---

41 Schmöhlz-Häberlein, "Integration," 372–74, 386–87 and passim. The Jews in Alsatian and Lorraine villages in the western part of the Upper Rhine Valley also acquired real estate and lived in close proximity to their Christian neighbors: Haarscher, Les Juifs du Comté de Hanau-Lichtenberg, 55–59; Ulbrich, Shulamit und Margarete, 192–95, 199.

42 Stadtarchiv Emmendingen, Gerichtsprotokoll Niederemmendingen 1775 [sic], Oct. 25, 1785 and Nov. 7, 1785.
clothes, and iron with their Christian neighbors as well as loaning them money, usually in small amounts. The Emmendingen sources show that Jews occasionally borrowed money from Christian inhabitants, even from administrative officials or government institutions. In 1760, for example, the elder Jakob Weil obtained a loan of 141 guilders from the margrave’s Burgvogtei in order to acquire a garden, and Moses Weil borrowed 300 guilders from Hofrat Wild, a member of the central government in Karlsruhe. Johann Wilhelm Zimmermann (1700–1788), burgomaster and for several decades the richest man in Emmendingen, also loaned money to several Jews in the town and district.

On some occasions, Christians assisted Jews in striking ways which suggest that Jewish integration into local society had made substantial progress by the late eighteenth century. When Parnass Jonas Weil’s barn caught fire in April 1788, his Christian neighbors helped to extinguish the flames “at the risk of their lives,” as the town’s account books tell us, and the bread and wine distributed among the helpers were paid for from the public treasury. That same year Weil and two Christian neighbors received 117 guilders from the town’s communal fire insurance to cover the damages. After soldiers quartered both in Christian and Jewish households damaged Weil’s house in 1792, the town again paid for repairs. Some sources even indicate a gradual accommodation of Jewish and Christian lifestyles in certain areas. When Hertzel (Naftali) Weil married Schena Dreifuß from the nearby market village of Eichstetten in 1775, the town council permitted them to hold a dance at the town hall, and Jewish dances and festivities in

43 The sources record about thirty such cases in the period 1720–1800.
44 Schmölz-Häberlein, “Integration,” 376–81; Schmölz-Häberlein, “Johann Wilhelm Zimmermann (1700–1788), Bürgermeister von Emmendingen: Eine biographische Annäherung an Handlungsspielräume und Sozialbeziehungen in einer südwestdeutschen Kleinstadt” in Wilbertz and Scheffler, Biographieforschung und Stadtgeschichte, 70–95. André-Marc Haarscher and Sabine Ullmann also found evidence that Jews were indebted to Christians in rural Alsace and east Swabia, respectively: Haarscher, Les Juifs du Comté de Hanau-Lichtenberg, 126; Ullmann, Nachbarschaft und Konkurrenz, 448–50. In a recent study of Jews in the small imperial city of Offenburg, situated about thirty miles north of Emmendingen, Irmgard Schwanke demonstrated that the Jewish minority, present there from the 1620s to 1680, engaged in economic activities and credit practices similar to their coreligionists in Emmendingen. The expulsion of the Jews from Offenburg in 1680, however, highlights the fragility of Jewish life in imperial cities. Irmgard Schwanke, “Nachbarschaft auf Zeit: Juden und Christen in der Reichsstadt Offenburg im 17. Jahrhundert,” in Mark Häberlein and Martin Zürn, eds., Minderheiten, Obrigkeit und Gesellschaft in der Frühen Neuzeit: Integrations- und Abgrenzungsprozesse im süddeutschen Raum (St. Katharinen, 2001), 293–316.
45 Stadtarchiv Emmendingen, C/IX, Stadtrechnungen 1787, 1788, 1792.
the town hall became quite frequent in the 1780s and 90s. The Emmendingen records do not indicate whether Christians were invited to Jewish weddings or other celebrations, but this may well have been the case, as evidence from other communities suggests. Jewish and Christian neighbors visited each other regularly in their homes. And both religious groups joined in the obligatory drinking rituals at the local tavern that marked the conclusion of business transactions.

As in the margravate of Burgau, conflicts between Jews and Christians mainly concerned scarce communal resources, such as the alleged abuse of grazing rights by Jewish cattle traders. Sometimes economic interests mingled with cultural and religious differences, inciting repeated disputes between Christian butchers and Jewish residents over the slaughtering of cattle. In a handful of cases in which Jews participated in the popular practice of verbally or physically insulting the honor of fellow inhabitants, they received fines from the town council that were comparable to those of Christians under similar circumstances. And while Jews were forbidden to trade in Lutheran Baden-Durlach on Sundays and holidays and were sometimes fined for transgressing that law, in 1779 they earnestly requested permission to trade with neighboring (Catholic) outer Austrian territories on Sundays.

While there is generally little evidence for overt anti-Judaism directed against resident Jews in Emmendingen, the limits of toleration are most clearly apparent in the townspeople’s attitudes toward foreign Jews. In 1772, when Emmendingen’s Christian traders and shopkeepers protested against the acceptance of Mejer Auerbacher, a wealthy Jew from Nordstetten, into the town, they complained that there were already enough Jews in the district and reasserted the popular stereotype that Jewish traders tended to squeeze money out of the villagers. But they hastened to add that the Jews

---

46 Stadtarchiv Emmendingen, C/VIII/10 (Ratsprotokoll 1775), fol. 64r; C/IX, Stadtrechnungen 1776, 1781, 1783, 1785, 1786, 1793, 1795–1800.
47 Stadtarchiv Emmendingen B 1/5; Generallandesarchiv Karlsruhe, 51/701 (Oberamtsprotokolle Hochberg), no. 1643, fol. 301r; cf. also Ullmann, Nachbarschaft, 444–47, 455; Ulbrich, Shulamit und Margarete, 264, 267–70.
49 Permission was denied, but still the petition indicates that trading on Sunday was common, and that Jewish traders had the self-confidence to ask authorities to give it official sanction. Stadtarchiv Emmendingen, B/VI/1, Fasz. 17, Kirchenzensurprotokoll, June 2, 1779.
who already lived in Baden-Durlach and were mostly active in cattle trading were generally beneficial to the country.\textsuperscript{50} Instances like this suggest that it was at least partly a fear of competition that motivated the townspeople's rejection of further Jewish immigration, not a particular hatred of Jews. In a society characterized by scarce resources and limited market opportunities, Rolf Kiegling suggests, all outsiders who threatened to take a slice of the economic pie met with resentment—whether Savoyan peddlers, country craftsmen, or Jews.\textsuperscript{51}

While central European Jews were denied citizenship, continued to live and work under numerous restrictions, and were confronted with persistent prejudices in the early modern period, recent research into the conditions of Jewish life and Jewish-gentile interactions in small towns and villages suggests that Jews were also integrated into the fabric of agrarian society to a degree unaccounted for in the older literature. They performed economic functions whose importance was acknowledged by their Christian neighbors, participated in the use of communal resources, and interacted with Christians in a variety of social spaces. In the context of German-Jewish history, these findings suggest that it would be much too simple to draw a straight line from the expulsions of the late Middle Ages to the rise of modern anti-Semitism. In his study of Hessian village society and its relationship to state authority, Robert von Friedeburg could find little evidence for open anti-Semitism in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. He argues that "communal anti-semitism" became a significant force between the late-eighteenth and the middle of the nineteenth centuries. The pauperization of large segments of Christian and Jewish society through demographic and social changes, and the politicization of the question of Jewish emancipation, encouraged the increasing articulation of grievances among the lower classes. Further research into the evolution of popular anti-Semitism between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries would help establish whether these findings can be generalized.\textsuperscript{52}

\textsuperscript{50} Stadtarchiv Emmendingen, C/VIII/8 (Ratsprotokoll 1769-1773), April 9, 1772, fol. 224r. For further examples, see Schmölz-Häberlein, "Integration," 392-94.

\textsuperscript{51} Kießling, "Zwischen Vertreibung und Emanzipation," 173.

Recent German historiography suggests that German-speakers who crossed the Atlantic in the colonial period carried a mixed bag of assumptions, impressions, and prejudices with them. While they were undoubtedly familiar with traditional stereotypes of Jews as usurers and blasphemers, they were also likely to know about the central role Jews played in rural trade and credit networks and the manifold forms of everyday gentile-Jewish social interaction at markets and fairs, in taverns and private homes. These experiences may have influenced the encounters between German-speakers and the relatively small Jewish communities of Pennsylvania. The history of the town of Lancaster contains evidence of interactions between Jews and German-speaking immigrants in the colonial backcountry, evidence which, in a transatlantic perspective, reveals a remarkable continuity of Jewish-Christian cooperation.

Founded in 1730, Lancaster served as the administrative center of Lancaster County (organized in 1729) and a commercial crossroads linking Philadelphia to Pennsylvania’s expanding backcountry. In 1747, a group of approximately ten Jewish families in the community obtained a plot of land for use as a Jewish burial ground. By the eve of American independence, Lancaster Borough’s three thousand inhabitants included a predominantly German-speaking population and a small Jewish community. Though most Lancaster Jews were Ashkenazim, at least three of the Jewish residents were of Sephardic origin. The household of the wealthy merchant Joseph Simon, an Ashkenazi Jew who had come to Lancaster from England in the early 1740s, was the physical and spiritual center of the community. Simon “employed a slaughterer of kosher meat, at his own expense . . . and held services in a room in his home, complete with two Torah scrolls and an ark to house them. Others in the Pennsylvania hinterland, like Myer Josephson of Reading, made their way to Simon’s home to observe important holidays.”

One of the principal merchants of the town, Simon imported hardware, textiles, sugar, coffee, tea, and a variety of other goods from England and the West Indies via Philadelphia. He also engaged in the fur trade and large-scale speculation in western lands, ventured into the

---

manufacture of liquor, potash, guns, and other iron goods, and supplied provisions to frontier troops during the French and Indian war as well as to British and Hessian prisoners during the American Revolution. Thus Simon became one of the entrepreneurs who linked the Atlantic trading world to the colonial backcountry and western Indian territories. While Simon and a few other Jews lived in Lancaster for extended periods of time, many others made only brief appearances in the town. So central was Simon’s importance to Jewish life in Lancaster that the town’s Jewish community faded away with his death in 1804.54

Joseph Simon formed his strongest and most enduring business associations with fellow Jewish traders such as David Franks and the Gratz brothers of Philadelphia and English-speakers such as the Lancaster gunsmith William Henry and the Indian traders Alexander Lowry and George Croghan. His manifold enterprises and business interests, however, frequently brought him into contact with his German-speaking neighbors as well. For instance, when Elisabeth Mulderin and Anna Maria Fischern announced their intention to participate in Holy Communion in Lancaster’s Lutheran congregation in September 1750, pastor Johann Friedrich Handschuh noted that the two women were living “with the Jew Joseph.” Whether they had rented a room in Simon’s house or were his servants is not clear. In any case, Fischern was still lodging with Simon in February 1751.55

In December 1750, Simon witnessed a mortgage given to innkeeper Jacob Eichholtz (father of the artist), an immigrant from the Kraichgau region in southwest Germany, by merchants Nathan Levy and David Franks of Philadelphia. He also bought a parcel of land in Manheim Township near Lancaster from Jacob Metzger in June 1751. In 1754, innkeeper Andreas Beyerle, another immigrant from the Kraichgau, and a member of


Lancaster’s Lutheran congregation, mortgaged a town lot to David Franks and Joseph Simon for £200. Two years later, the butcher Michael Fortinet, a member of the German Reformed Church, and his wife sold a house and lot in Lancaster borough to Simon for £327 10s. On the same day, May 3, 1756, the merchant Jacob Friedrich Curteus mortgaged his property on Queen Street in Lancaster to the Jewish trader for the large sum of £650. Four years later, Simon sold a town lot to Bernhard Brubacher for £160, and in 1767, the tinsmith and pewterer Johann Christoph Heyne paid him £600 for a part of Simon’s property on King Street.

German-Jewish business contacts apparently intensified during the French and Indian War, which presented Lancaster’s enterprising traders with new opportunities for profit. Joseph Simon entered into a business partnership with his Christian neighbor Mathias Slough, the son of a German immigrant who had become a prosperous tavernkeeper in Lancaster. In 1763, Slough and Simon organized wagons and teams for the provisioning of troops on the Pennsylvania frontier. Around that time, Simon was also indebted to the wealthy Lutheran merchant Michael Gross, while his nephew and associate Levy Andrew Levy had formed a partnership with the German Lutheran Michael Hubley for purposes similar to those of Slough and Simon. By 1764, Simon and his coreligionist Benjamin Nathan also operated a store in Heidelberg north of Lancaster. “The Simon & Nathan store,” notes Sidney Fish, “catered especially to the predominantly German population of that region.” The partners advertised their goods in Pennsylvania’s German-language newspapers, as did Simon and William Henry. When the Lutherans built a stately new brick church in Lancaster in the 1760s, they bought an iron lock and hinges and various other small items from the Simon and Henry store. Finally, the German blacksmith Johannes Miller produced metal goods for Simon’s Indian trade around


57 Mayhill, Lancaster County... Deed Abstracts 63 (E 115–E 117), 94 (H 47); Brener, Jews of Lancaster, 8, 12. In the early 1750s, Simon’s debtor Jacob Friedrich Curteus was engaged in the business of transporting German immigrants from Rotterdam to Philadelphia. His activities can be followed in Marianne S. Wokeck, Trade in Strangers: The Beginnings of Mass Migration to North America (University Park, Pa., 1999), 70–71, 83–84, 103, 105.
While Joseph Simon and Levy Andrew Levy are by far the most visible members of Lancaster’s small Jewish community in the historical records, other Jews came into contact with the town’s German-speakers as well. Daniel Mendez de Castro’s lot on Lancaster’s market square bordered on the property of Conrad Schwartz, a German-speaker. When Mendez de Castro defaulted on his debts to Nathan Levy and David Franks of Philadelphia in 1750, the sheriff sold his real estate to Peter Spicker, a shopkeeper and member of Lancaster’s German Reformed congregation. In 1762 Barnard Jacobs of Heidelberg Township, a Jewish trader closely associated with Simon, mortgaged a lot in the town of Heidelberg to Johann Georg Schneider of Philadelphia for close to £50. The manufacturer “Baron” Heinrich Wilhelm Stiegel, who operated an iron furnace and a glass works in northern Lancaster County, employed the Jewish glass cutter and engraver Lazarus Isaac in 1773–74; Isaac signed the employment contract (which is still in existence) in Hebrew. Moreover, Stiegel glassware was “handled in the Lancaster area by Jewish shopkeepers such as Myer Josephson, Barnard Jacobs, and Benjamin Nathan.” The fact that some Jewish traders set up shops in such centers of German settlement as Falckner’s Swamp (New Hanover), Easton, Reading, and York further testifies to regular business contacts between Jews and Germans in the Pennsylvania backcountry. In 1759, Jacob Levi and Barnard Jacobs announced in Christopher Saur’s German-language newspaper *Pennsylvanische Berichte* that they had opened a shop in Berks County. Near the end of the century, in 1798, both Meyer Solomon’s and Joseph Simon’s houses in Lancaster were rented by German-speaking tenants. And when the Jewish doctor Isaac Cohen, a recent immigrant from the city of Hamburg, appeared...
in Lancaster in 1797 and announced that he would cure poor patients free of charge, it seems plausible that German-speaking inhabitants responded to his offer.63

The journal of a participant at the Lancaster Indian treaty conference of 1744 provides a rare glimpse of the existence and the limits of Christian-Jewish sociability beyond the economic realm. “The dancers,” noted Witham Marshe, secretary of the Maryland delegation at the conference, “consisted of Germans and Scotch-Irish; but there were some Jewesses who had long since come from New York, that made a tolerable appearance, being well dressed and of an agreeable behavior.” Such partial sharing of the social sphere had roots in Europe, as the story of social life in Emmendingen indicates. The ubiquitous Joseph Simon provides another example. He would meet some of his German-speaking neighbors in the Lancaster Library Company (later renamed the Juliana Library Company), of which he became a founding member in 1759.64

In the published diary of his pastorate in Lancaster (1748–51), the Lutheran minister Johann Friedrich Handschuh (1714–1764), a Pietist from Halle, twice noted the presence of Jews in the town. In October 1749, Handschuh baptized an Englishman’s child in the father’s home “in the presence of many English people and five Jewesses, who behaved very decently and outwardly devout, so that I would not have recognized them for Jewesses if I had not been told so afterwards.” While Handschuh praised the women’s manners, he also betrayed certain preconceived notions he had about Jews’ outward appearance and behavior.65 The second episode reveals the minister’s reservations against Jews even more clearly. In July 1750,

63 Marcus, Colonial American Jew, 2:546; Brener, Jews of Lancaster, 6. For the German background, see Jütte, “Contacts by the Bedside.” Christian patients frequently sought the advice of Jewish physicians in the Holy Roman Empire as well.
Handschuh reported the visit of a “former Jewess” ("gewesene Jüdin"), who had been living in the Dunker community at Ephrata for nine years with her husband, another convert, and three children. According to Handschuh, the woman and her children had left Ephrata after the husband’s death, and she now expressed her desire to join the Lutheran congregation and have two of her children baptized there. After some “admonitions,” Handschuh asked her to return with her children several days later so that he could get to know her better and examine her more thoroughly. When the “former Jewess” and her children joined him for a meal after a funeral two days later, Handschuh seized the opportunity to “explore her intentions still further and address her conscience.” The woman makes another appearance in Handschuh’s journal in February 1751, when she returns to Lancaster after several months’ absence and expresses her continuing desire to join the Lutheran church. Her eldest daughter, however, had been “seduced” by her Catholic husband to become Catholic herself, and the pastor, annoyed by the twisted confessional path of the family, noted that “this woman appears to me to have a Jewish heart and earthly intentions, and to be very uncertain.” While Handschuh offered her instruction for Holy Communion after a further probationary period of two weeks, the records of Lancaster’s Lutheran church do not indicate that a “former Jewess” ever joined the congregation.

Handschuh’s account of his encounters with this woman reveals a deep-seated ambivalence toward Jewish converts, a reaction that has also been noted by students of conversions in early modern central Europe. While many theologians propagated the millenarian goal of the conversion of the Jews, Christians never really trusted the intentions and motives of converts, who often became alienated from the Jewish community while remaining marginal to Christian society. There are occasional glimpses of anti-Jewish
sentiment among German-speakers in other records. Thus William Pencak notes an attack on the business practices of Joseph Simon and other "Jew landlords," which appeared in a German-language newspaper in 1766 and drew on the stereotype of the "Jewish usurer." Nevertheless, incidents of open anti-Semitism seem to have been extremely rare in colonial Pennsylvania.

More generally, there is reason to assume that the presence of Jewish storekeepers and traders was a familiar aspect of life for Pennsylvania German farmers and townspeople who had migrated from the small towns and villages of southwest Germany to live in an unfamiliar colonial environment. Indeed, encounters with one of the few Jews in the countryside would probably have made Pennsylvania feel more like home to German immigrants than would their contacts with English lawyers and magistrates, Scots-Irish farmers and laborers, African Americans, and Delaware Indians. In the process of migration and resettlement, German-speakers had to adapt to a dispersed pattern of settlement, an English legal system, new forms of unfree labor, a pluralist social order, and the requirements of self-government in ecclesiastical and civil affairs. Amidst all these changes and adjustments, business contacts and neighborly encounters between Germans and Jews constituted a significant element of continuity.
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70 See William Pencak's contribution to this issue.

71 These processes have been explored in Roeber, Palatines, Liberty, and Property; Härberlein, Vom Oberrein zum Susquehanna; Aaron Spencer Fogleman, Hopeful Journeys: German Immigration, Settlement, and Political Culture in Colonial America, 1717-1775 (Philadelphia, 1996); and the essays in Hartmut Lehmann et al., eds., In Search of Peace and Prosperity: New German Settlements in Eighteenth-Century Europe and America (University Park, Pa., 2000)