חלק שני של פרק ראשון

1.1.b

Much like residential dispersal, Jewish economic activity both shaped and reflected the complexity of Jewish-Christian relations. In addition to physical barriers, conceptual ‘fences’ were set up within the shared urban economic sphere, forming the main platform for interreligious interaction.[[1]](#footnote-1) These controlled encounters were of crucial importance to managing coexistence and reconciliation processes. While economic ‘fences’ were formulated in various kinds of legal documents, such as royal privileges or municipal edicts,[[2]](#footnote-2) Jewish economic activity was regulated primarily by rulings of interreligious court cases, as well as by agreements and pacts (*ugody*) signed between Jewish representatives and Christian municipal authorities, burghers, guild members or craftsmen.[[3]](#footnote-3)

By and large, economic ‘fences’ allowed for economic activity within a controlled environment that restricted competition, especially in highly profitable niches, as economic rivalry could easily escalate to antagonism and violence. Although many modern historians interpret them as discriminatory, these restrictions, also indicated in Jewish communal rulings, were the product of a complex multifaith reality. Far from facilitating total separation between the two communities, they reinforced coexistence, but also usually came at a price to one or both sides.

While theoretically narrowing down economic opportunities for Jews, in everyday life economic restrictions were circumvented as much as possible and often breached altogether. In an attempt to better enforce these regulations, the Sejm in Piotrkow (1538) ruled that “Jews do not have unlimited freedom of trade, but [lecz] they ought to follow the rules of our kingdom and observe the pacts which were signed in given cities.”[[4]](#footnote-4) Although conceptual ‘fences’ were more liable to be trespassed than physical barriers, their importance was often manifested in transferring existing or potential conflicts from the market square to the court room. In addition to providing the involved parties with the possibility of litigation as an alternative to unregulated conflict, they also introduced frameworks for future litigations, thus preventing unnecessary cases and protracted legal procedures and enabling reconciliation.

As Jewish economic activity as such has been widely researched,[[5]](#footnote-5) I will discuss it only briefly, from the perspective of Christian-Jewish day-to-day coexistence and crisis management. Economically, Kazimierz was a satellite town that enjoyed a symbiosis both with the central city of Cracow and with the fellow satellite town of Kleparz. By most accounts originating as an auxiliary colony of craftsmen,[[6]](#footnote-6) Kazimierz continued to uphold its tradition of craftsmanship after receiving city rights (1335) and other privileges, among them the right to a weekly bazaar and occasional fairs. To avoid competition, the weekly bazaar was set on Thursdays, when there was no bazaar in Cracow or Kleparz.[[7]](#footnote-7) Fairs were held on June 24 (St. Johanan the Baptist), August 24 (St. Bartolomeo) and November 1 (The Day of All Saints). Between August 24 (St. Bartolomeo) and January 6 (Three Kings), a free meat bazaar was held at the Kazimierz town square every Saturday.[[8]](#footnote-8)

Within the entire metropolitan area, Cracovian merchants and craftsmen enjoyed the most privileges. Inhabitants of Kazimierz nevertheless enjoyed some trade rights in the capital, including permission to sell their products and purchase necessary materials.[[9]](#footnote-9) Extending to the trade of cloth and metal, this privilege encouraged the further development of craftsmanship in the town. Since Kazimierz had its own centrally located break Cloth Halls and a weighing scale for metals (pensa metallorum), it became an important part of metal- and cloth-related trade and craftsmanship in the metropolitan area.[[10]](#footnote-10) Like Cracow, Kazimierz had the right to build slaughterhouses and transport alcohol.[[11]](#footnote-11) It could also establish so called “stations,” stalls that served craftsmen as workshops and showrooms. The majority of stalls were located across the twenty market halls in the town center of Kazimierz, while the remaining stalls were dispersed all over town. Food and low-value commodities were sold in wooden huts or simply on benches.[[12]](#footnote-12) Alcohol was produced and sold in the town’s periphery. While Kazimierz was no competition to Cracow, it successfully complemented its market, not only in crafts but also in the cattle trade.[[13]](#footnote-13) The town had an auxiliary market square that served the cattle trade, known as the canine or cattle market.[[14]](#footnote-14) On the state level, Kazimierz had the same customs privileges as Cracow.

The Jews’ economic status and participation in Cracow-Kazimierz was subject to the Kazimierz market and interwoven into the symbiotic metropolitan economic structure. Like their Christian neighbors, Jews living in Kazimierz were notably engaged in crafts. Throughout the 16th century, the growing community widened its occupational range as the Jews of Kazimierz began dealing in trade and other economic activities such as pawnbroking, alcohol production, export and import, and fencing.[[15]](#footnote-15) With storage spaces and shops all over town, Jews took an active part in local bazaars and fairs, where direct sales and various kinds of deals were closed. Their activities answered to the economic needs of both the Jewish community and the surrounding Christian population. Although business opportunities in the small satellite town were scarcer than in Cracow, Jewish economic activity in Kazimierz was less restricted. Jews were perceived as an integral part of the local economy, acquiring a substantial share of an already competitive metropolitan market. Alongside royal privileges, this was manifested in agreements with the municipality of Kazimierz and complemented by regularly updated royal edicts and arrangements with local guilds.[[16]](#footnote-16) Of these, the pact signed in 1609 – revised and ratified in 1615 and complemented with an arrangement with the guild of innkeepers in 1645 – provides the most interesting insights into Christian-Jewish coexistence in a shared economic environment.

As mentioned, this agreement was first signed in 1609, a year after the third expansion of the ‘city of the Jews,’ and, according to Bałaban, following long negotiations.[[17]](#footnote-17) Despite this, its approximate, somewhat ambiguous provisions led to diverging interpretations, ultimately resulting in a court case between the two parties. Only after the king’s intervention were the litigations halted, followed by the drafting and royal ratification of a new version in 1615. While it underwent a number of amendments, this agreement remained valid until the partitions.[[18]](#footnote-18)

Broadly speaking, the agreement regulated Jewish economic activity by limiting its presence in the Christian part of the town. There were limitations on Jewish trade in alcoholic beverages, on the number of butchers and their stalls, and on products liable to undermine the privileges of Christian guilds; as well as an outright ban on wholesale trade in some commodities. And yet the signing of the document was welcomed by the Jewish community, who made an offering of a thick woven tablecloth to the city hall and willingly paid the substantial annual sum of 80 złp for keeping the agreement intact.[[19]](#footnote-19)

A close examination of the text reveals the complexity of the “inclusion-through-exclusion” of Jewish economic activity. The Jewish community’s acceptance of a degree of marginalization was in fact its opening to overall economic integration and coexistence. Thus, while the 1615 agreement introduced limitations on Jewish economic freedom, it also facilitated the general inclusion of Jews in the local market, reinforcing many of their rights. For example, while Jews were not allowed to deal in the wholesale trade of oats or hay, they were permitted to retail them internally within the community, as well as to trade in other commodities:

They [the Jews] should not buy wagons of oats and hay for sale, only for their own use, likewise they should not keep a Christian carter/wagoner [?] in their street, only a Jew who brings his own horses, should be [employed] in their street.

Excluding wine, Jewish import of alcohol was restricted. This restriction too, however, was not the product of anti-Jewish discrimination so much as a reflection of existing divisions within the alcohol market in the three-city metropolitan area, and a measure for protecting local guilds and the Christian consumers. Jewish export of local alcohol out of the city was allowed:

[They] should not bring Meads [and] various beers from other places, only the beer of Kazimierz. However, with the permission of Mr. Meir, they may take [some] for a wedding, a baptism party [chrzciny], or for personal use. And wine they may import in barrels to their street and sell to Jews, as well as to Christians. However, it is not right to sell [alcohol] to a Christian on credit, only to a Jew.

These and other paragraphs of the agreement attest to its having been a contract, in which both sides acceded to compromises. The growing needs of the Jewish community were largely recognized, with the agreement allowing for significant economic freedom within the walls of the “city of Jews.” The limits on Jewish activity, on the other hand, indicated a rather defensive Christian position, namely the attempt to protect their revenue from competition while maintaining Jewish supplies of cheap alcohol and meat for lower-income populations:

They should have no more butchers’ shambles than the previous number, eight, and no more than sixteen host butchers, under the penalty of 24 gr. Moreover, what [they find] unfit, can be sold to Christians.[[20]](#footnote-20)

The agreement did not undermine economic ties between Jews and Christians. Rather, it reflected a reality in which Jews and Christians saw themselves as physically separated from one another, while cohabiting the same economic and administrative environment and operating according to the same business calendar (the official Catholic calendar). The pact accepted the inevitability of Jews renting shops and storage space from Christians, as well as making use of Christian services such as the town weighing scale, where they and other merchants were required to weigh heavier commodities. Similarly, the agreement recognized that poor Christians relied on Jewish employers. At the same time, the pact imposed limits on interreligious ties that were liable to overexpose Christians to the Jewish way of life, forge intimate ties between the members of the two groups, or put Christians at risk of debt. It thus banned jobs necessitating the lodging of Christians in Jewish quarters or the employment of a Christian to transport merchandise into the Jewish quarter, but allowed Christians to work as a helping hand in private Jewish homes as an occasional source of income.

The agreement also contributed to Jewish-Christian coexistence by recognizing the Jewish community as a full economic partner involved in multiple market areas, capable of substantial import and attractive sales, and constituting a valuable pool of clients and consumers. Attesting to the contractual character of the agreement and of the relations between the two sides are the three elements identified by Guesnet’s model of the ‘ugody’: mutual recognition of the parties to the contract, a view to re-establish the balance between the divergent interests of Jews and Christians, and a mutual commitment to the agreement and its royal ratification.[[21]](#footnote-21) Jewish commitment was demonstrated by the community’s willingness to absorb fines in cases of violations, as well as by the 1,000 Marks guarantee (vadium) paid by Jewish elders to the municipality:

And if any Jew dared to violate any of those laws, and the honorable people of Kazimierz can prove it, then this Jew should be fined to the sum of 24 gr.,[…] half for the city hall and half for the Jewish elders. If the Jewish elders refuse to impose this punishment or to obey the rules, the honorable consuls of Kazimierz will receive the *vadium* of 1000 M.[[22]](#footnote-22)

Overall, the 1615 Kazimierz agreement supported coexistence, making use of conceptual ‘fences’ to create a *modus vivendi* that prevented crisis, or, in the worst case, provided a framework for crisis management. Another document of a similar “inclusion through exclusion” character was signed in Cracow in 1485, when Jews were still permanent residents of the capital.[[23]](#footnote-23) Its validity, however, was eroded after the Jews resettled in Kazimierz circa 1495. Jewish economic activity in Cracow – one of the major trading hubs of east-central Europe – was now both more restricted and more volatile than in Kazimierz. This instability reflected and affected Jewish-Christian relations in the city. Bałaban defined the 16th century and the first half of the 17th as a time of “struggle for trade rights in Cracow,” describing in detail burghers’ attempts to exclude Jews from the local market or at least limit their share.[[24]](#footnote-24) However, Jewish-Christian economic interaction was not as simple as that. From the perspective of interreligious coexistence, economic relations constituted a valuable framework for convivencia, supporting the management of crises and reconciliation.

Different groups in Cracovian society had diverging interests, influencing their interpretation of the agreement and their general attitude towards Jewish participation in the local market. On the one hand, many city dwellers enjoyed Jewish marketing methods and attractive prices, claiming: “If only Jews were allowed to sell goods and roots, we would get them for much cheaper; [Christian merchants] tolerate themselves worse than Jews, that is why they hate Jews […].”[[25]](#footnote-25) Wealthy patricians, as well as some city consuls and public figures, enjoyed renting out storage room and shops to Jews,[[26]](#footnote-26) even those located in the central market square. Nobles appreciated luxurious commodities imported by Jewish traders, and lower income populations valued Jewish pawnbroking services and cheap sales of unredeemed pledges and other second-hand goods.[[27]](#footnote-27)

On the other hand, as a group, Jews living in Kazimierz were no-longer perceived as indispensable to the Cracovian economy, nor as strong contractual partners. Merchants and craftsmen largely viewed Jews as economic rivals, attempting to exclude them from the local market or at least downgrade their economic rights to those of foreign merchants, known as ‘hospites.’ An emphatic example of this sort of attitude is Szymon Strawolski’s claim that Jews would buy off all the products on fairs before Christians, with the result that “cities and towns became poorer, and are getting poorer still.”[[28]](#footnote-28) Conversely, the Jews, “who had not even for a moment given up trade in Cracow and did everything in their power to preserve it,”[[29]](#footnote-29) tried to take advantage of the 1485 pact as a validation of their special status in the city and their right to have a share in the city market as residents and partners in the metropolitan economic symbiosis between Cracow and its two satellite towns. Their attempts resulted in a number of royal edicts, but these were not always implemented on the ground:

Jews are allowed to rent shops and storage spaces, diplay merchandise at the market of Cracow; the magistrate and custom officials should not charge them with high or special payments, different to those required of the citizens of Cracow or Kazimierz.[[30]](#footnote-30)

Both sides anticipated all-inclusive royal regulation of Jewish trade in Cracow while taking measures to effect it on the ground. The Jews appeared in the city on every possible occasion, selling various commodities on the so-called Jewish Market and elsewhere around the city, attracting Christian buyers and making use of the small city weighing scale – not only for measurements and taxes but also for closing deals.[[31]](#footnote-31) The Christian merchants and guild members appealed to city authorities with diverse complaints and demands for limits on Jewish economic activity. The municipality, which had much to gain from collecting Jewish taxes, tried to satisfy different interest groups. In addition to rising taxes and customs paid by Jewish traders, it issued a number of bans on renting out shops and storage room to Jews, thus responding to the concerns of merchants’ who claimed that “Jews settled in the Jewish street and other [streets] nearby, [from there] they transport their merchandise to fairs and bring it back with harm to Christian people.”[[32]](#footnote-32) However, due to the strong opposition of patricians and some members of the city council, and owing to royal intervention (in 1576 by Stephen Bathory and in 1597 by Sigismund II Augustus), these bans were barely enforced. On a few occasions, municipal authorities took the extreme measure of closing the city gates before Jews so as to prevent their economic activity within the city.[[33]](#footnote-33) This pro-merchants solution was obviously only temporary, but it nevertheless caused serious damages to Jewish revenues. [[34]](#footnote-34)

The never-ending rivalry and litigations alongside attacks on Jewish merchants, the confiscation of merchandise, and competition over agricultural products even before they reached the city[[35]](#footnote-35) all paint a very dramatic but incomplete picture of Jewish-Christian relations in a shared economic environment. Although Jews were no longer permanent residents of the city, with some merchants seeking their exclusion from the market, they largely remained a vibrant part of the economy and maintained a wide range of commercial and financial relations with Christian residents of the capital. These relations, which took place across conceptual ‘fences,’ had varying levels of intensity.

The most common type of commercial tie was likely the basic familiarity between buyers and sellers on the market, which involved the lowest level of intimacy. Judging from written rulings, Jews traded freely at the very least on market days – Tuesdays and Fridays in Cracow – and during fairs.[[36]](#footnote-36) Furthermore, “poor Jewesses had the right to sell shawls and scarves of their own making at all times,” while Jewish merchants who registered their commodities under the staple law were obligated to display them on the Cracovian market for at least a week before they could sell them in their shops.[[37]](#footnote-37) As can be gleaned from contemporary burghers’ complaints and descriptions, Jews used every opportunity to trade in the capital, often circumventing conceptual ‘fences’ that had been erected by the old agreement and subsequent edicts. Jews conducted retail trade in two basic ways: by approaching the Christian buyer himself, or by inviting him to their store or stand: “the Jews import all the products from abroad, and not only do they sell them, they also display them in Cracow […] The Jews sell their imported merchandise in front of the Cracovian merchants and even set up stands, stealing clients in this way and putting Christian merchants out of business.” The Jewesses also sold their goods by entering Christian houses, as can be deduced from repeated Jewish rulings forbidding such practice without a male companion. It is difficult to estimate the level of interreligious intimacy facilitated by commercial encounters of this kind.

Without a doubt, shop rentals and wholesale domestic and international trade, involving different types of contracts, led to far more intense cross-religious contact. Bypassing appeals and prohibitions of religious authorities on both sides, Jewish and Christian merchants of different denominations engaged in ad hoc contracts and commission agency to promote commercial objectives, while members of both elites engaged in financial loans. Jewish shop-owners sold products imported by Christian merchants, while Cracovian craftsmen bought raw materials form Jewish traders. Jewish merchants gave out loans against the collateral of merchandise of Christian traders or borrowed money with a bill of guarantee (membrane) that stated the debt would be paid “to whoever presents this […] membrane and holds it in his hand.”[[38]](#footnote-38) Joint ventures such as the concerted shipments of goods, cooperation in commerce between merchants and factors, or co-ownerships over commercial companies, left traces in court documents when gone wrong. Successful ventures left their mark in recurrent prohibitions, mostly by religious authorities. For example, the Protestant synods repeatedly criticized the apparently prevalent practice of Calvinist bankers to invest their money with Jewish bankers dealing with usury.[[39]](#footnote-39)

Commercial and financial cooperation, which was managed according to supra-confessional and supra-religious economic norms,[[40]](#footnote-40) was often criticized with zeal:

…whoever forms partnership with Jews by selling them goods on credit should know that he will always suffer losses. Do you know that no one who trades or forms partnership with Jews can truly make a profit?[[41]](#footnote-41)

 Generally, however, such cooperation was beneficial for both the economy and Jewish-Christian coexistence. Whether it contributed to religious dialogue[[42]](#footnote-42) or led to conversion is another question that falls beyond the scope of this book.[[43]](#footnote-43) In the market square, fluid and entrepreneurial Jewish activity[[44]](#footnote-44) and cooperation with Christians led to both prejudice and pragmatic toleration. The Jews continued to have an ambivalent attitude towards Christianity, some of them maintaining that the gentile world was idolatrous and suffered from “the absence of divinely taught ethics, [therefore] the less contact the Jew had with such a world, the safer he was in body and soul.”[[45]](#footnote-45) The Reformation brought with it self-praise for the strength of Jewish faith:

[…] every evil belief and worthless doctrine to be found in any place, even four hundred parasangs away, is immediately adopted, accepted and adhered to by the gentiles… Since the gentiles are easily … enticed from one faith to another. But we loyal sons of faithful sires will not act thus toward God – will be slain only for our own faith all day long.[[46]](#footnote-46)

Jews traded and maintained contacts with their Catholic neighbors, many of whom held on to medieval anti-Jewish stereotypes,[[47]](#footnote-47) as well as with adherents to Protestantism who in general “shared the negative opinions of Jews held by the rest of the population of Poland-Lithuania.”[[48]](#footnote-48) Physical and conceptual barriers regulating residential dispersal and economic activity helped curb mutual prejudice and strengthen neighborly ties on a day-to-day basis, including in the aftermath of crises. It was indeed ‘fences’ that enabled this peculiar symbiosis of exclusion and inclusion.
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