**1.1 “Good fences make good neighbors”: attributes of Christian-Jewish coexistence in early modern Cracow**

Sometime during the 15th century, likely in late 1454, Rabbi Meisterlin of Wiener Neustadt mentioned Cracow in a letter to two of his fellow German-Jewish scholars – “…the kingdom of Cracow and its environs has long served as a haven for the [Jewish] refugees.”[[1]](#footnote-1) In contrast, in 1913 historian Meir Bałaban summarized centuries of Jewish history in Cracow-Kazimierz as “a chain of pogroms and plunder, discriminatory rules and compromises.”[[2]](#footnote-2) In fact, Jewish existence in Cracow and later on in Kazimierz during the early modern period was to be found somewhere between these two extremes, one described by an Ashkenazi 15th century rabbi and the other by a modern historian at the dawn of the harrowing 20th century.

The history of Cracow-Kazimierz Jews was a combination between a rich internal community life (which saw itself both as local and as part of a diaspora and a broader Israelite tradition),[[3]](#footnote-3) and a tortuous coexistence that was constantly forged and reinvented between the Jewish and Christian inhabitants of the Cracovian urban conglomeration. This coexistence “cannot be reduced […] neither to an organic symbiosis, nor to a legal-judicial agreement”[[4]](#footnote-4); neither to a “paradisus Iudaeorum,” nor to a series of catastrophes. The two groups lived side by side in what amounted to a complex ‘*convivencia*’ made-up of day-to-day interactions in a peaceful context that were often interjected by crises that escalated violently and were then followed by a process of reconciliation.

It is beyond the scope of this book to fully convey the history of Cracovian Jews and their relations with their Christian neighbors.[[5]](#footnote-5) It is, however, possible to examine this history through the two prisms of residencee and economic activity, thus identifying significant attributes of Jewish-Christian coexistence within the confines of the early modern city. Notwithstanding Bałaban’s rendering of these two aspects of life as an ongoing struggle, they were in fact an integral part of a complicated relationship whose evolution was nonlinear and often ambiguous. Examining these aspects with an emphasis on day-to-day coexistence and its endurance allows us to gain perspective on how both physical and conceptual “fences” were perceived by both parties as necessary for sharing space within a highly inflammable reality.[[6]](#footnote-6)

In 1494-95, following a great fire and several anti-Jewish riots, the Cracovian Jewish community, amounting to 500-700 individuals at the time, was forced to leave Cracow and join the small community based in Kazimierz, an adjacent royal city south of the northern branch of the Vistula (Wisła) river.[[7]](#footnote-7) The nature of this resettlement and the reasons behind it remain undetermined, with numerous interpretations reflecting differing understandings of Jewish-Christian coexistence in medieval Cracow. Nevertheless, whether the king actively transferred (*transtulit*) the Jews to Kazimierz, as described in 1519 by the chronicler Maciej Miechowita (Matthias de Miechów);[[8]](#footnote-8) whether they moved of their own accord, as argued by other contemporary chroniclers;[[9]](#footnote-9) whether they were expelled on the king’s command following the city council’s request in order to put an end to the riots[[10]](#footnote-10) or reluctantly accepted a compromise,[[11]](#footnote-11) the historical significance of this change remains undisputed.[[12]](#footnote-12)

While the Jews remained under royal jurisdiction, they were now physically removed from the king’s immediate surroundings, where his influence was strongest.[[13]](#footnote-13) The institutions and authorities of the community were likewise transferred to Kazimierz. The Jews’ patterns of residence within the urban landscape changed in accordance with the local spatial, administrative and social conditions. Rather than spreading out over a few blocks in one of the city’s quarters, the community was to be concentrated in one area, which fast became fenced and homogenous. Both inhabitance and economic activity were henceforward negotiated with the authorities of Cracow as well as with the municipality and residents of Kazimierz. Despite these changes, however, the community continued to refer to itself as the Holy Community of Kroke and insisted on reaping the advantages of the capital’s centrality, regardless of considerable opposition and criticism from gentile city-dwellers.[[14]](#footnote-14)

The highly restricted territory allocated for the Jewish community in Kazimierz was referred to by contemporaries as “the city of the Jews.”[[15]](#footnote-15) It had had a mikveh (*balneum Judaeorum*) since1485, a Jewish market (*circus Judaeorum*) since 1488, and a Jewish cemetery,[[16]](#footnote-16) while some of the houses had been bought before the resettlement by rich Cracovian Jews.[[17]](#footnote-17) Nevertheless, the addition of the Cracovian community increased the density of the population considerably, necessitating additional facilities and reorganization. While the size of the Jewish population in Kazimierz was more or less compatible with that of the Christian population (circa 2000),[[18]](#footnote-18) the Jews were confined to a space five times as small.[[19]](#footnote-19)

The community was not inclined to accept the situation in resignation, and it was indeed within its power to change it, however slightly. A new community eventually emerged in Kazimierz following the resettlement of Cracovian Jews,[[20]](#footnote-20) the arrival of refugees from Bohemia and Ashkenaz, and the subsequent conflict between Bohemian newcomers and the “Polish” locals and its resolution.[[21]](#footnote-21) As defined by Elchanan Reiner, the result was a new kind of “big urban community.”[[22]](#footnote-22) This was no longer a small community typical of medieval Ashkenaz, dependent on a rich, privileged Jew or on the benevolence of a prince, and relying for its livelihood on only one form of economic production. It developed as an urban entity that saw itself as an integral part of the fast-changing world around it, trying its best to follow appropriate models of development. Cracovian in essence, this community saw itself as a kind of urban corporation that was responsible for the management of the “city of the Jews” both internally and outwardly, and took care to expand its members’ occupational options. The complex task of managing this community, its self-image and how it chose to present itself, are reflected in the community code of law known as the Cracow Community Statute of 1595.[[23]](#footnote-23) Its 93 paragraphs, which governed life within the community until the time of partitions,[[24]](#footnote-24) also testify to the community’s far-reaching judicial and administrative autonomy[[25]](#footnote-25) and reveal some aspects of its intellectual and economic growth.

In 1541, the community’s rabbi, Mosheh Fiszel (1480-1541), was appointed by the king as one of the two chief rabbis of Lesser Poland and Rusʹ. Kazimierz became “an important center of Torah scholarship […] as described by historians, even the butchers of Kazimierz were versed in the Torah.”[[26]](#footnote-26) One of the leading community figures was Ya’akov Pollak, considered “in Polish-Jewish tradition as the ‘founder,’ the father of the Polish yeshiva, and credited with the invention of the ‘Pilpul’ method.”[[27]](#footnote-27) He founded and managed the first ever Polish yeshiva, from which “Talmudic scholarship spread across the country.”[[28]](#footnote-28) Prominent Jewish scholars who were active in Kazimierz included: Mosheh Isserles (c. 1520–1572), renowned for his commentary on the *Shulḥan ‘arukh*, known as *Mapah*; Natan Note Spira (also known as Natan Nata Shapira, 1585–1633), the author of *Megaleh ‘amukot*; Yo’el Sirkes (d. 1640), commonly referred to as “Baḥ,” after the acronym of the title of his influential Talmudic commentary, Bayit Ḥadash; Yom Tov Lipmann Heller (1578–1654), author of the Mishnah commentary *Tosafot Yom Tov*; and many more.

This intellectual surge within the community also left its mark on the urban landscape, which saw the addition of five synagogues, as well as several smaller houses of worship. In 1537, the first Hebrew publishing house was opened in Kazimierz. It closed, however, shortly after in 1539, due to the owner’s conversion to Christianity. In 1568, Yitsḥak ben Aharon of Prostitz opened a new Hebrew publishing house, which was active until 1626 and saw the publication of 273 Hebrew and Yiddish books, including an edition of the Talmud. In 1630 a new publishing house was opened. It is reasonable to argue that during the first half of the 17th century, these two institutions produced “the lion’s share of Jewish religious literature in eastern Europe, and their printing press tended to the publication of the literary works of contemporary Polish-Jewish scholars.”[[29]](#footnote-29)

The community’s structure was elaborate, as was the network of relationships it maintained with the majority society and the ruling authorities. It was “a silhouette of the city in which it lived,”[[30]](#footnote-30) a partner in the contractual relationships making up the early-modern city. As such, the community constantly negotiated the scope of its activity with its Christian neighbors, who in turn recognized it as a an integral and important part of the city.

Through negotiation, the ‘big urban community’ of Kazimierz managed to obtain a permit for its geographical expansion no less than three times.[[31]](#footnote-31) As the northern border of the “city of the Jews” was determined by the city walls, the expansion was always southward. The negotiation was typically lengthy, developing over a number of stages. In most cases, the process began with Jews renting houses and buying land outside the borders of the overcrowded designated area. This aroused the protest of neighboring residents, who would then voice their objection before the city council, or before the king directly. The next stage saw local authorities or the king himself prohibit the lease of houses and shops to Jews beyond the confined area, imposing heavy fines on offenders. In 1543, following a complaint of the Kazimierz municipality, the king even instructed the Jews to sell back the houses that had been purchased outside the borders of the “city of the Jews” without a permit.[[32]](#footnote-32) In practice, royal prohibitions were not effective – neither against Jews who were in urgent need of space, nor against sellers who were in need of money, nor against municipal authorities, who took advantage of these negotiations to reap a profit. During the next stage of parley, an agreement (*ugod*a) would usually be signed between the Jewish elders and the municipal representatives. In the final stage, the Jews would see to the ratification of the agreement by the king and turn to settling on the newly acquired land. In each round, the terms of the agreement reflected the nature of relations between the Jews and their neighbors, shaping coexistence from that point forward, until the signing of a new pact. These conditions were manifested in different kinds of “fences” that grew around the expanding borders of the “city of the Jews.”[[33]](#footnote-33)

Foolowing the resettlement of the Cracovian community, the “city of the Jews” in Kazimierz became cordoned off from the rest of the town with a brick wall, a picket fence (*parkan*), and a gate. In 1533, an expansion was permitted on the condition that the Jews would “surround themselves with a wall with three gates”[[34]](#footnote-34) and pay an annual residence tax. The Jews further required not to use the third gate (designated for the cemetery) so long as windows of Christian homes faced it. The Jews were also obligated to look after the maintenance of those parts of the city walls that bordered on their area, to demolish the small houses attached to those walls, and to refrain from building along them in the future.[[35]](#footnote-35) In 1564, the community was granted the privilege of *de non tolerandis Christianis*, which meant that Christians were no longer allowed to settle or to purchase houses within the Jewish part of Kazimierz, thus protecting against the further confinement or costliness of Jewish inhabitance.[[36]](#footnote-36)

In 1583, two years after the king himself instructed the council of Kazimierz to permit Jews to buy houses outside their designated area,[[37]](#footnote-37) the second expansion agreement was signed, permitting expansion in the vicinity of the St. Lawrence Church (*Św. Wawrzyńca*). This time around, the Jews were required to fence off newly acquired land, allowing for neither gates nor windows. In the third expansion, in 1608, the “city of the Jews” reached both a symbolic and a physical barrier in the form of the Corpus Christi Church (*Bożego Ciała*), preventing any further expansion. This church, which stood at the far end of the “Jewish street,”[[38]](#footnote-38) played an important role in shaping Jewish-Christian coexistence in the city.

The Corpus Christi Church was founded in 1340, following the propagation of a problematic legend on an allegedly stolen host that was later miraculously found in a local swamp. It was henceforth considered a sanctuary and consequently attracted many worshipers. For example, in the 16th century, 2000 of the 5000 residents living in the church’s vicinity belonged to the Corpus Christi parish, including a declining number of German speakers.[[39]](#footnote-39) Every day, bell-ringers, dressed in rochets as a mark of fulfilling liturgical duty, sounded the bells from atop the church’s 30-meter-high tower. Overlooking the city of the Jews, the tower served as a constant reminder of its topographical and social inferiority. Beyond this symbolic meaning, the bells communicated the time to anyone within hearing distance, regulating the administration of the city in matters both religious and economic. The Jews were familiar with the bells’ functions and knew when they announced the opening of market day; a Christian holiday that prohibited Jews’ engagement in trading activities; or a religious procession that rendered it dangerous for Jews to walk neighboring streets.

There was no shortage of such processions, from the most modest, such as those of the Brotherhood of the Holy Sacrament,[[40]](#footnote-40) to larger processions around the church and the entire town during the week of celebrations of Corpus Christi, to the grandest procession, which took place on the day of Corpus Christi and on the octave. As reported by the first Cracovian Missal printed in Cracow (1509), during this holiday, masses of worshipers from across the capital would participate in celebratory processions displaying the holy host, commencing in different churches as well as the Cracow cathedral and ending at the sanctuary of Corpus Christi in Kazimierz. These processions served both as an expression of the participants’ faith and as a means of obtaining indulgences.[[41]](#footnote-41)

Oftentimes, these processions – particularly in the Reformation era, when they were considered an assertion of Catholic dominance and celebrated with excessive grandeur – served as an opportunity for anti-Jewish behavior. Naturally, the Corpus Christi Church often found itself at the heart of tension and conflict between Jews and Christians, not just within the context of celebrations or special occasions.[[42]](#footnote-42) Students of the parish school of Corpus Christi, which was on the main road leading to Cracow and considered one of the finest schools in the area, would regularly torment Jews who were headed to the capital. In addition to hurling insults at Jews passing by, they would harass them during ordinary church processions, in which Jews were meant to take an active part – evidenced in the directive of Piotr Tylicki, Bishop of the Corpus Christi Church in 1607-1617, which sought to implement in his sanctuary the reforms of the Council of Trent:[[43]](#footnote-43)

Here, beside Corpus Christi Church, there is a school; a magister, a cantor, young students who sing, all of whom receive payment from the church; and on Sunday processions the Jews are to walk ahead of all these (as was done in the past) and to carry liturgical books and place them on the stand; and the Jewish elders are to listen to holy sermons.[[44]](#footnote-44)

Of course, the bishop’s requirement was not received with enthusiasm by Jewish elders, who undertook to rid themselves of this obligation through monetary compensation. Bishop Tylicki accepted, most likely due to the afore-mentioned harassments, regarding the entire affair as a compromise meant to prevent “a riot [such as the one] that erupted among the boys [students] when they saw the Jews enter the church.”[[45]](#footnote-45)

The Church of Corpus Christi was involved in yet another symbolic compromise. As mentioned, according to the 1583 agreement, the Jews were to erect a wall adjacent to the Church of St. Lawrence. The Jews did indeed fence off their area, but it was the clergy of the Corpus Christi church who built a stone wall in 1627 and received payment from the community in the form of annual utilization fees. The wall bore a Latin inscription attesting to how “fences” of different kinds were perceived as a measure against interfaith riots and a means of maintaining the status quo for the benefit of both sides:

In order to praise the almighty God with the utmost dignity and composure, within this Church devoted to St. Lawrence and especially on his celebration [the Day of St. Lawrence], and in order to eradicate the causes for the riots, which people of lesser intellect are wont to instigate at the sight of the Jews, posing a danger not only to Jews but to the Christians themselves […] [the clergy of Corpus Christi erected this wall and permitted the Jews to forever use the plot adjacent to it in exchange for an annual fee.[[46]](#footnote-46)

The wall’s importance and the idea that separation makes for better neighborly ties are also highlighted in the local 17th century guide, most likely authored by Piotr Hiacynt Pruszcz, who tendentiously argued that

The place [next to the Church of St. Lawrence A.V.] was inhabited by Jews who have long been cursed by God, but the respectable priest Marcin Kłoczyński, vicar of the Church of Corpus Christi, who had jurisdiction over this [St. Lawrence] church, let it [the church of St. Lawrence] be separated with a wall from the Jews, so that their devilish commotion would not disturb the Christian service […]

Why did the Jews’ proximity to the filial church of St. Lawrence create more tension than other intersections?[[47]](#footnote-47) Why did the two parties not find a regular fence sufficient and required a stone wall in order to keep the peace? The reason could have been a pragmatic one. As the “city of the Jews” was particularly vulnerable to fires, it posed a hazard to the wooden church building, which had been saved “by pure miracle in 1624, when the Jewish town was aflame.”[[48]](#footnote-48) On the other end, the flammable church presented a very real danger to the Jews, who, in case of a fire, were likely to find themselves on the receiving end of Christian accusations and unchecked fury. But was the threat of fire reason enough to erect a wall? According to the two afore-mentioned descriptions, contemporaries needed far less than a fire as an excuse to “instigate riots.” Was the congregation of the Church of St. Lawrence simply less tolerant, chafing at the mere presence of Jews? The answer has to do with the church’s membership. Every year on August 10, the Day of St. Lawrence, the patron saint of students, the students and professors of the Cracow Academy would organize a ceremonial procession to the church of St. Lawrence in Kazimierz, while another procession would be held on the octave. This massive pilgrimage was often accompanied with anti-Jewish excesses. Students’ hostility toward Jews can be attributed to the prominent contemporary view according to which that part of the “city of the Jews” that was located “along the wall and the church of St. Lawrence” came at the expense of the “extensive and broad space” that the king Kazimir the Great allotted to the new academy.[[49]](#footnote-49) The reason, however, is more likely related to the general aptitude for violence of contemporary youth and students, regarded as one of the most dangerous segments of early modern society, which consequently had a profound impact on Jewish-Christian coexistence.[[50]](#footnote-50)

The students of the Cracow academy and later on also the students of the Jesuit schools,[[51]](#footnote-51) were the immediate suspects in case of disturbances and violent outbursts.[[52]](#footnote-52) Student riots were part of everyday life in the early modern period.[[53]](#footnote-53) While bearing arms was forbidden within the academy and the dorms,[[54]](#footnote-54) well-to-do students were commonly in possession of swords, arches, or spears. The poorer students – also known as mendyczkowie – relied on charity and would usually make do with knives.[[55]](#footnote-55) Often, students would turn on each other for reasons such as origin,[[56]](#footnote-56) trespassing begging zones, insults, or other trifles.[[57]](#footnote-57) Students would also frequently assault city-dwellers, both as individuals and in groups, sometimes causing mayhem that would allow them not only to run amok, but also to loot property. Violence was not the only issue with the student population. In a city where “brutality of human relations was a universal social language, considered normal and necessary […],”[[58]](#footnote-58) student life was marked by drunkenness, theft, gambling and general promiscuity. In his speech about the “evil students,” a rector of the academy deplored the fact that some of the students “molested the Jews criminally […] needlessly and unjustly harming Jews and others […]”[[59]](#footnote-59) As mentioned, some of the students of the Jesuit schools also “frequently attacked the Jews […] Schüler-Gelauf [student riots] became an integral part of the community’s life.”[[60]](#footnote-60)

The Jews tried to prevent clashes with the students by making “donations” and other payments to the academy. One example was “kozubales,” a stipend paid directly to the students in the 16th and 17th centuries, ostensibly for the purpose of purchasing stationery. The Cracow community also appointed a “kampsor,” or designated banker, who was obligated to give students special loans with an interest that did not exceed 25 percent. Despite many these and other efforts, including contributions made in cash or in the form of luxury items, such as rice and spices,[[61]](#footnote-61) student riots persisted, gradually establishing themselves as a form of ritual violence. On some holidays, such as St. Gregorius Day, the students would charge en masse on the city of the Jews, demanding alcohol, causing mayhem and looting property. Often, the students’ violent behavior was not religiously motivated – as when students ambushed Jews on the path to Kazimierz only to rob them for material purposes. Nevertheless, it was easy to attribute a religious dimension to the riots, especially those instigated by the Jesuit students.[[62]](#footnote-62) In the Reformation and post-Reformation eras, the academy became a bastion of conservatism, increasingly exposing students to the anti-Jewish views of prominent faculty members such as Sebastian Petrycy and Szymon Syreński, as well as lower-ranking teachers such as Sebastian Myczyński, whose words spurred anti-Jewish behavior.[[63]](#footnote-63)

Whether or not it was religiously motivated, student violence was one aspect of an array of everyday disturbances in the pre-modern era.[[64]](#footnote-64) For this reason, the authorities often took student violence lightly. Directing student violence against Jews – the so-called Schüler-Gelauf – and imbuing it with religious meaning by timing riots to coincide with specific dates in the religious calendar (a practice known as ritualized aggression) – were in fact a means of curtailing violent outbursts and containing them within manageable limits. Rather than its antithesis, these incidences formed an integral part of a tense but sustainable coexistence.
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