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**Abstract**: This article analyses visual representations of urban water fountains in two 15th-century haggadot, drawing attention to the use Jews made of water sources during their preparations for Passover. The first section concludes that these images present features unique to 15th-century Franconia, particularly Nuremberg. The second section shows that the Jews of Nuremberg made daily and exclusive use of the local urban water system, and argues that some of the images in the haggadot portray this reality. The final section focuses on rabbinic sources that discuss halakhic deliberations regarding the drawing of water for baking matzah and highlights the connection between this discussion and the images, as well as practical concerns associated with water usage in Nuremberg. This analysis shows that the images represent the tension between older halakhic traditions regarding drawing water for matzot and the practical constraints on local Jews' daily practices imposed by the contemporary urban environment.
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**Introduction**

The first folios of the Yahuda Haggadah, created in Franconia around 1465 or 1470 by an anonymous illuminator, present a series of images depicting the making of matzah, the unleavened bread eaten during Passover.[[1]](#footnote-1) While this scene has a long history in German haggadot,[[2]](#footnote-2) it is presented in the Yahuda Haggadah in unusually great detail[[3]](#footnote-3) One of the images shows two men facing each other, apparently engaged in some discussion or argument next to a public water fountain (Fig. 1, lower right).[[4]](#footnote-4) One man is holding a vessel for drawing water, while the other is standing behind the fountain, seemingly discouraging him from doing so. A scroll above their heads reads: “The scholars debate with each other: shall we draw water from this fountain?”[[5]](#footnote-5) A similar but less detailed series of images, probably by the same artist, appears in the Second Nuremberg Haggadah, which includes the only other depictions of municipal water fountains.[[6]](#footnote-6)

This scene has no parallels in surviving medieval Hebrew manuscripts. Furthermore, the only depictions of municipal water fountains that have been found come from these two analogous haggadot. What was the debate depicted in the Yahuda Haggadah about? Why did the scribe, illustrator or patron choose to include this unusual scene in the opening folio of his haggadah? What message did he mean to convey regarding the use of water drawn from municipal fountains for the baking of matzot? What can we learn from this about the challenges that Jews in Franconia faced when using water from public sources, built and used by Christians, for their own purposes?

To answer these questions, this article draws upon three different sources. First, it compares the scenes depicting public water fountains in the Yahuda Haggadah and the Second Nuremberg Haggadah[[7]](#footnote-7) with similar scenes in other haggadot, in order to highlight their uniqueness and demonstrate they fit historically into the specific context of 15th century Nuremberg. Second, archival material is used to trace the construction of public fountains and wells in medieval Nuremberg and their use by local Jews. Third, Jewish literature regarding the use of water for Passover rituals, particularly with respect to the baking of matzot, is used to demonstrate what halakhic concerns Jews had regarding the utilization of public municipal fountains for this purpose. As a whole, based on a juxtaposition of different kinds of sources, the article aims to shed light on how Jews in late medieval Nuremberg interacted with their urban environment, particularly the municipal water system, in the context of the preparations for Passover.

The designer(s) of the Yahuda Haggadah and the Second Nuremberg Haggadah seem to have had a particular interest in urban fountains. Each manuscript contains two illustrations of fountains,[[8]](#footnote-8) all four showing a public urban fountain that consists of a central shaft; one, two or three water faucets; and a pool (see Fig. 2). [insert Fig.2 facing this page] Despite these similarities, the fountains differ in context and form.[[9]](#footnote-9) The fountains representing the preparations for Passover, which reflect the daily life of Jews in Nuremberg, are the focus of this article (Fig. 2, top).

If the fountains at the beginning of both the Second Nuremberg Haggadah and the Yahuda Haggadahrepresent the actual everyday reality of medieval Jews, why do no other haggadot or any other Hebrew medieval manuscripts present similar images? There are two haggadot made in Italy that do depict preparations for Passover; both open with instructions for drawing water for making matzot, accompanied by marginal illuminations.[[10]](#footnote-10) The Second Nuremberg Haggadah and the Yahuda Haggadah open with the same subject, but present it only in images and captions, rather than explicit written instructions. However, the Italian haggadotdepict the water for matzot being drawn from a well, not an urban fountain.[[11]](#footnote-11) [insert Fig. 4 as close to this page as poss] By depicting fountains, the German haggadot seem to reflect a more developed stage of urban water technology.

Historically, German cities were not necessarily more advanced than northern Italian towns in developing public water systems.[[12]](#footnote-12) To understand why the haggadotseem to represent a different reality, we must place them in their exact geographical and historical context. On the grounds of their style and craftsmanship, Kogman-Appel has suggested that these haggadot come from either Nuremberg or Bamberg in Franconia, with Nuremberg as the more likely option.[[13]](#footnote-13) Nuremberg was the larger, better-established community with the resources necessary to produce expensive and elaborate manuscripts, such as wealthy patrons who could order and finance them, alongside rabbinic scholars who could supervise the content of the haggadot and scribes, illustrators, colorists and binders who could execute their vision.[[14]](#footnote-14) It is possible that the fountain in the opening folio of the Yahuda Haggadah included an eagle on its top, the heraldic symbol of Nuremberg, but due to the state of the manuscript it is difficult to determine conclusively (Fig. 1).[[15]](#footnote-15) In addition to this, I suggest that the extensive public water system of Nuremberg, unique among late medieval cities, inspired the designer(s) of the Second Nuremberg Haggadah and the Yahuda Haggadah to include municipal fountains in his illustrations.[[16]](#footnote-16)

**1. The Public Water System of Nuremberg, and Local Jews**

In the German Empire of the late medieval period, Nuremberg was a large, growing and economically prosperous city, second only to Cologne. As a center of commerce, it had extensive ties of trade throughout the surrounding regions as well as further afield, and was home to numerous artisans and urban industries.[[17]](#footnote-17) Its status as a Free Imperial City meant that it enjoyed practical autonomy, and its political clout drew to it the patronage of several emperors, particularly after 1350. The city was governed by a council dominated by a number of noble families, who also controlled the local guilds.[[18]](#footnote-18) This combination of a major urban center, with prospering economy and industry and a strong centralized government, proved beneficial for the development of public water technology.[[19]](#footnote-19)

Endres Tucher, who served as a master builder in Nuremberg from 1464 to 1475, recorded its extensive public water system.[[20]](#footnote-20) This consisted of 95 public wells scattered around the city, and 17 additional major water conduits, which fed fountains located along them. The public wells were usually relatively uncomplicated affairs. In some parts of the city they had to be dug fairly deep to reach groundwater, but in most locations a shallow dig into the sandstone layer was enough. They usually had simple rope-and-pulley mechanisms to draw the water, and occasionally multiple buckets installed to serve many users simultaneously.[[21]](#footnote-21) Fountains, on the other hand, required a more complicated technology. Using gravitational force, water conduits or wooden pipes, usually above ground, were used to bring water from distant springs into the urban fountains. The topographical conditions in the northern side of the city were more conducive to this apparatus, and 15 of the water conduits were located there. Thus, many of the main streets in that part of the city had water conduits running next to them, with a public fountain every few blocks.[[22]](#footnote-22) This also happened to be the area of the city in which the Jews lived.

In addition to the public fountains, an official survey conducted in 1479 shows that many of the city’s households had private wells.[[23]](#footnote-23) Rather than deep wells, which were difficult and expensive to dig, these were probably small cisterns for collecting rainwater, or shallow wells dug where topographical conditions allowed. The fact that the city council invested such great effort into the public system suggests that the city was far too large and crowded to rely solely on private water sources.

Another major source of water, the Pegnitz River that flows through the city, was rarely used for drinking. It was a center of urban industry, packed with workshops, watermills and waterwheels. The mills and wheels were used for milling grain and served an array of industries. The workshops, meanwhile, used water to wash materials and drain away waste, and it flowed back to the river polluted. Two crafts located on the banks of the Pegnitz, textile production and tanning, were major sources of water pollution, as they released materials used for bleaching, dyeing and leather processing into the river. Household sewage also sometimes flowed into the river. Urban administrators were concerned about these problems and issued regulations intended to minimize the damage, but the water remained unsafe for drinking.[[24]](#footnote-24)

Information about the water systems of Nuremberg can help elucidate the illuminations in the opening folios of the Yahuda and Second Nuremberg haggadahs. It indicates that these water fountains were not merely stylized images that the designer of these manuscripts found in model books, but actual objects familiar to him. At the same time, fountains in Nuremberg were an important symbol of local identity. The cover of a builders’ book composed in 1459 by the master builder Heinrich Scharpf has an image of a fountain quite similar to those in the haggadot (see Fig. 3[should now be 4], compare Fig. 2).[[25]](#footnote-25) [insert Fig.4 facing this page] This fountain also includes an angular pool with a central shaft, multiple faucets and a floral decoration on top, as well as faucets shaped as lion heads. The fountain in the Second Nuremberg Haggadah also has an animal-shaped faucet (Fig. 2, top right); the other fountains in Fig. 2 may also have animal-shaped faucets, though they are not clear. A caption in Scharpf’s book indicates that it was the Fair Fountain (*Schöner Brunnen*), a Nuremberg landmark situated in the main market square (see Fig. 5, no. 20).[[26]](#footnote-26) [insert Fig. 5 as close to this page as possible] However, the caption also indicates that the builder referred to the original fountain built in 1361, not the fountain that existed in 1459, which had undergone massive rebuilding between 1385 and 1396 and been redesigned in the Gothic style. No surviving visual sources and very few clues in written sources attest to the shape of the original structure.[[27]](#footnote-27) In 1459, when Scharpf’s book was compiled, the artist probably had no way of knowing what the original fountain looked like, so he depicted the fountain in an idealized form (with some elements of the later construction). He likely chose to depict the fountain in this form on the cover of his book because the Fair Fountain represented Nuremberg’s central political position in the Empire, and religious ideals tied with local identity.[[28]](#footnote-28) Even if we cannot determine for certain what actual fountains in Nuremberg looked like in the late 15th century, we can conclude that both the designer of the haggadot and the illustrator of Scharpf’s book shared ideas regarding centrality of the fountain in the urban landscape. Moreover, when the illuminator of the haggadot wished to represent a biblical, idealized fountain, he did so in a similar form (Fig. 2, below: Fountains of Eylim). This further supports Kogman-Appel’s dating of the haggadot to 1465-1470, and her suggestion of Nuremberg as their origin.

But what about the fountains depicted in the opening folios of the Second Nuremberg Haggadah and the Yahuda Haggadah that have round pools, single faucets, and no floral decorations (Fig.2, above)? Unlike the fountains representing the biblical springs, these do not resemble the Fair Fountain in Scharpf’s book. I believe they depict real fountains associated with actions that Jews in Nuremberg practiced every year: the preparations for Passover. These actions occurred in the actual urban space, and thus the fountains depicted could be a window into real life and represent the common design of public fountains in Nuremberg.[[29]](#footnote-29)

**2. Using the Water System**

According to municipal records, the Jews of Nuremberg owned 15 private houses, a synagogue and a public hall in the *Salzmarkt* quarter in the north of the city, where the *Judengasse* is still located (see Fig. 5).[[30]](#footnote-30) The community consisted of some 200 or 250 men, women and children, who must have lived in tight quarters.[[31]](#footnote-31)

Documents from Nuremberg’s municipal archive reveal how these households obtained water for everyday use. In 1479 the city council organized a tax-raising operation to pay municipal officials, the *Brunnenmeister* (well master) and his men, to develop and maintain the public water system. Upkeep of this elaborate system was expensive, and regular municipal funds were apparently insufficient to pay for it. Thus, two officials walked the streets, knocking on every door, to determine how much each household should pay. The records do not specify what criteria they applied, but the size of the household and the economic capacities of its residents probably played a role. And although those houses with private wells or cisterns were noted, all households were required to participate in financing the public system. The officials visited all 15 houses owned by local Jews. Only one, Mayr Johel (or Meir Yoel), was recorded as having a private well. The record mentions explicitly that another Jew, Simon, did not own a well (perhaps because this surprised the officials); in other cases it does not specify wells or lack thereof. Still, the record as a whole suggests that most Christians did not have private wells, especially in quarter where the *Judengasse* was located. We may therefore assume that this was the case for Jews as well, and that any exception to this rule would have been recorded.[[32]](#footnote-32)

Thus it appears that, like the other residents of their neighborhood, the Jews relied on the public system for their water. Around 1470, the *Judengasse* had a public well with two buckets, which probably supplied most of the necessary water for the surrounding houses. In addition, the main streets parallel to the *Judengasse*, *Laufergasse* and *Ledergasse*, also had several public wells and fountains.[[33]](#footnote-33) In 1476 Jews paid municipal authorities for the upkeep of a water conduit running along *Ledergasse*, and this payment was recorded in the urban water system management records.[[34]](#footnote-34) This indicates that Jews occasionally used public water fountains along this conduit, which were not far from their houses.[[35]](#footnote-35) Additionally, in 1489 a Jew named Koplein was registered in urban records as a water porter (*wasserträger*), suggesting that he (probably like others before him) was regularly employed to bring water from public sources to the houses of Jews.[[36]](#footnote-36)

What control did the Jews have, if any, over their use of these public water sources and over their maintenance? In general, very little. Urban administrators controlled these issues. The Jews lived close to their Christian neighbors and shared the same water sources (with the one exception of the private well in Meir Yoel’s house).[[37]](#footnote-37) Moreover, on the subject of public water use, municipal administrators did not consider the Jews a unit (as on most other municipal issues). The 1479 records show that urban officials assessed each Jewish household separately and determined a different payment for each. While on average Jews had to pay a little more than their Christian neighbors (perhaps because they lived in larger households), the sums were not substantially different.[[38]](#footnote-38) Representatives of each Jewish household arrived individually, on different days, to the place where the sums for the *Brunnenmeister* were to be paid.[[39]](#footnote-39) Apparently, in this matter at least, urban authorities considered the heads of Jewish households to be private citizens, did not view the *Judengasse* as a separate administrative unit, and in this instance did not expect the community to represent all of its members together.[[40]](#footnote-40)

Urban records mention only one exception to this rule: in September 1483 representatives of the Jewish community approached the city council asking to stretch a wire through the public street, around their houses and the nearby well, explaining that in doing so they would be allowed by Jewish law to use the well on their Sabbath. The council accepted their request.[[41]](#footnote-41) The Jews were referring to the halakha that states that it is forbidden to carry objects through public space on Shabbat. By stretching a wire to encircle the well and their houses, they created an *eruv*, defining the entire area as a single private space in which the carrying of water would be halakhically permitted. This was necessary because the *Judengasse* of Nuremberg was not an enclosed space, with gates or other clear boundaries.[[42]](#footnote-42) In fact, the public well was located in front of the house of a Christian, Erckenprecht (or Erckenbrecht) Coler, so Christians used it as well.[[43]](#footnote-43) And so, because it was in Christian public space, a symbolic action was needed to include the well within the “private Jewish space.” This demonstrates that Jews in Nuremberg did not usually have access to water sources within their houses and consequently could not do without the public water system for even one day of the week. It also indicates that these Jews had little practical control over their water sources, as they could not stretch a wire around a public well without formal permission.[[44]](#footnote-44)

If Jews relied on the public water system for all their needs, even on the Shabbat, there is little reason to think that they had a different option when preparing for Passover. Since the Jews in Nuremberg usually drew water from a well located in the *Judengasse*, other water sources, such as fountains, were probably a secondary option. If this was the case, why do the Yahuda and the Second Nuremberg haggadot depict a fountain rather than a well?[[45]](#footnote-45)

**3. Passover Traditions, Local Circumstances and the Haggadot**

Studying the images and the captions accompanying them in the opening folios of the Second Nuremberg Haggadah and the Yahuda Haggadah, we discover that the designer(s) of these manuscripts had little interest in illustrating the text of the haggadah, but instead chose to include images that served exegetical purposes. Kogman-Appel has shown that this approach characterizes many of the images in the two manuscripts.[[46]](#footnote-46) I argue that the same principle applies not only to images depicting biblical scenes, but also to those describing Passover rituals, thus serving as a halakhic commentary.

The illustrations in the opening folios of these haggadot refer to particular texts, but not the formal text of the haggadah. While most haggadot begin with a blessing over the wine, the opening act of the Passover eve ritual,[[47]](#footnote-47) both the Second Darmstadt Haggadah and the Schocken Italian Haggadah start with texts describing the preparations for Passover.[[48]](#footnote-48) These are short instructions for drawing water for matzot and inspecting the house for foodstuff forbidden on Passover, a ritual known as *bedikat ḥametz*. Although the scribe of the Second Nuremberg Haggadah and the Yahuda Haggadah did not include this text in his manuscripts, these preparatory activities are presented figuratively.

The first issue is the making of matzot. Both illustrate the milling of flour for matzot (see Figs. 1, top, and 3, bottom). Both scenes depict a servant leading a donkey laden with wheat to a mill while another man, apparently in charge of the milling process, waits for him at the door. The mill in question in the Yahuda Haggadah is a watermill, while in the Second Nuremberg Haggadahit is a windmill. This is not an incidental detail. The text above the windmill reads: “We shall use the windmill, not the power of water.”[[49]](#footnote-49) The designer of the Second Nuremberg Haggadah apparently believed that the proper way to mill flour for matzot was with a windmill, not a watermill. Halakhic traditions can explain this belief. R. Asher b. Yeḥiel, who lived in Germany and Castile in the late 13th and early 14th centuries, said that “in Ashkenaz and France, they have a tradition to guard the wheat [for making matzot] from the moment of milling it, since at this time they are placing it close to water, as they are using watermills.”[[50]](#footnote-50) Halakhically, in order to remain unleavened, matzah must be baked as quickly as possible from the moment water touches the flour when making the dough. Any contact of water with the wheat or flour before kneading was thus forbidden, and therefore watermills could be problematic. Windmills could theoretically solve this problem, but they were much less common than watermills, and this may be why R. Asher did not consider them a possibility.[[51]](#footnote-51) The designer of theSecond Nuremberg Haggadah must have preferred the windmill from a halakhic standpoint.

If so, why did the same illustrator depict a watermill in the Yahuda Haggadah? Watermills were the common milling method in Nuremberg, as they were the more reliable technology. Some of the mills on the Pegnitz were not far from the *Judengasse*, and Jews were likely to have used them regularly.[[52]](#footnote-52) Finding a windmill probably required traveling further, perhaps outside of the city walls, a journey that in itself could have entailed other halakhic problems.[[53]](#footnote-53) In practice, the Jews of Nuremberg apparently did as R. Asher and other scholars suggested and sent a Jew to the mill to supervise the process.[[54]](#footnote-54) Indeed, both the Yahuda and the Second Nuremberg haggadot show a Jewish supervisor waiting at the mill, as the servant, perhaps a Christian, arrives with the wheat.[[55]](#footnote-55) The Yahuda Haggadahdepicts an argument between the supervisor and the servant, and the text above reads: “The master with his slave had a dispute, since he was late bringing in the wheat.”[[56]](#footnote-56) R. Ya‘akov b. Yehuda Weil, who lived in Germany in the first half of the 15th century, had opined that the wheat had to be milled three days before Passover.[[57]](#footnote-57) The designer chose to depict a conflict at the watermill, not at the windmill, again suggesting that he considered the use of the watermill halakhically problematic.

Study of these scenes shows that the illustrations and their captions were created as a halakhic commentary. They were not aimed to present the preparations for Passover as they actually occurred, nor were they meant to demonstrate their ideal form. Instead, they present possible solutions for halakhic problems that occurred when Jews in Nuremberg tried to prepare for Passover and were faced with practical difficulties. While the Second Nuremberg Haggadahrecommends the ideal solution of using a windmill, the Yahuda Haggadah (created in the same workshop) shows that in practice this was unfeasible, and calls for strict supervision over the milling process instead.

The same logic can be applied to the illuminations depicting the drawing of water for matzot in these haggadot. In both the Second Nuremberg Haggadah and the Yahuda Haggadah, the vessel (a pot or a bucket) used for carrying water from the fountain is marked in gold (Fig. 2, top). This has puzzled some scholars,[[58]](#footnote-58) but a consideration of halakhic traditions and the urban conditions of Nuremberg clarifies the issue. In Ashkenaz a special vessel was sometimes dedicated for drawing water for matzot, so the golden decoration was probably designed to indicate this.[[59]](#footnote-59) The Schocken Italian Haggadah also depicts such a vessel, and in the Second Darmstadt Haggadah one of the Jews present at the well lifts it up, demonstrating its importance (Fig. 3, top).[[60]](#footnote-60) However, while the Italian manuscripts show a pitcher, the Second Nuremberg Haggadah and the Yahuda Haggadah depict a pot or a bucket, which can contain much more water and had to be carried on the shoulders of two men (Fig. 1, lower left).[[61]](#footnote-61) Wells were much more common than fountains in Nuremberg and closer to the *Judengasse*.[[62]](#footnote-62) The decision to draw water for matzot from a fountain apparently forced Jews to carry enough water to the place where they prepared matzot*,* while keeping the water cool and covered, as some halakhic traditions required.[[63]](#footnote-63) Unlike those in places where Jews drew water from wells for this purpose, Jews in Nuremberg could not easily go back and forth to their water source and apparently had to use a vessel that allowed them to carry all of the needed water at once.

If drawing water for matzot from a well was easier, why do both haggadot show the Jews of Nuremberg using fountains? Again, halakhic deliberations can help us understand. The main concern when preparing matzot was to keep the dough from becomingleavened. Separating the wheat or flour from water before kneading the dough was key, but the rabbis also wanted to avoid leavening during the kneading process, so the goal was to place the matzot in the oven quickly. The colder the ingredients were before kneading, the longer leavening would take, and the better the matzotwere considered from a halakhic standpoint. This principal was already established in the Talmud and was adopted by medieval rabbis, starting with Rashi, in the late 11th century.[[64]](#footnote-64) Thus, making sure that the water for matzot was cold and clean was the main consideration that guided rabbis in discussing the proper times and locations for drawing it.

However, finding cold and clean water and keeping it in this state was far from trivial in pre-modern times. The talmudic scholar Rava described a series of environmental conditions that could affect the matzah-making process, including the heat of the sun. Another talmudic scholar, R. Yehudah, decreed that one should only use *maym she-lanu,* “water which has rested (overnight),” for matzot*.* While R. Yehudah did not elaborate, Rashi suggested that the water should be drawn a day before Passover and kept overnight to allow it to cool before using it − a reasonable idea in the northern European climate.[[65]](#footnote-65) To explain the need for keeping the water overnight, he turned to a section of the Talmud that deals with the astronomical location of the sun throughout the year, in which the scholars agree that during summer the sun travels through the middle of the sky and during the winter through the margins.[[66]](#footnote-66) This leads to the conclusion that during winter, the sun heats the water of springs underground, and therefore they are warmer than water drawn from open water sources, while in summer the opposite is true. Rashi applied this discussion to the issue of keeping the water for matzot cold and suggested that since Passover occurs during the (early) spring underground water is still relatively warm. Therefore, it is best to let these warm underground waters cool outside overnight, thus making sure that the water is as cold as possible. He supported this idea with the observation that water drawn during the night is warmer than water drawn during the day (regardless of the season) − an observation he explained by the idea that the sun heats up underground water reservoirs during the night.[[67]](#footnote-67) Thus, the way to obtain the coldest water for matzot would be to draw it the day before Passover, during the daytime, when it is the coldest, and then let it cool further overnight.[[68]](#footnote-68)

Later medieval rabbis, particularly in Ashkenaz(where the climate in the early spring was indeed appropriate for cooling water), adopted this reasoning and developed it. For example, several of them agreed that only Jews should draw water for matzot, to make sure all of the relevant instructions were performed to the letter. When a Christian servant drew the water, a Jew had to be involved in the process and supervise him or her.[[69]](#footnote-69) Rabbis also debated the proper sources of water for matzot, based on the principle that it should be as cold as possible. Several suggested that it would be best to draw the water from rivers, which are still cold during the season of Passover. In this manner, the problem of warm underground water would be avoided altogether, regardless of the time of drawing (though some of these rabbis emphasized that water should still be drawn in the formally proper hour).[[70]](#footnote-70) One of these, R. Ya‘akov Weil, pointed out that rivers were not always reliable source for clean water, especially in the spring, when they could be overflowing with water, yet still considered them the best option.[[71]](#footnote-71)

Another disadvantage of wells or springs in comparison to rivers was that they provided small quantities of water, so small quantities of wheat or bread could easily contaminate them, rendering the water unsuitable for use on Passover. While a small amount of wheat or bread was insignificant in the massive flow of a river, when using a spring or a well one had to make sure that its water was clean of such materials before using it to make matzah. R. Ya‘akov b. Moshe Levi Moelin, who lived in the Rhineland during the late 14th and early 15th centuries, suggested that it would be best to pour some 50 buckets of water out of the spring or the well before drawing its water for matzot, to ensure that it was clean.[[72]](#footnote-72) To conclude, according to Ashkenazic halakhic traditions, the best solution was to draw water for matzot from a clean river, and the second option was to use a clean spring or a well and keep the water overnight to cool.

Nevertheless, both the Second Nuremberg Haggadah and the Yahuda Haggadah depict Jews drawing water for matzotfrom urban fountains and not from wells, though wells would have been the more practical option in Nuremberg (Fig. 2, top). Halakhic considerations can explain this. The best possible source of water for matzot, the river, was not an option in Nuremberg, where it was highly polluted.[[73]](#footnote-73) Furthermore, Nuremberg was an urban center, with no natural springs. Jews used public water sources, which urban officials alone regulated and controlled. Cleaning them before Passover by pouring out many buckets of water was almost certainly forbidden.[[74]](#footnote-74) The only option for the Jews of Nuremberg was to choose between municipal wells and fountains. This is probably the context of the halakhic argument presented in the Yahuda Haggadah, as rabbis debated “Shall we draw water from this fountain?” (Fig. 1, bottom right). Fountains were not necessarily similar to springs or wells (all halakhically inferior to rivers) – the situation in Nuremberg was even more complicated, as urban fountains did not provide water directly from underground, but rather relied on a system of water conduits.[[75]](#footnote-75) While the water flowed in these aboveground conduits and pipes, its temperature became similar to the outside environment. In this respect, conduits (and fountains) were similar to rivers and would have been a preferable option for water for matzot. However, Jews could not supervise the entire length of these conduits, nor clean the fountains that drew water from them. In that respect, perhaps the well located on their street would have been preferable. However, the illustrations in both the Yahuda and Second Nuremberg haggadot indicate that, after debate, the Nuremberg Jews opted for the fountains. While no written halakhic texts referring to this specific problem have survived, the visual sources shed light on the difficulties that the Jews of Nuremberg faced as they tried to practice their traditions in a modern urban environment.

**Conclusion**

This article has analyzed the images in two medieval German haggadotbased on the premise that their designer (or designers, whether illustrators, scribes or patrons), invested them with complex messages, rather than using them simply as illustrations of the text. The designer intended to depict the preparations for Passover as they should be carried out, but at the same time was well aware that some of the halakhic traditions were impractical in the urban environment in which he lived. This difficulty arose because many of the halakhic traditions were developed in the much less urban environments of the 11th to 14th centuries. None of the early rabbis considered the possibility of polluted rivers, which was a common reality in late medieval urban centers, particularly Nuremberg. None of them imagined public urban water systems so developed as to include many long conduits and fountains, which would have to be discussed as a new halakhic type, dissimilar to springs, wells or rivers. None of these scholars conceived of a water system so complex, extensive and regulated that Jews would not be able to make sure their water sources were free of wheat or bread, would be forbidden to clean these sources, and would not be able to turn to other sources. However, these were the realities faced by the designer of the Yahuda and the Second Nuremberg haggadot and members of his community. The illustrations in the opening folios of the haggadot represent their struggle to align older halakhic traditions with the urban environment in which they lived.
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