**Part B: From political camp to religious minority: Protestants' struggle for toleration**

**Chapter 4: Protestants and multi-religious coexistence in Cracow**

 **(forthcoming)**

**Chapter 5: Protestant responses to violence**

 5.1. Attacks on the Brog

[[1]](#footnote-1)

“It is a sad thing, but the church in Cracow did not have long to enjoy the sought-after peace granted it by the Polish kings. […] Since, in 1574, on the 10th of October, during the second interregnum after King Sigismund August, when King Henry […] fled Poland for France and Piotr Zborowski […]was just appointed as voivode […], following the incitement by the priests the disobedient students were stirred up […] and the rabble joined them in throngs [causing] a great uproar in the city of Cracow, and afterwards they stormed the church with such force and fervor that it lasted from Sunday noon until Tuesday. Day and night they attacked the church […].”[[2]](#footnote-2)

“Houses destroyed, walls shattered, windows, locks, bars, doors, and boards all pulled out, […]; secret boxes were removed; looting took place, people were killed.”[[3]](#footnote-3) The vice-starost Zygmunt Palczowski tried to help, but when most of his men were injured and he himself was attacked, he retreated to protect the castle.[[4]](#footnote-4) He later posted guards in the streets of the city,[[5]](#footnote-5) and “sent […] a request to the rector of the academy, along with a complaint about the havoc that his students had wreaked. The rector responded that the matter pained him greatly and he would investigate the offenders and punish them.”[[6]](#footnote-6) The vice-starost sent the rector’s reply to the Protestant community, and also requested that its members “not do anything dangerous, [and act] only through the court beadle and with the aid of a nobleman, keeping to the Polish custom.”[[7]](#footnote-7) In the meantime, the riot continued. “Schoolboys (żacy) began as usual, the students – spurred on by priests […] – protected them, hooligans smashed things, builders fanned the flames, axes were brought that had been prepared and rented for just this occasion, and the rogues celebrated over their profit from it all.”[[8]](#footnote-8) The gates of the castle were closed. “The students were about 1,500 men and almost all of them were armed.”[[9]](#footnote-9) They split up and, while one group watched the streets, the other broke into the church and the adjacent building. The gates of the city were closed[[10]](#footnote-10) and for the next three days the capital was as if under a siege.

After destroying the church building, “They shamelessly sang the hymn Te Deum while celebrating their victory.”[[11]](#footnote-11) According to the report of a Venetian diplomat by the name of Lucio Sacello, the students took more than 30,000 florens worth of money and other church property, and none of the authorities demanded their return.[[12]](#footnote-12) The events drew to a close only with the arrival of the voivode Zborowski with a sizeable contingent of soldiers who “threw up a barricade between the two sides and evacuated a number of dead and wounded.”[[13]](#footnote-13)

On Friday, the 15th of October, when calm had returned to the city, Palczowski registered an official complaint with the castle office against the students and the other evildoers (*malevoli*) and vagabonds (*homines vagabondi*).[[14]](#footnote-14) In addition to the vice-starost, the community elder, Stanislaw Karniński Iwan,[[15]](#footnote-15) whose property had been deposited for safekeeping in the church, delivered an official protest to the castle office against the students who, in disregard of laws and freedoms, disturbed the public peace and displayed contempt for the Confederation.[[16]](#footnote-16) In response, an official investigation was opened by the castle office, in which participated the starost and voivode Zborowski, the Bishop of Cracow, Franciszek Krasiński,[[17]](#footnote-17) and Jakub Górski, the new rector of the University of Cracow.. On October 18th, the court beadle inspected the injuries suffered by servants sent by their noble or municipal masters to defend the church, and recorded in court books his testimony as to the severity of the injuries.[[18]](#footnote-18) In the course of the investigation, no witnesses from the student body could be found. Thus, on October 21st, the court took testimonies indicating that certain students under suspicion had not taken part in the riot.[[19]](#footnote-19) Furthermore, as part of the investigation, two inquisitors were chosen and tasked with finding the stolen property. However, the nobility lacked confidence in them and even before the investigation had concluded, the community representatives gathered with the voivode in order to consult on how to proceed in their search for the true perpetrators.[[20]](#footnote-20) On Saturday, October 23rd, officials and counselors from schools appeared in the castle court for interrogation. On Monday, October 25th, their affidavits were presented. As a result of the investigation, the students and the entire university were charged with the destruction of the church,[[21]](#footnote-21) along with “five men – builders’ apprentices and carpenters’ assistants – who joined the students and the rabble in the destruction and were apprehended based on the evidence against them.”[[22]](#footnote-22) “The servants of the voivode of Sieradz and some servants of the clergy – who were identified as culprits – hid behind their noble origin or various other privileges, and so were saved harm.”[[23]](#footnote-23) Alongside the investigation, the Protestant nobility from across the province gathered in Cracow and “drafted a protest against the destruction of the church, sending it to all the provinces.”[[24]](#footnote-24) According to the report of the papal emissary Vincenzo Laureo to Cardinal Como, the representatives of the common members joined the community leaders in this gathering. Following speeches, the reading of letters from various provinces and foreign lands, and calls for revenge, it was decided to initiate a more vigorous investigation in order to find the true instigators of the riot. One of the members was chosen to facilitate conversations with the council of priests, while another was tasked with delaying the king in his journey to Poland. It was also decided to set a guard over the church and to present an official protest (protestacja) in the castle court in order to assure compensation for damages[[25]](#footnote-25): “the estimated cost of looted goods and damages amounted to roughly 100,000 zloty.”[[26]](#footnote-26) In addition, “the nobles and the burghers who were injured filed a complaint before his eminence, the voivode Piotr Zborowski, over the destruction of the church and the looting.”[[27]](#footnote-27) On October 26th, after harsh interrogation in the castle court,[[28]](#footnote-28) the five commoners mentioned above, who had been caught “assisting in the theft and looting of the house on Św. Jana street, known as “the Brog”[[29]](#footnote-29) – specifically, carrying away wood from the church[[30]](#footnote-30) – were beheaded. In the testimony of Wojciech of Kościelec, one of those sentenced to death, it is written:

While still standing facing the Protestant church, the ax was taken from him by force in order to pry off the bars, and he received [for the ax] one Czech gros from a bollard wearing a white żupan. The said Wojciech admitted of his own free will that he had taken the fur coat, which had been thrown from the church into the street, and pawned it for four gros. The said Wojciech admitted under torture that he had approached the bars with an ax and pried them loose, at which point the bars crushed him; the mob passed over the bars, with him lying beneath, and when he entered the basement there was nothing left […][[31]](#footnote-31)

On the same day, October 26th, the court beadle, Stanisław Chudziński, reported on the finding of a certificate of privilege of a nobleman by the name of Leszczyński that was stolen from the church treasury.[[32]](#footnote-32)

The investigations continued even after the sentences had been carried out. On October 29th, the court beadle’s testimony was recorded regarding the death of one of the defenders of the church following his injuries.[[33]](#footnote-33) On October 30th, the court registered the examinations of the injuries (obdukcja) of the castle guard and a castle administrator (Skopkowski) who had been sent “with other servants of the castle to restrain and calm the violence,”[[34]](#footnote-34) and had participated in the defense of the church. On November 1st, Krzysztof Trecy sent a letter to the Calvinist community in Zurich reporting on the events. The responses from Switzerland, as well as letters expressing solidarity from other foreign communities, were not preserved, but the sources testify that they were read publicly.

It is likely that, in the course of the investigation, some noblemen were also arrested, but they were released after promising to donate to the repair of the church. Their promises were not enough, however, and the community presented an official demand for compensation by the city, since the city itself had done nothing to stop the destruction at the time.[[35]](#footnote-35)

In the meantime, “since there was no king in Poland, little good came of such confusion.”[[36]](#footnote-36) Following the conclusion of the investigation, the Protestant nobility reconvened, this time during the noblemens’ diet in Proszowice, in order to use their political power to demand justice. This assembly, which was held between the 11th and the 16th of November 1574, invited Marcin Glicky, the rector of the academy in Cracow at the time of the events, to respond to the charges against the students and the university. The hearing was held on November 14th and, according to the rector’s report, his defense was successful.[[37]](#footnote-37) After this failed attempt to seek justice from the university authorities, the noblemen’s diet decided to present a public complaint , referring its preparation to the general assembly, set to convene in May of 1575. In the meantime, despite the declarations of Cardinal Hozjusz that “we must endeavor with all our strength to ensure that on the site of the destroyed Brog church no church of Satan be built,”[[38]](#footnote-38) the Protestant community repaired the church. On March 13th, 1575, to mark the renovation of the church, the Protestant district assembly made a point of convening in Cracow. On April 13th, 1575, the nobility assembled again in Proszowice in order to relay instructions to the representatives to the general assembly [Zjazd Stężycki] set for May of that year.[[39]](#footnote-39) The fourth section of those instructions included demands for prevention of war, the restoration of justice, and compensation.[[40]](#footnote-40) On May 12th, when the assembly opened, these demands received renewed validity following the opening of a new trial that very day of Catholics who had attacked the Brog church.[[41]](#footnote-41)

The Protestants’ actions at the general assembly in Stężyce had a transitional character. They concluded the Protestant response to a single, local event and began a new process protesting a series of anti-Protestant events which had started with the destruction of the Protestant graveyard on June 24th, 1575. This time, the castle office – which was at that time under the control of Calvinists[[42]](#footnote-42) – set a guard around the church for four weeks, saving it from destruction.[[43]](#footnote-43) Nevertheless, in the face of recurring attacks, the district assembly at Proszowice moved to preventative measures, announcing that, in the case of future attacks, all noblemen would convene and, if necessary, judge the guilty parties without consideration of their social standing. Furthermore, the assembly tasked Piotr Zborowski (voivode and starost of Cracow) and the municipality with keeping the public peace and judging those who violated it, in keeping with the Statute of Toruń. The assembly sought to demand the same of the Bishop of Cracow.[[44]](#footnote-44)

Despite these decisions, attempted attacks continued to be made on the church as well as its members. The worsening situation reached a nadir on April 11th, 1577, when the church was attacked and Daniel Bileński, a Calvinist preacher, was injured. A week after the events, the injured preacher filed a personal protest at the castle office against Mathias Puchacz, the student of the academy in Cracow, who, “without consideration for public peace and general welfare […] turned to violence and wounded him […] and even tried to kill him.”[[45]](#footnote-45) This time the complaint reached the king, Stephen Bathory. On April 27th, 1577, the king commanded the starost to open a careful investigation into the wounding of the preacher, to punish any guilty parties in his jurisdiction and to be sure to bring any others to the appropriate court for punishment, out of an understanding “that these matters have violated the public peace.” He added, “if they [the guilty parties] were forgotten, turn to us [the king] regarding the matter, and we will find ways to investigate and ensure that they do not violate the public peace.”[[46]](#footnote-46) The king gave the same command to the city council, not wanting the public peace to be broken “in this city [Cracow], which has been a wondrous example of justice and security.”[[47]](#footnote-47) The king also commanded the rector and the professors of the academy to find and severely punish those guilty of attacking the church, and to prevent students from participating in future riots.[[48]](#footnote-48)

Vice-starost Palczowski also got involved in the case, seeking justice in Bileński’s name. On May 10th, 1577, an arrest warrant was served for the student Puchacz for assault of the preacher.[[49]](#footnote-49) Following the investigation, the rector decreed that the student surrender his weapon, which he held counter to the rules of the academy, and to pay a fine of six groshen for its possession. For the assault of the preacher, the student was declared subject to arrest and trial in a court suitable for a nobleman.[[50]](#footnote-50) The student fled arrest on May 26th, for which he was expelled from the academy on June 2nd.[[51]](#footnote-51)

The response to the events made a significant impression on the Protestant community. The instructions of the assembly of nobility in Korczyn included an order to the emissaries to the king to express their thanks for the royal orders and to request that he consider how to prevent similar events in the future and avoid the state of affairs current in Western Europe. They further requested that responsibility be taken for such events regardless of the culprits’ social standing or the location of the crime.[[52]](#footnote-52)

The Protestants’ satisfaction with the responses of the king and the academy did not last long. The anti-Protestant attacks did not cease. Despite their severity, the royal edicts were not actually enforced. Węgierski summarized the situation in the following way: “[…] when they turned to the king and complained of the acts of those rioters, they received an order from his highness the king to the castle office, the municipality, and the rector of the academy, demanding that justice be done, but the truth of the matter is that the order did not help at all.”[[53]](#footnote-53) On August 3rd, 1578, the Protestants sent emissaries to the king to lodge complaints against the students and warned that if the king did not prevent further attacks the community would attempt its own defense. The voivode Zborowski also requested that the king come to Cracow in order to prevent future violence. The king promised to come and to prevent future riots but, in the meantime, the royal edicts did not bring about any justice; rather, the anger spread and caused additional riots, public shaming, and other hardships, as well as attacks on Protestant sites. The king finally arrived in Cracow in October of 1578. In his and the Senate's presence, the Protestants named the students and the heads of the academy as responsible for the destruction of the Brog church as well as the continuing attacks and the events of June. The Protestants estimated the damages to the church at 70,000 zloty. The debate dragged on for ten days. According to the rector’s records, the heads of the academy denied all wrongdoing and mocked the Protestants before the king and the senators: “Thanks to God and the king’s mercy, nothing came of this.”[[54]](#footnote-54) The king, who apparently did not wish to reopen the trial “because a number of people had already been beheaded who were apparently guiltless,”[[55]](#footnote-55) heard arguments from both sides and on October 27th issued a ruthless edict to prevent any future excesses.[[56]](#footnote-56)

 Despite the king’s response, the Catholic camp did not give up hope, as described by the papal emissary: “With time, the king will have to expel the heretics from the city, along with their synagogue, for the public peace is not secure and the king sees how much the academy suffers at the hands of its opponents.”[[57]](#footnote-57)

The royal edict brought calm and “for the following years, so long as King Stephen, may his memory be blessed, was alive, there was a sort of peace, and prayer services were held in Cracow without incident, except in the year of 1579,”[[58]](#footnote-58) when high school students attempted to break into the church. The attacks gained in strength, finally resulting in the second destruction of the Brog church.

**4.2.   Vengeance in the reconciliation process**

The attack on the Brog church in 1574 was the first of its kind, “an exceptional thing in Poland, where such a thing had never been read or heard of, and nothing like it had ever occurred.”[[59]](#footnote-59) It came as a surprise to the Protestant community and, since they had no tradition of collective response to persecution, it drew a variety of responses, including the immediate urge to respond with violence. This should come as no surprise, given that violence and violent revenge were a part of life for the Polish nobility, who were the inheritors of a military tradition (levée en masse), were the first to take up arms, and did not refrain from violence in their daily lives. Although over the course of the 16th century legislators and courts in Poland sought to do away with or at least minimize the practice of revenge-taking (odpowiedź /odwet),[[60]](#footnote-60) “noble vengeance” was not considered a serious crime.[[61]](#footnote-61) Only murder, without the prior granting of terms, was considered to fall outside the law, and resulted in loss of honor and the death sentence.[[62]](#footnote-62) It was not without reason that the vice-starost Palczowski tried to direct the initial response of his co-religionists towards the accepted procedure of “noble vengeance,” ordering the members of his community “[…] not to do any dangerous thing, but [to act] only through the court beadle and the nobleman, as established by Polish tradition.”[[63]](#footnote-63) This demand is understandable in light of the fact that during the period of conflict between Catholics and Protestant, that is, between the emergence of the Reformation from the underground and the victory of the Counter-Reformation, the Protestants at times resorted to violence to defend themselves, at times even injuring Catholics. For example, in 1591, while defending the Brog, the representatives of the Protestants, along with the king’s guard, “killed five or six Catholics and wounded sixty-eight or seventy.”[[64]](#footnote-64)

In the course of the Protestants’ response to the events, the desire to respond to the Catholics measure for measure appeared as both an immediate impulse [“that everyone should go out and destroy whatever church he should find”[[65]](#footnote-65)] and as a planned response to be employed when no other options could be found. The threat of revenge was voiced, for example, after the first destruction of the Brog. On November 25th (1574) “many heretics gathered in the church […] after some words from the preacher, the voivode of Cracow gave his speech, and afterwards the starost of Sandomierz called for a revenge attack on the Cracow Cathedral Chapter (kapituła) and the academy as well as their looting.”[[66]](#footnote-66)

The desire for revenge reoccurred after a Catholic attack on a Protestant funeral and the subsequent riot in June of 1578, when

they [the Protestants] declared publicly and stated in the following words or in a similar fashion that, after the matter had been judged it was decided to launch a hostile attack […] with their own hands against their [the Catholics’] sanctuaries and holy places and even clergymen themselves, and to spill blood and cause destruction, to cut down the clergy and do away with them completely.[[67]](#footnote-67)

These threats were taken seriously by the Catholics and their leadership, not only out of fear of revenge but also out of concern that the interreligious conflict would spread as it had in Western Europe. This concern, which stemmed from the desire to preserve the peace of the state and prevent civil war, was shared by Catholics and the various communities of Protestants. Despite religious fervor and the arrogance of the nobility, both camps were aware of the danger: “There is reason to fear that the matter [the first destruction of the Brog] will be a spark that ignites a fire in the homeland, which the blood of many will not be able to extinguish.”[[68]](#footnote-68)

Despite the voices in favor of violent revenge, the Protestants chose to marginalize violence within their collective policy, and to deal with the inter-religious conflicts in ways that allowed the restoration of co-existence rather than aggravating the crisis. In addition, like other minorities, which, according to Nirenberg’s argument, dealt with violence in different ways depending on their roles in society,[[69]](#footnote-69) the Protestants in Poland concentrated their post-trauma responses within the political arena. As members of the nobility, the only social class with political power in Poland,[[70]](#footnote-70) they took advantage of this power and the mechanisms most familiar to them, such as the legal and court systems and the political structure.

 These, along with the right of the religious minority to use them, were the channels that allowed for post-conflict reconciliation.

**4.3.    Tolerance through law and justice**

In 1574, the official response of the Protestants came three days after the violent events. It aimed at restoring the balance of justice and laying the foundation for the restoration of Protestant-Catholic coexistence. The first step to this end was the official complaint presented to the castle office by vice-starost Palczowski, in which he described the events and accused the students and their accomplices.[[71]](#footnote-72) Whether he was acting within his official capacity or was the genuine representative of the community, Palczowski performed the groundwork allowing for an official investigation and a subsequent case in castle court. At the same time, an elder of the community, Karniński Iwan, presented an additional complaint against the students and their looting. By recording the events in castle books, Palczowski and Karniński achieved legal recognition of the injury suffered by the community and of their version of the events, thereby laying the foundation for future complaints by the Protestants. This process was the first word in the official response of the community, as well as a sort of summary of the first stage in the community’s coming to terms with the shock of the events. In this early stage, we can see the crystallization of the collective understanding of the events as well as the way in which they presented them to outsiders. Likewise, patterns of behavior were set, establishing the mechanisms to be used and the paths to be taken towards the creation of a platform for reconciliation.

From the outset, the evangelical community chose to see the destruction of the church not as an attack on a house of worship but as a violation of noble rights and an attack on the public peace and on agreements between nobles. That being the case, in their response the community stressed the violation of noble privileges and prior agreements and not the religious aspect or the violation of freedom of religion. They described the attack within the context of non-religious violence and looting characteristic of students and the city’s poor.[[72]](#footnote-73) In his first protest, the vice-starost had already complained that the students had scorned the law as a whole and particularly the laws of the Confederation regarding the public peace. He did not mention religious persecution or mourning, nor did he use religious imagery or language of the type we find in later responses by the radical streams, which drew on the tradition of Jewish persecution in formulating their responses.[[73]](#footnote-74) The local authorities likewise related to the attack on the community as part of the general atmosphere of violence and looting common throughout the early modern city. Protestants' perception and presentation of the events shorn of their religious context can be understood as the expression of the dominance of the socio-political element and ethos within the life of the Polish nobility, for whom “politics penetrated everything.”[[74]](#footnote-75) However, it should also be recognized as a reflection of the nature of the Polish Protestant community and its belief system. It should be apprehended as revealing the way in which the Protestant nobility understood tolerance first and foremost as social equality and the preservation of politico-social rights before the law. Regarding the Protestant response to violent events, the socio-political understanding of the events was one of the factors leading the Protestant community to choose recourse to the law and the courts in its pursuit of communal and inter-religious reconciliation.

Within this context of post-crisis responses, the Protestant community sought recognition of the injury done to them as well as the restoration of justice. The first protestations were registered with the castle office of Cracow, which served in fact as a sort of notary public, granting legal legitimacy to various actions. [[75]](#footnote-77) It was an active arm of the system that came in direct contact with all populations belonging to different jurisdictions. It was the castle office that mediated between people and the law, the court and the state. As such, the Protestant community used the castle office as a legal agent that granted sanction and validity to its appeals to the authorities, not only in the early stages but throughout the process of restitution of the balance of justice. From the first protestations to the summons of communal authorities to hearings in political forums, the injured community used the office and its agents to bolster their claims. For example, after the second destruction of the Brog, the castle office summoned – in the name of the Protestant community – the culprits to the electoral assembly (conventum electionis) by which they were to be judged. It was also the castle office that later took the testimony of the beadle (ministerialis terrestris) regarding the execution of the summons.[[76]](#footnote-78)

In addition to the castle office’s duties as notary, it also served as the office of the castle court. After an appeal had been made, the legal briefs were passed to the castle court, which conducted an investigation and passed on its finding to the court. For example, after the second destruction of the Brog, an agent of the office accompanied the beadle (woźny grodzki) in order to inspect the scene of the riot and to estimate the damages. The agents of the office were responsible for recording testimony, issuing and delivering summons to an investigation or a courtroom. At times they also took part in initiating an investigation as representatives of one side or the other. For example, a castle clerk by the name of Paweł Strzeszkowski accompanied the inspection of the crime scene in 1579 and subsequently presented to the castle office a complaint against the students in the name of the Protestant community.[[77]](#footnote-79) By doing so he increased the involvement of the castle office in the restoration of justice.

There were advantages to the castle court which the Protestants exploited in their pursuit of legal redress. First of all, it was the court of the nobility which, according to the Polish legal system, was governed by a rather arbitrary law "actor sequitur forum rei."[[78]](#footnote-80) It acted according to the Law of the Land and dealt primarily with cases in which the accused were from the noble class or the crime was a violation of the four laws of the Grod.[[79]](#footnote-81) This was a high court and, since its judgments were made in the name of the king, there was no option of appeal. At the head of this court stood the starost – a nobleman who served as the representative of the king in his city and was responsible for public order and security. The castle court was the highest police authority in the royal city. It possessed power of the sword and was responsible for carrying out legal decrees of various courts.[[80]](#footnote-82) This court had the authority to summon people from other jurisdictions, such as citizens of the city. In addition, practically speaking, the castle court was one of the more efficient courts in the period under discussion. Appealing to it guaranteed a thorough, well-documented, and relatively speedy legal process.. In light of these advantages, it is no surprise that the Protestant nobles conducted part of their struggle for justice in this court. They understood and explained the traumatic events as a violation of public order and peace, which fell under the jurisdiction of the castle court.

In addition to making wide use of existing legal systems, the Protestant community developed other patterns of behavior in their use of the legal-judicial approach. These characterized the first stage of the community’s coping with events and permeated later stages as well as other approaches to seeking justice. The most salient pattern, emerging at the beginning of the official response, was reliance on the most prominent members of the community and their rights. The Protestants’ claims were based first on the violation of the individual nobleman’s rights – including damages to his property and at times his person. The Protestants consciously used personal grievances that stressed the high standing of the injured party. Only at a later stage did they add collective claims. Within the framework of the judicial system, the standing of the representatives was also exploited in forming committees.

An additional salient pattern that emerged from the Protestants’ legal pursuits is the attempt to create an interreligious and cross-jurisdictional infrastructure for the restoration of justice, for example through the appointment of judicial committees composed of representatives of various authorities.[[81]](#footnote-83) By involving diverse powers in the judicial process, the Protestants hoped to increase their chances of ensuring that the true culprits be punished.

The legal-judicial path and the patterns of behavior mentioned above aided the Protestants in advancing in two critical areas characterizing the early stages of coping with the crisis: locating and punishing the guilty parties as well as ensuring compensation for the damages to the community and its property. From the first destruction of the Brog, the Protestant community supported the search for the true culprits. They were not willing to settle for the arbitrary punishment of individual attackers by local authorities in the face of widespread violence in the city and demanded a thorough investigation to reveal the instigators of the attack and to punish them severely. In the majority of cases the Protestant community did not rush to accuse specific people, preferring instead to appeal to those responsible for the relevant parties, such as the rector in the case of the students or the chapter (capitulum) in the case of the clergy. It was the legal-judicial path that granted validity to such appeals and gave them a better chance of earning a response from those belonging to autonomous jurisdictions.

The second area in which the Protestants pursued the legal-judicial path was the return of stolen property and the securing of reparations for damages to the community and its property. This element was considered an important part in the restoration of the balance of justice, despite the fact that the community members were affluent and at times contributed from their own coffers in order to repair damages even before receiving any reparations. Such reparations were at times part of the sentence of the guilty parties and could come from individuals or from official authorities accused of abetting the criminals or ignoring their crime, as for example after the first destruction of the Brog.

In addition to efforts to restore justice through punishment and compensation, the Protestant community emphasized the future prevention of similar events as a necessary step in the process. In the first stage of their response, this element was only referred to obliquely, but in the second, when the prospect arose of such events repeating themselves, it became a central condition for the restoration of coexistence. Within the context of the legal-judicial channel, the Protestants demanded that the various authorities act to prevent future attacks. However, it quickly became clear to the community that the reach of the judicial system was too short to prevent recurring anti-Protestant attacks or other such violence in the city. The attempts of the representatives of that system, for example the starost or the castle guard, to prevent riots by placing armed guards around the church likewise turned out to be short term solutions that simply shifted the site of the attacks, for example to the Protestant graveyard. These facts, along with the recurring riots, were among the factors driving the Protestant community to pursue reconciliation through political means and transform it into a primary channel of their advanced response.

While the judicial-legal path did not always produce the desired results and did not provide all the necessary solutions, it remained the primary channel through which the community could express its understanding of the events and formulate its immediate responses to them. It was the first channel through which the Protestants sought to restore tolerance when it disappeared from the Polish street. The legal-judicial system provided the Protestants with the mechanisms to act for the restoration of justice and reconciliation. It gave practical expression to tolerance as equality of legal rights. Both the system and legal litigation constituted a fundamental factor in the facilitation, preservation, and restoration of interreligious coexistence.

**4.4.        Reconciliation and politics**

The Protestant community operated through the political channel on two closely related levels: conceptual and practical. In the conceptual sphere, the community sought to strengthen the socio-political element in their claims as well as in the resulting reconciliation. In the practical dimension, the Protestants used all levels of the political system in their efforts to reconcile and re-establish the interreligious status-quo. These two dimensions and the interactions between them not only characterized the advanced stages in the Protestants’ coping with the shock of tumults but also influenced the nature of the interreligious coexistence the community sought.

**4.4.1 Expansion of the Socio-Political Element and the Use of Political Mechanisms**

From the first stages of their response to the events, the Protestants internalized and relayed the basic understanding that causing injury to them or damage to their sites had socio-political, rather than religio-theological, import. Even if the religious element was mentioned, the general context remained entirely a civil one since, in the Protestants’ opinion, “religious rights [of their church] were [also] guaranteed by the Confederation to which all parties were accountable.”[[82]](#footnote-84) Once that understanding had crystallized within the framework of the judicial-legal path, the efforts of the Protestants were redirected to strengthening and expanding the socio-political element of their claims. In this stage of the process of coming to terms with the shock, the Protestants intensified their accusation of the Catholics violating the public peace by claiming that the events amounted to “not only a violation of the public peace but of all the laws of the Confederation and the important laws of the Republic, which are thus likely not only to be abandoned but openly scorned, nullified, and practically trampled upon.”[[83]](#footnote-85) This new direction was intended to expand the importance of the events as well as to stress the need for coming to terms with the shock, a need shared not only by the Cracow community but the entire nobility. According to their claims,

Not only are all the holy and ancient laws (sacrosancte leges) of our forefathers likely to end in chaos, but also all of our assemblies since the death of his majesty, our lord the king, and all the debates which required so much effort and labor […], all of these will become a mockery in the Republicae. And we could never achieve any form of law and order nor discipline in the Rzplita […] and we would quickly come to destruction and collapse.[[84]](#footnote-86)

According to this complex understanding of the situation, the anti-Protestant events were an attack on the foundations of law and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, on which were based the rights of the entire nobility. By propagating this meaning of the anti-Protestant attacks, the Cracow community attempted to stress the relevance of the events to the state as a whole and to enlist the broadest possible support for its post-conflict efforts. It aimed to put the process of reconciliation on the collective agenda. Just as their efforts in the judicial-legal process combined individual protestations with communal claims, so too was the political channel intended to combine claims and demands of the injured community with the broad support and shared interests of the entire noble class of the Commonwealth. Furthermore, the emphasis on the socio-political aspect of the events and its relevance to the entire nobility aided the Cracow community in arousing class solidarity, which in turn could be used to advance Protestants’ demands. For example, at the provincial assembly in Proszowice in April of 1575, the Protestant members succeeded in inserting their demands into the instructions to the representatives to the general assembly not only by virtue of their political power but also with the aid of the claim that restoration of justice, along with the payment of reparations, could prevent the civil war that threatened the entire state.[[85]](#footnote-87)

Likewise, the practical dimension of using existing political mechanisms to advance the reestablishment of the status quo contributed greatly to emphasizing the relevance of the crisis to the state as a whole and to enlisting the broad support for the proposed solutions. Since “in the Polish Republic the nobility was a singularly powerful political force,”[[86]](#footnote-88) and in light of the fact that during the riots many of the politically active nobles were Calvinists, the Protestant leadership had no problem in exploiting political institutions and networks to advance their socio-political agenda. The basic political mechanism in the “democracy of the nobles” and, ex post facto, in the Protestants’ response to the crisis, was the assembly in its various forms. The assembly records (djariusze), their legislation (lauda), and the assemblies’ instructions (instrukcje) to the deputies to the general conventions or the emissaries to the king all show that the Protestants’ demands were expressed loudly and clearly and impressed their stamp on the political process.

The provincial diet (sejmik ziemski) was the primary platform used by the Protestants to promote the socio-political meaning of the crisis and to emphasize its relevance to the state as a whole. Here the socio-political policies took shape and subsequent political maneuvers were crafted. Here the claims and demands of the local Protestant community were incorporated into the agenda of a regional, multi-denominational political assembly and their appeal became relevant not only to all Protestants of the region but also to the political class of nobility cherishing its solidarity.

In addition to laying the foundation for cross-confessional regional support, the provincial diet granted the Protestants access to the statewide network of over sixty assemblies that worked in tandem. Through exploiting the mechanism of the regional assemblies and the connections between them, the Protestants formed a broad-based network of multi-denominational and cross-regional support, the primary goal of which was to influence the king and royal policy. Appeals to this network were reserved for the most pressing matters and were carried out either through correspondence or the sending of emissaries from one region (Cracow in this case) to other assemblies.[[87]](#footnote-89) For example, after the first destruction of the Brog church, the local nobility drafted a letter of protest and sent it to all the provinces to request advice, assistance, and cooperation in punishing the culprits and preventing future riots.[[88]](#footnote-90) Proof of the effectiveness of such political mechanisms in advancing their causes can be found in the appearance of similar demands – for the preservation of the Confederation and the punishment of the instigators of the crimes – in the instructions of the various regional assemblies that were held around the convening of the Sejm in 1593.[[89]](#footnote-91)

In addition to their political function, the various political assemblies fulfilled a series of roles in the process of reconciliation, such as public trials. Due to their political strength and their independent judicial standing, the assemblies helped in cases in which the accused were people of authority or fell under the jurisdiction of autonomous courts. For example, after the first destruction, the assembly used its authority to summon the rector of the academy for interrogation and judgment. Furthermore, the assembly was the first to establish inter-denominational committees and to authorize the nobles serving on them to investigate the riots and even to accuse officials or authorities and to summon their representatives to judgment before the general assembly.[[90]](#footnote-92)With the transformation of the socio-political aspect into the conceptual basis and a factor in uniting and enlisting broad support, the demands for the prevention of future riots and the punishment of the true instigators were also granted new standing and a socio-political interpretation through the political channel. Instead of temporary steps – such as the placing of armed guards around the church, establishing emergency judicial committees, or appealing to authorities for cooperation in apprehending and punishing the guilty parties[[91]](#footnote-93) – the political channel suggested a more general answer of restoring coexistence with the aid of legislation and the government. This answer fit the socio-political understanding of the anti-Protestant riots and the recognition of them as part of the violence endemic to the early-modern city, as well as the political culture of the noble class. After the founding of the community the Protestants had made efforts to anchor their socio-political standing and the status quo in the law. Likewise, after the presentation of the crisis in coexistence as a fundamentally socio-political event, the Protestants saw fit to bolster the post-conflict solutions with the help of the law and its mechanisms. The two primary resolutions they established as fundamental for the restoration of coexistence and which they attempted to protect by law were the prevention of additional riots and the enforcement of laws delineating punishment. They decided to introduce them into the Warsaw Confederation, which until that point had served as the basis for Protestants' standing and rights. The process of amending and reaffirming the Confederation became known in historiography as ‘the procedure of the Warsaw Confederation’ (processu confederatio). However, despite the many studies on the Confederation and its procedure, their importance in the process of coping with the anti-Protestant riots has yet to be granted the proper emphasis.[[92]](#footnote-94)

4.4.2. **Reconciliation and 'The Procedure of the Warsaw Confederation'**

The Warsaw Confederation was a collective initiative guaranteeing equal rights to nobles of all non-radical Christian denominations. It was signed by men acting as equals and not by a king issuing a privilege for a tolerated religious minority. The Confederation was ratified first by the Electoral Diet (sejm elekcyjny) and not by the king. Yet, due to the legislative supremacy of the nobles and the rule of consensual lawmaking,[[93]](#footnote-95) it was considered a law. As a law it received symbolic ratification by the elected kings, despite the opposition of the Catholic camp.[[94]](#footnote-96) The treaty was considered a great achievement and the jewel in the crown of Polish tolerance.

Nevertheless, as the treaty was signed within a particular context, it was laconic in its language and addressed only the immediate threat of a religious war. The shock of the riot, which was not mentioned in the treaty, underscored many of the problems of the treaty and created new challenges that demanded changes in the content and the nature of the Confederation.

First, the Confederationwas part of the process of establishing the legal standing of the Protestant community and thus focused on preserving equal rights for the nobles who left the Roman church. Second, it obligated the signatories not to launch a war for religious or political reasons, thus seeking to eliminate mutual conflicts. The treaty did not address attacks or the need for physical protection of community members or their places of worship. As Count Walerjan Krasiński noted, the Confederation promised religious freedom but, in contrast to the Peace of Augsburg, did not contain the words “security, tolerance, and protection” (securitas, tolerantia et protectio), speaking only of peace between religious dissidents (pax dissidentium).[[95]](#footnote-97) The treaty, which related exclusively to the nobility,[[96]](#footnote-98) was intended to address the immediate fears of that class, such as state persecution, political strife, and civil war. It did not address the possibility of local attacks on community members or their institutions by “the street,” that is, city residents from various social classes.[[97]](#footnote-99) In the opinion of Tazbir, while the Warsaw Confederation, together with the privileges of nobility, prevented partisans of the Counter-Reformation from acting in their own power or using the power of governmental agencies against the Protestants, it drove the struggle into the streets and the hands of the classes that were not responsible to such agreements. It was precisely the move to the streets that created the need to amend the Confederation so that it would address physical security and defense of community members and their institutions. Paradoxically, the classist and political nature of the Confederation, which protected the Protestants against other nobles, created a new problem: street riots. The riots in turn demanded change in that very characteristic of the Confederation: from an agreement between members of the same class, with equal rights, to an agreement addressing the defense of one side against another. The anti-Protestant riots were in fact both the cause and the expression of the change that was occurring in the standing of the Protestant community from a socio-political camp with equal rights to a tolerated religious and political minority that required protection.

In addition to guarantees of security and tolerance, the Protestants sought to define in the Confederation the means of enforcing the law. In contrast to the privileges of the Jewish religious-ethnic minority, which alongside defining the rights of the Jews also listed the punishments for those who injured the community, which was considered “a weak group in need of protection against hostile social forces,”[[98]](#footnote-100) until the outbreak of the riots the violation of the Protestants’ rights went unaddressed. The signatories to the Confederation relied on the accepted and operative law and saw freedom of conscience as one of the rights of their class, no different from other liberties. The riots underscored the uniqueness of the right to freedom of conscience and revealed the need to establish the system of correction and execution of the Confederation. Similar to guarantees of security and tolerance, the establishment of punishments and sanctions was considered as both a fundamental deterrent and a factor in restoring justice and hence was accepted as necessary for the return to coexistence. In addition, since in 1573 the participants in the Confederation had not in fact passed a new law but only agreed to follow a certain procedure, the establishment of a means of enforcement was considered a necessary step in turning “the amended Confederation” into binding law.

In addition to safety-oriented laws, the Protestants sought to secure in the text of the Confederation also the enforcement of the rules. To this end, they demanded the appointment of a specific authority as responsible for enforcing each of the laws. The shock of the riots, as it came to expression in the Protestant response, underscored two intertwined problems: one, the confusion regarding questions of authority in responding to outbreaks of violence, and the other, negligence of authorities. According to testimonies, a multiplicity of sources of authority and a lack of clarity in the division of responsibilities between them made it difficult at times for the authorities to act effectively during the riots or afterwards. For example, at the time of the destruction of the Brog in 1587, the city council “did not want to intervene in matters of the Cracovian starost, and [so] they only commanded the guards to fire to frighten away the attackers.”[[99]](#footnote-101) Similar problems occurred due to the polyphonic character of the judicial system. At times, the complicated division of jurisdictions, including autonomous ones, disrupted the responses of the authorities. For example, after the first destruction of the Brog “it became clear that it was impossible to fault the castle office or the city council, since for their part they wished to prevent the riot, but it became clear that the culprits were students and academic authorities, who belonged to an autonomous jurisdiction.”[[100]](#footnote-102)

Unfortunately for the Protestants, aside from coping with these objective limitations, they were also forced to fight official negligence and feigned ignorance: “In such turmoil and injury the guilty parties were the members of the city council, who looked on ‘with one eye closed,’ when they did not wish or did not dare to give assistance.”[[101]](#footnote-103) In the early stages of their response, the Protestants sought to improve the effectiveness of the authorities in two essential ways: on the one hand they demanded their involvement in containing the riots, and on the other they advised cooperation between various authorities in order to overcome the lack of clarity regarding responsibilities as well as the obstacle of autonomous jurisdictions. In response, the authorities did occasionally intervene in the riots themselves, but primarily at the king’s command and by sending the city guard or the castle guard to the scene of the riot.[[102]](#footnote-104) At times the authorities’ representatives participated in trials following outbreaks of violence. But this piecemeal response was not particularly effective in the absence of any solution grounded in and backed by the law. Although the Protestants tried to force cooperation between the authorities with the help of the dietines, they did not meet with much success. Thus, in later stages of the reconciliation process, the Protestant representatives attempted to deal with the matter of delegation of authority and responsibilities through the use of higher political mechanisms and instances, such as the Sejm (National Assembly) and the king.

The General Sejm was usually convened by the king every two years and was joined by representatives of regional dietines equipped with instructions, some of which related to dealing with the anti-Protestant riots and post-crisis reconciliation.[[103]](#footnote-105) In between, and especially in periods without a king (interregnum), special assemblies would also convene. The assembly was composed of three bodies: deputies (the lower house), the Senate, and the king. Generally speaking, after the assembly was certified as a legislative body in 1505, it became an arena for political fights and the exertion of influence on the political and religious policies of the king. From the point of view of the Protestants, the Sejm was a source of legislation, the forum for enlisting support, and a way to reach the king. Although the Warsaw Confederation was signed at the general assembly, in the case of amending the Confederation, this interreligious forum was beset by difficulties. In the period of the Protestant-Catholic struggle, the religious and political differences at times overpowered the sense of class unity. The Catholic members of the assembly were absolutely opposed to the Protestants’ demands. What’s more, the clergy proposed rebuilding multi-confessional coexistence on the basis of a solution to the political and economic problems between it and the nobility (compositio inter status) and not a solution to the problem of the riots. In addition, as early as 1577 the Church Synod of Piotrków condemned the Confederation and threatened with excommunication “anyone who would bless, defend, or support this treaty.”[[104]](#footnote-106)

In the light of repeated failures, the Protestants changed their political strategy. They gave up their hopes of inserting their demands into the Confederation and instead tried to pass new laws. For example, in 1587 a number of Protestants proposed a law that, in the event of a riot, would appoint two special commissars who would summon the violators of the public peace to the sejm court which in turn would possess the power to issue the death penalty.[[105]](#footnote-107) Facing the absolute opposition of the Catholic camp, the Protestants were ready to reduce their demands and proposed setting general guidelines for punishment of whoever assaulted clergymen of any religion or any Christian church. Yet even this far-reaching compromise was not accepted. Another time the Protestants proposed an anti-riot law that would place the culprits, regardless of their background, under the jurisdiction of the starosts and the city (while preserving the right of appeal for the nobility). This idea was likewise not well received. In 1589, in the aftermath of the second destruction of the Brog, the Protestants demanded that the sejm set the death penalty as the legal punishment for instigators of riots, even if they were Catholic clergy. This initiative also failed. When the Protestants’ efforts to advance their agenda with the help of the sejm did not meet with success, the Protestant camp turned to the kings.

**4.4.3** Kings and the Protestant reconciliation process

The period of the anti-Protestant riots and the response to them was generally coterminous with the reigns of three kings: Stephen Bathory, Sigismund III Vasa, and Władysław IV Vasa.[[106]](#footnote-108) The Protestants turned to the kings with complaints, protests, requests, deputies’ instructions, and personal appeals. They presented the demands that were formed in response to the attacks or raised in the context of the “procedure of Confederation.” In addition, the Protestants often came with requests for direct royal intervention to prevent or contain riots or to restore justice in their aftermath. The kings responded to the Protestants’ demands in three essential ways as demanded by policy, circumstance, and need. They confirmed the Warsaw Confederation, participated personally in responses to specific riots, and issued new legislation.

After its signing, the Warsaw Confederation was turned into a part of the Articuli Henriciani and then part of the Pacta Conventa. As such, it was considered a part of the process of crowning the new king and anchoring Polish tolerance in the law. At the same time, when the ratification of the treaty was no longer in the hands of the assembly, its nature, import, and power were given over to various interpretations. On the one hand, confirmation of the Confederation by each elected king was still seen as a success for the Protestant camp. On the other, this victory was partial and even bitter due to the changes in the nature and importance of the Confederation, which stemmed from the change in the ratifying power as well as from changes and interpolations in its text.

With the king’s ratification as a replacement for the consent of the assembly, the Confederation was transformed from a treaty maintaining the status quo between equal sides to the granting of rights by the king. It was transformed from a symbol of mutual tolerance and class unity to a document similar to the privileges of other minorities, by which the king defined the legal status of a weak group and promised to protect it.[[107]](#footnote-109) In this new context, tolerance was not unanimously agreed upon but rather imposed by a higher power.

 This change in the nature of the Confederation and in fact the spirit of tolerance was also bolstered by amendments to the text itself. Although the interpolations were relatively minor in scope, they had a decisive effect and revealed far-reaching shifts in inter-denominational coexistence and the concept of tolerance. As early as the reign of Stephen Bathory, who is considered the most tolerant of the kings, the definition within the text of the Confederation changed from “dissidents de religione” to “dissidentes in religione.”[[108]](#footnote-110) The import of the change was that the Catholics were no longer included within the definition, being placed instead beside the king who granted tolerance to the dissidents, whose faith strayed from the norm. The state obligated itself to tolerate certain citizens who differed in their faith and were therefore unequal and in need of protection. Both types of emendation illustrated the change in the standing of the Protestants, a change initiated by, among other factors, the riots and the need to deal with them. The riots were one of the causes as well as one of the expressions of the Protestants’ shift from a political collective with equal rights to a religious minority in need of protection.

The kings, for their part, were sworn to protect the Confederation and, like the Protestants, stressed the civil-political aspect of the document. They presented the Confederation as part of the state’s system of laws, which must be accepted for the sake of public peace and not as an expression of pro-Protestant leanings. The royal interpretation of the Confederation as an oath to protect the interreligious peace and forbid religious persecution matched the view of the riot presented by the Protestants. Hence, after the Brog was destroyed for a third time, the delegates from the assembly in Radom reported to the king on the violation of the law, rights, and the public peace, which “His Highness our king has sworn to protect in defiance of the insult to the king and the crown.”[[109]](#footnote-111)

In 1588 the Confederation underwent a further development with the addition of the words “dissidentes in religione christiana” (“dissidents in the Christian religion”), which clarified that the Protestants were the sectarians who needed to be tolerated. This change in the language further illustrated the deterioration of the Protestants’ standing as they shifted from a political collective with equal rights to a religious minority that was tolerated out of mercy. Paradoxically, at the same time that their standing and rights worsened, the Protestants succeeded in including their demands within the language of the law. Although they did not succeed in changing the content of the Confederation, they managed to move towards rebuilding the peaceful status quo through separate royal legislation. In 1578 the king Stephen Bathory issued a decree “against riots for any reason,” in which he declared,

(1) No man is permitted to instigate riots in Cracow for personal or public reasons or for religious ones; (2) Any who attack houses in the city and its environs will be sentenced to death; (3) Private individuals must resolve their differences through the proper official channels, and if someone nevertheless violates the law, any official body is permitted to arrest him and conduct him to the proper office, which shall imprison him and conduct him with due speed to the court befitting his class. If the criminal should die while in custody, the official body that arrested him is not accountable for his death; (4) If a student (*scholarium sive studiosus*) is apprehended for a severe criminal offense, he should be conducted to a royal court, since the hegemon and the rector are not permitted to set up a court to hear criminal cases. If the apprehended is a clergyman, he shall be held in the jail of the hegemon, and if he is not a clergyman, he shall be held in the castle jail. The investigation shall be conducted immediately by the official body of the jurisdiction in which the accused is found, so that the truth may be revealed and innocent men not sit in jail; (5) If the official body should allow the accused to flee out of ignorance or negligence, it shall be punished according to the laws of the kingdom; (6) Students of the academy in Cracow must register by their full names in the records of the university so that no man may steal their identity and so that they be more disciplined. The students must reside in dormitories and buildings adjacent to church schools. It is forbidden to city residents to rent dwellings to students without special permission from the rector himself. The fine for doing so is fifty zloty; (7) City residents are forbidden to possess weapons that are forbidden to students and they are forbidden to give a weapon to students; (8) The responsible parties in the schools must register all their students of any age who depend on donations and may not allow them to loiter in the streets except at the times of the morning and evening meals. If, nevertheless, some are found wandering during other hours, for the first offense they shall be fined, and for the second or third offense they shall be expelled from the academy; (9) The rector and the professors must ensure that all youth, regardless of class, profession, or religion, are allowed to join the lectures. It is their responsibility to prevent quarrels and misunderstandings between the students. Academy matters shall be conducted according to the orders of Sigismund August; (10) The city council must maintain fifty soldiers who shall stand together with selected city residents beside the city gates and record the names of all unknown men who enter the city, along with the place from which they have come and their address in the city. This is in order to preserve quiet and to prevent entry by people likely to cause riots. The security of this guard is ensured by royal command. Householders must also report any guests or temporary residents in their homes to the city council. Any violation of these laws will be punished by a fine of fifty zloty; (11) The castle office must contribute special guards to the night watch in order to prevent criminal activity at night; (12) Beggars (mendicis) are not permitted to go about the city and gather donations unless their names and signs (signum) are registered by the city council; (13) If the city magistrate and city council do not follow all of these laws, or do not punish any person violating these laws, they shall each pay one-hundred zloty to the starost. Half of the fine shall remain with the starost and half shall be paid to the state treasury. There is no right of appeal; (14) These laws are also valid regarding the houses and holdings of senators and noblemen, and they must report all guests and vagabonds (vagis) found in their estates to the castle office. The castle office shall punish violators of these laws; (15) The representative of the king in Cracow (magnus procurator) and the city council must oversee the enforcement of these laws in all areas surrounding the city as well. Nevertheless, the castle office is responsible for the houses of the senators and the noblemen in these areas. Similarly, the hegemon of Cracow must also ensure the enforcement of the laws and ensure that no vagabonds are hiding in monasteries or clergymen’s houses. All information on temporary residents and guests in these houses must be shared with the hegemon’s assistant and other official bodies. The hegemon shall set the fines for the violation of these laws; (16) It must be ensured that, at the time of tumults in Cracow, every authority, supported by other official bodies and in consideration of the advice of the senators present in the city at the time, must attempt to stop the riots with peaceful means and with proper respect for other authorities. If one of the authorities does not wish to or cannot assist, then other authorities can stop the riots without its assistance.[[110]](#footnote-112)

From the point of view of the Protestants and their attempts to deal with the riots, such a resolute decree as this was a proper response to their demands. First, it granted legal legitimacy to the view of the anti-Protestant outbreaks as commensurate to any riot disrupting the public peace and needing immediate attention. As such, the decree ratified with the power of law the socio-political view of the anti-Protestant riots that the Protestants had formulated and spread. Second, the legislation forbade the riots and defined such disturbances – initiated for any reason, including religion – as criminal acts in every respect, requiring sanction and trial as any other criminal offense. By requiring the same treatment of rioters without exception, the decree strengthened the law as well as the hand of the authorities responsible for its enforcement. What’s more, the decree set a severe punishment for attacks on city buildings, thereby in fact forbidding and deterring attacks on Protestant institutions. In addition, the decree addressed the topic of prevention and required strict conduct regarding communities mentioned in the Protestants' demands as “the immediate suspects” liable to riot, e.g. the students of the university and the Jesuit schools and the “free people.”[[111]](#footnote-113) The matter of enforcing the laws is included in the decree and clearly connected to solutions to the problem of the delegation of powers and the division of responsibilities. The legislation forbade local authorities from ignoring the riots or dismissing them as part of the daily reality of violence. It clearly defined all areas of responsibility of every authority and every regional official, and divided the jurisdictions according to the state's legal system.[[112]](#footnote-114) Furthermore, the decree strengthened the delegation of powers by setting monetary sanctions and thus ensured that the legislation be followed by benefiting officials.[[113]](#footnote-115) In addition, the decree increased the level of involvement and cooperation of the authorities in preventing and responding to riots, especially since the king lay the responsibility for formulating and drafting the laws upon the delegates of the local authorities: the bishop Piotr Myszkowski, the rector of the academy and his assistants, the voivode and starost Zborowski, the mayor and the city council. Only at the end did the king ratify the decree, giving it the validity of law. Although the decree is usually seen as expressing the king’s support for tolerance and as a chapter in a political struggle, this mandatory legislation was the apex in the Protestants’ struggle for reconciliation and reestablishment of the peaceful status quo. The decree answered the demands they had put forward through every possible channel. Although it fell outside of the framework of the Confederation, the decree bolstered Protestants' rights and greatly contributed to the pursuit of peace which in turn allowed for a degree of toleration and the rebuilding of a complex coexistence based on it.

Despite the Protestants’ success in seeing their demands written into law, their struggle for reconciliation and toleration did not end there. In actuality, the decree was not strictly enforced, especially after the death of the king responsible for it. So the Protestants were forced again and again to fight for the decree’s continuing validity and enforcement. Their success was limited to the renewed ratification of the decree by the general assembly in 1593, 1595, and 1598, each instance being only a temporary resumption of the discussion. The example of the decree shows that Polish tolerance was bound up not only with coexistence itself but also with the ability to reconcile and return to the status quo time after time. The crises were unavoidable due to the nature of interreligious coexistence and, what’s more, “the lack of strong and effective authority was the factor that encouraged rioting in old Poland.”[[114]](#footnote-116) According to Tazbir and Teter, it was specifically the lack of effective implementation force that created the opportunity for tolerance, since “in a state without strong and effective authority, it is impossible to enforce any religion on the entire populace.”[[115]](#footnote-117) Yet, in this reality, tolerance was manifested not only in the policy of a “state without stakes” but also in the ability to reconcile the sides and reestablish coexistence without allowing disintegration into religious war.

In the context of the struggle against riots, the Protestants generally turned to the king as a higher authority who could help them directly and immediately in confronting specific outbreaks of violence. They turned to the crown in the same way that nobles did: through the sending of representatives from the provincial assembly, through the drafting of letters, through their supporters in the government, and through their instructions for deputies to the Sejm. A review of royal involvement in specific cases shows that the kings did not generally act of their own accord but only responded to the demands of one party or another. If the kings did intervene, they tried to preserve the public peace, to help in the restoration of justice, and to prevent specific outbreaks of violence. They acted first and foremost through royal orders to local authorities, for example the order sent by King Stephen Bathory to the starost and the city council of Cracow, or the orders of Sigismund III to the city council and regional assembly (1592). Unfortunately for the Protestants, royal orders, especially as a form of prevention, generally lacked the power of enforcement and so their influence was rather limited. At times, when orders were not enforced, the Protestants demanded that the king come himself to the capital in order to pacify the sides and prevent similar events in the future. So, for example, in 1578 the emissaries to Bathory received a response that the king would come to Cracow “and will stop more riots before his journey to Lithuania.”[[116]](#footnote-118)

In their struggle with the riots, the Protestants emphasized the post-conflict restoration of justice through punishment of the guilty parties. Thus, they also turned to the king as a high judge, primarily in the case of appeals and when the accused were people in authority or belonged to autonomous jurisdictions. For example, after the destruction of the church, the death of Paweł Chrzanowski, and a series of other attacks, the Protestants turned to the king and complained against “all the university [students and authorities] who had been summoned to the tribunal of the king and the senate.”[[117]](#footnote-119) The kings did not always respond affirmatively to the appeals of the Protestant camp, and for a number of reasons. For example, after the second destruction of the Brog, Sigismund III did not support the demands that the instigators of the riot be found and punished. On the contrary, “while quite a few were arrested and put [in prison], they all stayed in prison [only] until the arrival of the king and Swedish prince Sigismund III, when they were all set free”[[118]](#footnote-120) In another instance, after the final destruction of the Brog, “when the heretics turned to the king [Sigismund III], he was on the side of the Catholics.”[[119]](#footnote-121) While on the one hand he made sure to convene an assembly to discuss the solution to the problem of the riots, on the other he forbade the rebuilding of the Protestant church in Cracow.[[120]](#footnote-122) Just as the Protestants employed the political channel in their response to the riots, so too did the church and the Catholic nobles use it to advance their own agendas. For example, Cardinal Hozjusz – who was known as a partisan of the Counter-Reformation who supported riots and praised the students’ determination – tried to influence King Bathory through a number of letters. In his correspondence, he denounced the king’s apathy and demanded, among other things, the expulsion of the Protestant community from Cracow.[[121]](#footnote-123)

When the Protestant camp encountered repeated political failures or succeeded in obtaining only temporary compromises, when the king’s response was insufficient or did not bear fruit, and likewise when it became clear that the king did not stand by his promises, the Protestant nobles decided of their own accord to convene assemblies (Radom and Chmielnik), without the instructions of the king. In this way they moved to the side of the opposition, while making use of the mechanisms at their disposal.

An analysis of the Protestant responses to the riots against them shows that the policy of tolerance in the Kingdom of Poland-Lithuania did not stem from a separation of religion and politics. “In the Republic of Nobles, religious and political problems were bound up together, and so drawing a clear line between them would have been impossible.”[[122]](#footnote-125) Inter-denominational problems were an integral part of the political discourse of the nobility. Armed with the idea of freedom of conscience as one of the social and political rights of the nobility, and with the understanding of the riots as a violation of laws and rights, the Protestants responded to the violence through the judicial-legal system and the political channel. It was the combination of these two channels that allowed for the formulation and actualization of Protestants' claims, thereby setting the stage for the restoration of peaceful coexistence. It was not the lack of crises but the ability to find solutions that served as one of the important contributing factors in the functioning of Polish tolerance.
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