**Introduction**

Throughout the 16th century and into the beginning of the 17th, in the days when England was considered a paradise for women and a hell for horses,[[1]](#footnote-1) Poland – “one of the most original civilizations of early modern Europe”[[2]](#footnote-2) – was regularly described by satirists as a paradise for Jews (paradisus Judaeorum) and a refuge for heretics (asylum haereticorum).[[3]](#footnote-3) Indeed, amidst a Europe fraught with religious wars, Poland’s “golden and silver age”[[4]](#footnote-4) boasted conditions that accommodated a multi-cultural, multi-ethnic, and multi-religious mosaic that attracted members of persecuted denominations and empowered the association of local religious groups.[[5]](#footnote-5) The unification with Lithuania (1569) and resultant territorial expansion from the Black Sea almost all the way to the Baltic Sea coincided with economic prosperity as the “wheat barn of Europe” and a cultural and intellectual boom. Concurrently, the aristocracy’s gains over the church and monarchy led to the emergence of an “aristocratic democracy.” Together with a legacy of religious pluralism and discussions of religious tolerance as well as a fear of religious war, these factors enabled the coexistence in Poland of Catholics, Orthodox Christians, Armenians, Muslims, Jews, and Protestants of different denominations, with no religious coercion.[[6]](#footnote-6) Shared churches of Catholics and Protestants, or of Lutherans and Calvinists, Mosques in the outskirts of Vilna, several Jewish communities, and neighborly ties between the followers of various faiths, were a source of Polish pride at the time and attracted the attention of foreign travelers. Retrospectively, this legacy produced the idyllic image of a tolerant Poland in the eyes of numerous 19th century intellectuals in the Second Polish Republic as well as the Polish People’s Republic (PRL). Even today, when Poles look back on their history, many have a large, multicultural, tolerant Commonwealth in their mind’s eye.

Given this image of religious tolerance and the relatively low number of victims burned at the stake due to religious persecution, interreligious violence within this period did not receive much scholarly attention.[[7]](#footnote-7) Religious riots were studied either as a means of challenging the idea of an interfaith utopia, or as an unexpected, marginal phenomenon worthy of condemnation and totally out of place within the idealized world of a “state without stakes.”[[8]](#footnote-8)

While top-down religious persecution was indeed rare, religiously motivated violence led by mobs, such as attacks on funerals, demolitions of cemeteries and houses of prayer, assaults on clerics, etc., was an inseparable part of the “Convivencia” in early modern Poland.[[9]](#footnote-9) In an age when the meaning of the world *tolerancia* had not yet been decoupled from the explicit, rather negative meaning of the original Latin verb *tolerare*, which means “to bear” or “to endure,” the eruption of religious violence did not eliminate coexistence and pluralism, but rather constituted another aspect of it. While this aspect is less palatable to the modern reader, it was a natural part of Poland’s multi-religious fabric and is indispensable to a fuller understanding of interfaith relations in the Polish Kingdom. Just as anti-Jewish or anti-Protestant riots did not invalidate the existence of pluralism, neither was the absence of stakes in Poland an ideological or ethically motivated expression of this pluralism, so much as it was the result of a socio-political balance of power.

The nature of Poland’s religious tolerance during one of the most violent periods in European history[[10]](#footnote-10) is far more complex and ambiguous than the myths it inspired. Geopolitical conditions often played a bigger role than the mutual acceptance of divergent views, while the lack of state persecution was often the result of local power-structures. In addition, the practicalities of day-to-day coexistence were an intrinsic part of this reality, including religious riots. While interfaith arrangements temporarily achieved a degree of coexistence elsewhere in Europe,[[11]](#footnote-11) Poland’s religious tolerance did indeed stand out – not only due to this combination of circumstances, but most of all due to its endurance:

Poland was not stained by the blood of Christian brothers spilt over differences of faith and did not imitate others’ regrettable zeal in this endeavor. [...] For long, it implored its religiously diverse subjects to exhibit mutual tolerance, a commitment anchored in sworn agreements.”[[12]](#footnote-12)

Despite religious turmoil, controversy, prejudice, and political struggles, Poland managed to avoid the escalations of interfaith crises into full-blown religious warfare. What made this system of religious pluralism work? This book investigates how Polish tolerance – which was not founded upon theological principles, nor embedded constitutionally – functioned and evolved before giving way to a more discriminatory approach towards religious minorities, who came to be regarded as a threat to the state and treated accordingly.

More specifically, this study’s innovation lies in its examination of the “workings” of toleration at the critical historical moments of interfaith conflict resolution. It reconstructs tolerance not just as it was defined legally or implemented in times of relative stability, but specifically in those moments of tension, in which other countries saw “stakes burn,” that is, in those moments of shock when the “smoke of the pogrom clears.”[[13]](#footnote-13) These important points in time did not receive due recognition in existing renditions of this period. Although they laid the foundations for the continuity and regeneration of coexistence, their significance is not reflected in the historiography.[[14]](#footnote-14) The main objective of this book is to reconstruct the coping mechanisms of minorities in the aftermaths of attacks initiated by the Catholic majority, and to demonstrate how tolerance was manifested and applied in processes of reconciliation and the rehabilitation of coexistence. This new perspective is meant to paint a fuller picture of Polish tolerance and thus deepen our understanding of Jewish and Protestant existence within a Catholic majority in post-Reformation Poland.

In order to capture more fully the crisis management processes and acts of tolerance in those times when coexistence was at risk, I employ an accumulative, rather than comparative research method and rely on two main case studies: the Holy community of Kroke – at the time the “most important [Jewish] community in the Crown of Poland,”[[15]](#footnote-15) which resettled in Kazimierz (the royal city adjacent to the capital) in 1495, but continued to manage its affairs in Cracow and to see itself as Cracovian; and the Evangelist community in Cracow, which included devotees of the Augsburg Evangelical Church (also known as Lutheran) and the Evangelical Reformed Church (also known as Calvinist). Despite the religious differences between them, these two Protestant churches fully coexisted, sharing a church building and a cemetery and referring to themselves as “Evangelists” in order to underscore their adherence to ancient Christian principles, and as an affront to the names assigned to them by the Catholic establishment.[[16]](#footnote-16) As the book examines the relations between different groups and religious tolerance, the two chosen communities are defined as ‘minorities with pluralistic aims’ that sought to be tolerated by the majority,[[17]](#footnote-17) or simply as religious minorities. The use of the term “minority” here is straightforward and refers to the quantitative ratio between the Catholic majority and the communities, each of which amounted to ten percent of Cracow’s population at the time.[[18]](#footnote-18) The model as a whole is trilateral, framing the relations between the described minorities as being shaped by the majority’s treatment of each group.

The book explores how riots were dealt with in the post-Reformation era,[[19]](#footnote-19) that is, during a period marked by tension and fraught with interfaith crises, beginning in 1572-3 and ending with the beginning of the “reign of catastrophe’ in the middle of the 17th century. This periodization follows, among others, Janusz Małłek in his study on the history of religious tolerance in Poland.[[20]](#footnote-20) Applying Heinz Schilling’s paradigm of confessionalization within the context of Poland’s history,[[21]](#footnote-21) Małłek argues that this was an age of tolerance with some counter-Reformation elements.[[22]](#footnote-22) The examined period begins when the Warsaw Confederation (Konfederacja Warszawska) was signed, circa 1573 – a year traditionally identified in Polish historiography as the height of Protestant achievement and the beginning of the Reformation’s decline.[[23]](#footnote-23) Within the historiography on the Reformation, this year is seen as marking the end of “the Cracovian Protestants’ expansion efforts,”[[24]](#footnote-24) when, following the granting of a royal permit in 1572, they officially established their church in the capital.

Wojciech Kriegseisen suggests a sub-division of this period: the age of equal rights and a delicate balance of power between the Catholic Church, the united Protestants, and the Russian Orthodox Church from 1573 to 1606; and the age of relative tolerance towards non-Catholic minorities, who were gradually losing ground to the Catholic majority, from 1606 to 1648.[[25]](#footnote-25) The periodization’s endpoint, 1648, rushed in “the reign of catastrophe” (*calamitatis regnum*), named after the title Paweł Jasienica gave to the second installment of his trilogy dedicated to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.[[26]](#footnote-26) This point in history was a time of continuous hardship due to a series of events that also directly bore on the status of the minorities in question.[[27]](#footnote-27) In 1648, Cracow was in the throes of economic crisis, the result of destructive wars with Russia, as well as the political crisis of an interregnum following the death of Władysław IV Vasa. During this year, which was set to be, according to several Rabbis, a year of salvation for the Jewish people, a stream of Jewish refugees from Cracow to Kazimierz was fleeing the terrible Cossack massacre on the Jewish communities that followed the uprising in the east (i.e. the Cossack Riots). Bringing with them tales of horror, refugees continued to flow in as the Cossack rebellion, led by Bogdan Chmielnicki, spread westward. In 1651-1652, Cracow and its densely populated suburbs were hit by a deadly plague. 1655 saw the Swedish Deluge, to which the Jewish and Protestant communities also fell victim. Even though they suffered lootings, famine, and bloodshed together with the other town residents, members of religious minorities were accused of collaborating with the enemy, which also undermined the communities’ legal status.[[28]](#footnote-28) As their fellow devotees were being slaughtered across Poland by Stefan Czarniecki’s liberation army, they found themselves at the receiving end of hostile outbursts from their Catholic neighbors. This process of marginalization of religious minorities reached its apex with a wave of pro-Catholic legislation, which led to the expulsion of the radical Arian sect (1658) and legally forbade the abandonment of the Catholic faith (1668). The ‘mutual tolerance’ that found expression in the Warsaw Confederation gave way to a ‘granted tolerance’ entirely at the discretion of the Catholic majority, which in turn rendered religion an element of group identification among the nobility as well as other social strata – one that was tied to the state and served as one of its mainstays.

The book’s geographical scope is limited to Cracow-Kazimierz. While Protestant and Jewish communities resided in several cities across the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, with important Protestant centers emerging in cities such as Raków or Ostrów, Cracow was nevertheless the center where each community sought to gain a foothold. For this reason, Cracow saw its first anti-Protestant incident as early as 1557, becoming the most likely scene of violent outbursts over the latter half of the 16th century.[[29]](#footnote-29) Cracow was the capital of the kingdom at the time,[[30]](#footnote-30) the seat of the throne (until 1609) and of the Bishop; a publishing hub; a university town with extensive ties to other states and with a substantial foreign and student population;[[31]](#footnote-31) and a commercial, cultural, and political center known for being “dangerous and prone to riots.”[[32]](#footnote-32) Due to the city’s diverse make-up,[[33]](#footnote-33) the intensity of interaction between the communities, the power struggles, and the frequent riots over religious disputes, Cracow was chosen as the most appropriate case-study for the purpose of reconstructing the coping mechanisms and the means by which coexistence was reinstated and fashioned in the aftermath of upheavals. In other words, because religious tolerance was continuously put to the test in Cracow, I chose it as a historical laboratory in which expressions and manifestations of tolerance can be examined in the context of coping with interfaith turmoil. The centrality of this city and its communities meant that its balance of power largely reflected that of the kingdom as a whole.[[34]](#footnote-34) Moreover, the examined riots made waves in Poland and beyond, which often entailed multi-dimensional, state-wide coping mechanisms.[[35]](#footnote-35) This renders the communities in Cracow as both representative of, and having an influence over coping mechanisms in interfaith crises across the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Despite the capital’s centrality and the singularity of its communities,[[36]](#footnote-36) it is an invaluable source for better understanding the nature of both coexistence and interreligious crises. In the process, more can be gleaned about what stands behind the terms “paradise for Jews” and “refuge for heretics,” with due awareness to the dangers of generalization.[[37]](#footnote-37)

There are also practical reasons to choose Cracow as the area of research – access to archives and the availability of both Polish and Jewish sources. While the city’s Jewish archive may not have survived,

Cracow was lucky in that more records of its Jewish community survived until the eve of the Holocaust than that of any other community in Poland, providing documentation of its institutional history from the early modern period. […] including various types of documents, ranging from the community’s regulations, whose first version appeared in 1595, to bookkeeping records, as well as records of various organizations, including a highly important account book of the *chevra kadisha* (burial society).[[38]](#footnote-38)

The primary sources used in this study can be divided into five general categories: official documents of local, monarchical, and church authorities, including Protestant synods of Lesser Poland; court documents; private and officials accounts of the riots; polemic literature; and various Jewish sources.

Historiographically, the present study follows a long tradition of research on interreligious relations in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, which began after the First World War with Stanisław Kot’s seminal work,[[39]](#footnote-39) and continued with numerous modern studies that sang the praise of Polish tolerance and popularized the image of “a state without stakes.”[[40]](#footnote-40) Building on this tradition, this book ventures to reconsider the concept of tolerance as defined by Zbigniew Ogonowski[[41]](#footnote-41) by complementing our image of early modern Poland with a perspective on reconciliation processes after riots and disturbances. For the purpose of revising and reevaluating the concept of tolerance, this book incorporates a number of basic assumptions while drawing on a number of prominent studies in relevant fields.

First, I make use of Benjamin Kaplan’s approach,[[42]](#footnote-42) brilliantly applied by David Frick in an East European context.[[43]](#footnote-43) Rather than “tolerance” as an intellectual or conceptual principle, Kaplan’s notion of 16th and 17th century interfaith coexistence is the day-to-day practice of “toleration.” While Kaplan examines patterns of interfaith coexistence across Europe, demonstrating how communities and individuals of different faiths managed to coexist within societies that in principle supported religious homogeneity, Frick discusses Vilna, the religiously diverse and multi-ethnic capital of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, providing an in-depth analysis of interreligious encounters and interactions within a single urban space. Frick examines interfaith relations in everyday contexts, as well as surrounding significant life events and moments of crisis. Based on his findings, he argues that religious riots were commonly conducted according to a pre-rehearsed script, and in a way contributed to maintaining the social balance.[[44]](#footnote-44) Both studies inspired me to adopt David Nirenberg’s thesis that violent religious riots were an inseparable part of Convivencia.[[45]](#footnote-45) This theoretical foundation allowed me to understand interfaith crises as an aspect of quotidian violence within a pre-modern society,[[46]](#footnote-46) and thus demonstrate how interreligious violence in Cracow was manifested by all sides and immanently and dialectically tied to toleration – Catholics, “Jews, and Protestants [who] accepted tension as a basic condition of pluralistic existence alongside rivals.”[[47]](#footnote-47)

Second, in order to deepen the understanding of coping mechanisms in the aftermaths of riots, the present study also relies on important findings from the field of conflict theory, [[48]](#footnote-48) particularly Louis Kriegsberg’s framing of post-conflict reconciliation as an integral part of co-existence.[[49]](#footnote-49) By applying Roland Paris’ model,[[50]](#footnote-50) Kriegsberg demonstrates that the post-riot reconciliation process in the early modern period was in accordance with the nature of the conflict – it began with the cessation of violence and was imperative to the continued coexistence of the involved parties. While I agree with Frick regarding both the importance and ubiquity of juridical deliberations in the context of interreligious crises and their inherent character,[[51]](#footnote-51) I apply Eric Brahm’s model, which outlines a chronological timeline of crisis and sees deliberation as leading up to reconciliation, rather than the height of the crisis, as posited by Frick.[[52]](#footnote-52) In contrast to Kaplan and Frick, my emphasis is on the shock experienced by the Jewish community due to the riots and its effect on the rehabilitation process and the fashioning of coexistence. I do not, however, adhere to the historiographical approach nicknamed by Salo W. Baron the “Lachrymose conception of Jewish history,” which construes Jewish history in Poland as a series of catastrophes.[[53]](#footnote-53) Rather, I adhere to Jacob Goldberg’s school, which sees interreligious crises as one of many elements of life between “rejection and acceptance.”[[54]](#footnote-54)

The book is divided into three main parts. Part one, consisting of the first two chapters, reviews aspects of the examined minorities’ existence alongside a Catholic majority that assisted them in coping with violent riots. The first chapter describes day-to-day coexistence and the function of its guarding mechanisms in times of stability. The second chapter analyzes the Jews’ legal and social status as derived from royal privileges, examining its role in maintaining coexistence and reestablishing toleration after conflicts. By reconstructing the tools and mechanisms provided by royal privileges in the context of reconciliation processes, this chapter also discusses the role royal charters played in structuring and implementing Polish tolerance towards Jews.

The second part of the book investigates in detail how the examined minorities responded to violent attacks, analyzing their post-conflict coping mechanisms – particularly the creation of reconciliation platforms as a means of reestablishing coexistence. This part demonstrates that alongside coping strategies within the communities, the existence and utilization of legal and political mechanisms also contributed to the endurance of toleration.

The third part explores whether the shared fate of Jews and Evangelical Protestants led to any form of cooperation between them. Although the study finds that Jewish post-conflict coping mechanisms were influenced by the emergence of the Reformation and Protestant-Catholic polemics, it also demonstrates that despite having a common enemy, Catholic attacks did not create a sense of solidarity among Jews and Protestants and did not deepen the extent of their interaction or cooperation. In addition to discussing the rise of anti-Jewish hostility following the Reformation and its exploitation in the context of a Counter-Reformation struggle, parts one and three of the book contribute to the seldom researched subject of Jewish-Protestant relations within the Polish -Lithuanian Commonwealth.

This study’s main thesis is that toleration did not necessarily imply the absence of crises or enshrining the rights of a strong political minority. Rather, toleration was also manifest in the possibility for religious minorities to resolve conflicts. It was the provision of conflict-management tools that allowed the recurrent reestablishment of the status-quo, constituting an additional layer in the complex nature of famous Polish tolerance. In shifting the focus from the causes leading up to the riots, this book contextualizes the shock experienced by Jewish and Protestant communites following the riots, and provides a novel, source-based examination of the coping mechanisms used within and beyond the assaulted community. It shows that although the community response had to adjust to the nature of the events as well as to the gradual erosion of religious toleration, the communities’ core strategies for coping with riots and reestablishing coexistence endured and even expanded throughout the examined period. Only in the modern did violence reach such magnitude that no existing paradigm was able to achieve reconciliation.
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