

Out of the (Historiographic) Ghetto: European Jews and Reformation Narratives

Debra Kaplan, Yeshiva University
Magda Teter, Wesleyan University

Extant historiography has created a historiographic ghetto, seldom considering Jewish sources as relevant to the larger narrative of European history. This has created two parallel, often disconnected areas of study, “European history” and “Jewish history.” Archival materials show that Jews and Christians resided side by side and interacted daily in early modern Europe. Reformation Strasbourg and post-Reformation Poland, geographically and demographically diverse, offer new insights about the past by including sources about Jews. In Reformation Strasbourg, leaders of different Christian confessions jointly issued policies aimed at regulating daily interactions between Jews and Christians, despite simultaneously battling one another in the realm of faith and politics. In post-Reformation Poland, the physical presence of Jews recorded underscores their neighborly relations with Christians and further demonstrates the limits to the seemingly successful Counter-Reformation in Poland.

IN A RESPONSUM, the seventeenth-century Polish rabbi Joel Sirkes matter-of-factly illustrated the possibility of proximity and perhaps even overlap of the living spaces of Jews and Christians. Addressing the status of meat left unattended in a place where non-Jews might come, he discusses a case in which the meat was hung in a room from which Jews come and go, “like when the Jew lives in the winter-section [heated room] of the house and the non-Jew lives right across from him in the same house where they bake bread and the Jew comes in and goes out during the day and night.”¹ Sources such as this one, which attest to the spaces, physical and cultural, that Jews and Christians shared in early modern Europe, clearly transform traditional notions of the firm boundaries between groups and raise questions about the extent and implications of interactions between Jews and Christians living side by side.

In Jewish studies, attempts to place Jews and their culture within the broader context of the environment in which they lived are a relatively recent phenomenon.² In recent decades, traditional views of Jewish isolation, lack of agency, and victimhood have been exploded. Scholars of Jewish history of various periods have increasingly recognized that the boundaries between Jews and non-Jews and between their cultures were not impermeable. These developments have led to

¹Joel Sirkes, *Ba’H he-ḥadashot* (Koretz: Johann Anton Krieger, 1785), no. 24.

²See for example, an overview on medieval history, William Chester Jordan, “Jewish Studies and the Medieval Historian,” *Exemplaria* 12, no. 1 (2000): 7–20, esp.18–20. Another useful discussion of historiographic trends is Moshe Rosman, *How Jewish Is Jewish History?* (Portland, OR: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2007).

new avenues of study, as well as to new insights and to heated scholarly debates about the development of Jewish culture, communities, and practices.

Ancient Jewish history, for example, has been reconsidered in light of larger cultural and political phenomena, changing earlier views of the political position of “Jews” (or Judeans) in the Fertile Crescent, with some scholars pointing to the emergence of Christianity and of rabbinic culture as two parallel phenomena.³ Yaakov Elman’s groundbreaking work on late antiquity underscores the importance of the surrounding environment, demonstrating that the rabbis of the Talmudic era were dealing with the same legal issues as their non-Jewish Sasanian counterparts.⁴ Studies of the medieval period have also shifted to recognize a much closer Jewish-Christian interaction that influenced not only daily relations, but also rituals and religious writings.⁵ So too, Hasidism, a movement among Jews of eastern Europe, has been reconsidered in the light of sources from Polish archives.⁶ While much work still needs to be done, most scholars of the Jews have recognized the need for such a broad approach, acknowledging that only knowledge of the environment and culture in which Jews lived their lives can lead to a fuller understanding of Jewish culture itself.⁷

leggerc?

³See for instance, Daniel Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994); idem, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004); Shaye J. D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999); Seth Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society, 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001). David Biale postulated that both Judaism and Christianity should be seen as “second testaments” since they “emerged in late antiquity out of the same literary, cultural, and religious milieu; David Biale, *Blood and Belief: The Circulation of a Symbol between Jews and Christians* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), 3.

⁴For example, see Yaakov Elman, “Marriage and Marital Property in Rabbinic and Sasanian Law,” in *Rabbinic Law in Its Roman and Near Eastern Context*, ed. Catherine Hezser (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 227–76; idem, “Acculturation to Elite Persian Norms and Modes of Thought in the Babylonian Jewish Community of Late Antiquity,” in *Netiv 'Ot Le-David: Jubilee Volume for David Weiss Halivni*, ed. Yaakov Elman, Ephraim Bezael Halivni, and Zvi Arie Steinfeld (Jerusalem: Orhot, 2004), 31–56.

⁵For an overview of the historiographic shift, see David Berger, “A Generation of Scholarship on Jewish-Christian Interaction in the Medieval World,” *Tradition* 38, no. 2 (2004): 4–14. For examples of this newer scholarship, see Ivan Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood: Jewish Acculturation in Medieval Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996); Elisheva Baumgarten, *Mothers and Children: Jewish Family Life in Medieval Europe* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004); Israel J. Yuval, *Two Nations in Your Womb: Perceptions of Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006).

⁶For Jews in eastern Europe, Gershon Hundert’s and Moshe Rosman’s works are exemplary in their situating of Jews in a broader context of the politics and culture of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. See, for example, M. Rosman, *Lords’ Jews: Magnate-Jewish Relations in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth during the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990), and idem, *Founder of Hasidism: A Quest for the Historical Baal Shem Tov* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), as well as Gershon Hundert’s groundbreaking “An Advantage to Peculiarity? The Case of the Polish Commonwealth,” *AJS Review* 6 (1981): 21–38.

⁷For an example of the tension between an intellectual understanding of the importance of integration of Jews into a broader historical context and the traditional textual approach see the debate between Moshe Rosman and Immanuel Etkes about the founder of Hasidism; Rosman, *Founder of*

This historiographic shift has been fueled by the recognition that Jews of various periods and geographic locations were situated in a specific place and time whose culture, intellectual developments, and social realities shaped the Jewish experience. This led some scholars to explore an explicit question—one relevant for this discussion—“How Jewish Is Jewish History?”⁸

The acknowledgment that the Jews were part of the societies in which they lived has been largely one-sided. Calls to integrate Jews into general history issued six decades ago by Salo Baron and, more recently, by subsequent scholars were addressed to both historians of the Jews and to general historians; however, very few generalists have included Jews as part of the narrative of general history.⁹ Indeed, the tendency to compartmentalize “Jewish” and “non-Jewish” history has imposed a separation of material that is in reality intrinsically related. The continued separation of these two fields creates, in effect, a type of “historiographic Jewish ghetto.”¹⁰

The irony of this historiographic ghetto is that in most places and in most times, Jews did not reside in actual physical ghettos. During the early modern period, when the first ghettos were established, the Jews of eastern Europe, the Ottoman Empire, North Africa, and most of the Holy Roman Empire did not reside in ghettos. Moreover, current historiography indicates that even those Jews who did reside in ghettos interacted with, influenced, and were influenced by their

Hasidism; Inmanuel Etkes, *The Besht: Magician, Mystic, and Leader* (Hanover, NH: Brandeis University Press, 2005) represents the approach that focuses more on internal Jewish sources.

⁸See Rosman, *How Jewish Is Jewish History?*

⁹Salo Wittmayer Baron, “The Jewish Factor in Medieval Civilization,” in *Ancient and Medieval Jewish History: Essays*, ed. Leon A. Feldman (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1942, 1972), 241; Jordan, “Jewish Studies and the Medieval Historian,” 7–20; Gavin I. Langmuir, *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 21–24.

¹⁰Resembling the decades-old resistance of historians to integrate women’s history fully into a general historical narrative, historians have tended to treat Jews as a separate field of “Jewish history,” rarely integrating them into the fabric of their historical studies. In some instances, no mention of the Jews is made at all; in others, the Jews are relegated to a tangential chapter, a sidebar of a textbook, or a brief mention. Upon reading these historical narratives, one gets the sense that the Jews lived in a world apart. One gets no sense of the daily interactions and cultural exchanges between Jews and their non-Jewish neighbors; Jews are portrayed as “aliens within.” See, for example, Robert Bonfil, “Aliens Within: The Jews and Anti-Judaism,” in *Handbook of European History: 1400–1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation*, ed. Thomas A. Brady, Heiko A. Oberman, and James D. Tracy (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996). Aside from this one chapter, there is little mention of Jews as active participants in Europe at this time. See also, Daniel Stone, who strives to provide information about Jews in his book on the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth but assigns them separate sections. In his book, too, Jews are also the only group meriting their own sections, instead of being integrated into the narrative, as are, for example, the Armenians. Daniel Stone, *The Polish-Lithuanian State, 1386-1795*, vol. 4, *History of East Central Europe* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001); and Janina Bieniarzówna and Jan M. Małeckci, *Dzieje Krakowa: Kraków w Wiekach XVI–XVIII*, vol. 2 (Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1994).

non-Jewish neighbors outside ghetto walls.¹¹ Thus, even the physical ghettos in which some early modern Jews lived did not create the divide between Jews and their neighbors that is extant in much general historiography of the early modern period.

Our aim in this article is to provide two concrete examples from the early modern period that remove Jews from the historiographic ghetto and weave them into the narrative of general history. Our examples consciously focus on the significance that incorporating Jewish material has on the current understanding of two environments which, at first glance, do not seem to have much to do with Jews: Reformation Strasbourg and post-Reformation Poland.

These two seemingly disparate cases represent two vastly different sets of demographic circumstances. Whereas the Jews had been expelled from Strasbourg in the fourteenth century and resided in the surrounding countryside, post-Reformation Poland was home to one of the largest Jewish populations in the early modern world, inhabiting cities, towns, and villages across the vast state. These two very different situations highlight the fact that integrating Jews into the general historical narrative may be widely applicable.

THE REFORMATION AND LOCAL JEWS

Scholars have often pointed to the urban setting of much of the Reformation, which first unfolded in the free imperial cities of the Holy Roman Empire.¹² While the city served as the setting for the Protestant movement's inception in the empire, it did not serve as a home for the empire's Jews. From the mid-fourteenth century through the sixteenth century, the Jewish communities were expelled from all German cities, with the exception of Frankfurt, Worms, and Prague.¹³ Even as some cities allowed individual Jews to return, the number of Jews permitted reentry and the duration of time for which they were granted the right to stay were both severely limited. These smaller communities were often re-expelled, so that the bulk of the Jewish population that remained in the empire and that did not migrate elsewhere lived in the countryside.¹⁴ By the 1520s, when the cities in the

¹¹See Benjamin Ravid and Robert Davis, eds., *The Jews of Early Modern Venice* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001); David B. Ruderman, ed., *Essential Papers on Jewish Culture in Renaissance and Baroque Italy* (New York: New York University Press, 1992); Robert Bonfil, *Jewish Life in Renaissance Italy*, trans. Anthony Oldcorn (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994). On eastern Europe see Jürgen Heyde, "Ghetto' and the Construction of Jewish History: The Case of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth: Considerations about a Research Project," *Kwartalnik Historii Żydów* 4 (2004): 511–18.

¹²Bernd Moeller, *Imperial Cities and the Reformation: Three Essays*, trans. H. C. Erik Midelfort and Mark U. Edwards Jr. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1992); Steven Ozment, *The Reformation in the Cities: The Appeal of Protestantism to Sixteenth Century Germany and Switzerland* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975).

¹³See Dean Phillip Bell, "Jewish Settlement, Politics, and the Reformation," in *Jews, Judaism, and the Reformation in Sixteenth-Century Germany*, ed. Dean Phillip Bell and Stephen G. Burnett (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 431–34.

¹⁴*Germania Judaica*, vol. 3, ed. A. Maimon and Yaakov Guggenheim (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1963–); Alfred Haverkamp, "Die Judenverfolgungen zur Zeit des schwarzen Todes im Gessellschaftsgefüge Deutscher Städte," in *Zur Geschichte der Juden im Deutschland des späten*

southwest of the empire began to usher in reform, Jews were largely barred from residing within city walls. Social historians of the Reformation in the empire rely upon the various prescriptions forbidding Jewish residence in urban areas, and assume that since Jews were excluded as residents in the city, they are irrelevant to the narrative of the urban Reformation.¹⁵ More recent studies of the Reformation in the countryside have also focused on the internal Christian narrative, and have not dealt with the question of whether reform had an impact on local Jews.

Much critical recent scholarship focuses on rural Jews, the extent of their interactions with their Christian neighbors, their experience in Christian courts, and their relations with various forms of authority and leadership.¹⁶ These rural Jews traveled in order to survive economically, entering local cities to lend money and to sell wine, foods, and animals, particularly horses. This was the case in Swabia, Thuringia, and Alsace, as well as in the areas surrounding Nuremberg and Augsburg. Although scholars are now aware of the daily presence of Jews in the

Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1981), 27–93; Gerd Mentgen, *Studien zur Geschichte der Juden im mittelalterlichen Elsass* (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1995); Michael Toch, “The Formation of a Diaspora: The Settlement of Jews in the Medieval German Reich,” in *Peasants and Jews in Medieval Germany: Studies in Cultural, Social and Economic History* (Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum, 2003), 62–64. This chapter was originally published in *Aschkenas* 7 (1997): 55–78.

¹⁵See, Thomas A. Brady, “German with a Difference? The Jews of the Holy Roman Empire during the Early Modern Era—a Comment,” in *In and Out of the Ghetto: Jewish-Gentile Relations in Late Medieval and Early Modern Germany*, ed. R. Po-chia Hsia and Hartmut Lehmann (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 289–92. There are several exceptions to this, as some scholars have discussed the Jews of the empire and the Reformation, especially in terms of intellectual contact that they had with reformers. Early scholarship consists of two important articles by Haim Hillel Ben Sasson. See Haim Hillel Ben Sasson, “Jewish-Christian Disputation in the Setting of Humanism and the Reformation in the German Empire,” *Harvard Theological Review* 59 (1966): 369–90; Ben Sasson, “The Reformation in Contemporary Jewish Eyes,” in *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* 4 (1970): 239–326. Stephen Burnett’s various articles about printing during the Reformation are also excellent examples of this. For example, see Burnett, “The Regulation of Hebrew Printing in Germany, 1555–1630: Confessional Politics and the Limits of Jewish Toleration” in *Infinite Boundaries: Order, Disorder, and Reorder in Early Modern German Culture*, ed. Max Reinhart and Thomas Robisheaux (Kirksville: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1998), 329–48. For more recent scholarship in this area, see Dean Phillip Bell, *Sacred Communities: Jewish and Christian Identities in Fifteenth-Century Germany* (Leiden: Brill, 2001); Bell and Burnett, *Jews, Judaism, and the Reformation*. Some studies have taken social history into account, see, for example, Hsia and Hartmut, *In and Out of the Ghetto*.

¹⁶Rotraud Ries, *Jüdisches Leben in Niedersachsen im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert* (Hannover: Hahn, 1994); Sabine Ullmann, *Nachbarschaft und Konkurrenz: Juden und Christen in Dörfern der Markgrafschaft Burgau 1650 bis 1750* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999); Stefan Rohrbacher, *Die jüdische Landgemeinde im Umbruch der Zeit: Traditionelle Lebensform, Wandel und Kontinuität im 19. Jahrhundert* (Göppingen: Jüdisches Museum Göppingen, 2000); Stefan Litt, *Juden in Thüringen in der Frühen Neuzeit (1520–1650)* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2003); Debra Kaplan, “Negotiating Boundaries: Jewish-Christian Interaction in Strasbourg, 1530–1648” (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2003); Sabine Hödl et al., *Hoffjuden und Landjuden: Jüdisches Leben in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Berlin: Philo, 2004); A. Gotzmann and S. Wendehorst, eds., *Juden im Recht: Neue Zugänge zur Rechtsgeschichte der Juden im Alten Reich* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2007).

early modern city, this information has not been integrated with larger examinations of the city during the Reformation.

The case of Strasbourg provides an exceptional venue for inquiry into the question of how the history of rural Jews, residentially excluded from urban centers of reform, may add to our understanding of the Reformation. The formidable work of Tom Brady, Miriam Usher Chrisman, Lorna Jane Abray, Lee Wandel, and others has rendered Strasbourg a well-known urban center of reform.¹⁷ Tom Scott's work on Alsace has demonstrated the deep bonds between the city and the surrounding countryside.¹⁸ What we now know is that Christians were not alone among rural residents to enter urban space; rural Christians and Jews alike entered Strasbourg for various purposes.

The archives in Strasbourg contain laws, court cases, and correspondence that reflect a strong and persistent Jewish presence in the city during the Reformation, despite their expulsion in 1391. The Jews who entered Strasbourg were primarily residents of Lower Alsace, although some Jews who lived in Upper Alsace or in other regions also entered the city on occasion. Documents from two of the territories in Lower Alsace in which Jews lived—the Landvogtei Hagenau and the lands of the bishop of Strasbourg—indicate that there were about eighty-two Jewish households dispersed in about twenty-six small villages, towns, and cities.¹⁹ As was the case in other cities in the empire from which they had been expelled, the local rural Jews were active members of society in Strasbourg. Not only did they participate in local economies despite heavy restrictions, but they appeared before local, municipal, and imperial courts, and at times instructed their Christian neighbors in the study of Hebrew and Judaism.²⁰

These documents not only shed much light on the history of the Jews in the empire, serving as excellent sources for reconstructing both Jewish economic life and Jewish-Christian relations during the early modern period; they are also indispensable for a thorough understanding of the nexus between religion and policy in the Reformation city and in larger territories. Far from being extraneous material about "others," the data concerning Jews in Reformation Germany highlight aspects of Reformation history that are less visible from more traditional vantage points. The conclusions that can be drawn from some of this material not only

¹⁷Lorna Jane Abray, *The People's Reformation: Magistrates, Clergy, and Commons in Strasbourg, 1500–1598* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985); Lee Palmer Wandel, *Voracious Idols and Violent Hands: Iconoclasm in Reformation Zurich, Strasbourg, and Basel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Miriam Usher Chrisman, *Strasbourg and the Reform: A Study in the Process of Change* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967); idem, *Lay Culture, Learned Culture: Books and Social Change in Strasbourg, 1480–1599* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982); Thomas A. Brady, *Ruling Class, Regime and Reformation at Strasbourg 1520–1555* (Leiden: Brill, 1978); idem, *Protestant Politics: Jacob Sturm (1489–1553) and the German Reformation* (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1995).

¹⁸Tom Scott, *Regional Identity and Economic Change: The Upper Rhine, 1450–1600* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997).

¹⁹Archives Départementales du Bas Rhin (hereafter ADBR), 1G 151/11, C 78 (71).

²⁰Eric Zimmer, "Hebrew Letters of Two Sixteenth-Century German Humanists," *Revue des Etudes Juives* 141 (1982): 379–86.

add to Reformation historiography, but can also challenge current assumptions, lending greater nuance to current understandings of the Reformation.

Politics in Strasbourg, a free imperial city that had, in the thirteenth century, wrested power from its bishop, only grew more complicated with the advent of reform. During the 1520s and the 1530s, as reformers, burghers, and magistrates introduced Protestant preaching, teaching, and ritual to the cities, the confessional battles that were waged were often extreme and dramatic.²¹ The iconoclasm that took place in cities such as Basel, Strasbourg, and Zurich demonstrates the fervor that gripped urban citizens, who literally destroyed the symbols of their Catholic faith to demonstrate their dissatisfaction with local charity and pastoral care.²²

These local attempts at reform were frequently met with strong opposition from Catholic clerics and political leaders.²³ In the case of Strasbourg, the city's decision to abolish the mass resulted in a political and legal conflict. While the magistrates ushered in this change at the behest of local reformers and burghers, their decision was contested by the bishop, although he had not resided in the city for centuries. The bishop challenged the magistrates' authority to alter the ritual practice of the mass, claiming that the city lay in his jurisdiction, and so the decision to adopt reform lay with him, rather than with the magistrates. Thus, the bishop and the magistrates were battling on two fronts, with each side seeking to establish both religious and political hegemony over an area with overlapping jurisdictions.²⁴

The battle for control over the city, its faith, and its rituals was one of high stakes. First, the city of Strasbourg was a major center for print and humanism as well as a crucial economic hub.²⁵ As such, its identification as Protestant or Cath-

²¹Abray, *People's Reformation*.

²²Wandel, *Voracious Idols*.

²³In various locations, the attempt to transition from a Catholic confession to a Protestant one was met with enough resistance to result in failure. Robert Scribner's analysis of Erfurt and of Cologne and Kaspar von Greyerz's description of the first attempt at reform in Colmar each demonstrate that calls for civic unity and attempts at limiting the Reformation could quash local desires for reform. See Robert W. Scribner, "Civic Unity and the Reformation in Erfurt," *Past and Present* 66, no. 1 (1975): 29–60; Robert W. Scribner, "Why Was There No Reformation in Cologne?" *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 49 (1976): 217–41 (these essays are reprinted in Kaspar von Greyerz, *The Late City Reformation in Germany: The Case of Colmar, 1522–1628* [Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1980]); Robert W. Scribner, *Popular Culture and Popular Movements in Reformation Germany* (London: Hambledon, 1987).

²⁴The bishop of Strasbourg was not the only territorial landowner or prince who attempted to quash reform in his lands. The archbishops of Cologne and Münster did the same. Records of the *Reichskammergericht*, the imperial chamber court, document that similar litigation was brought in various imperial territories, including cases against the cities of Altenstadt, Augsburg, Bremen, Eßlingen, Frankfurt, Goslar, Göttingen, Hamburg, Heilbronn, Isny, Constance, Lindau, Lübeck, Magdeburg, Minden, Naumburg, and Ulm. See Gero Rudolf Dolezalek, "Die Juristische Argumentation der Assessoren an Reichskammergerichte zu Reformationprozesse, 1532–1538," in *Die Reichskammergericht in der deutschen Geschichte, Stand der Forschung, Forschungsperspektiven*, ed. Bernhard Diestelkamp (Cologne: Böhlau, 1990), 25–58; Euan Cameron, *The European Reformation* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991), 268–72.

²⁵Chrisman, *Lay Culture*; Mark U. Edwards, *Luther's Last Battles: Politics and Polemics, 1531–46* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983); idem, *Printing, Propaganda, and Martin Luther* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994); Scott, *Regional Identity*.

olic had tremendous implications for the spread of Evangelical Protestantism. Furthermore, as a free city, Strasbourg maintained the right of *non appellando*.²⁶ As such, the city's residents were exempted from having to bring their appellate cases to an imperial court. In general, Strasbourg's magistrates fiercely guarded their privilege to conduct a local court outside of the imperial sphere.²⁷ In this case, the magistrates were forced to respond to the bishop's claims over the city in an imperial venue, a further affront to their privileges and a double assault against Strasbourg's freedoms that questioned both its status as independent of the bishop and its right to legislate and adjudicate its own matters. Taken on its own, this evidence points to an acute conflict between the bishop and the magistrates.

These tense religious battles were not the sole factor determining relations between the city of Strasbourg and the bishop, who as one of the largest landowners in Alsace, was one of the city's most powerful neighbors. Strasbourg was a Protestant city, situated in largely Catholic Alsace. The city also bordered Reformed Swiss and Catholic French areas. Strasbourg's economy thus depended on trade with neighboring Catholics and Calvinists, and these practical concerns had an effect on policy.²⁸ Despite religious tensions, mutual social, economic, and military concerns led to fifty-three joint sessions between delegates of both Upper and Lower Alsace between 1528 and 1616.²⁹

Documentation concerning the Jews points to even greater levels of collaboration between Catholic and Protestant neighbors in Alsace. That an impending invasion or the threat of a bad harvest would be cause enough for the feuding magistrates and bishop to work together is understandable. More surprising are the examples of collaborative and even joint policies toward Jews that were aimed at regulating everyday life, devised by the feuding Catholic bishop and Protestant magistrates.

On 16 March 1530, just one year after the abolition of the mass, Strasbourg's magistrates issued a law banning economic transactions between rural Jews and all residents, burghers, and subjects of the city:

We, Bernhart Wurmbser the Knight, the Meister, and Council of Straßburg, declare: Since we, through much experience and inquiries have learned how many of our burghers, subjects, and those who belong to us, in the city and in the rural areas, have become troubled through borrowing from the Jews and the ensuing usury ... such that a few desert

²⁶See "Aufzeichnung der städtischen Freiheitsrecht," in *Verfassungs-, Verwaltungs- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Stadt Strassburg bis 1681*, vol. 1, *Urkunden und Akten*, ed. K. Th. Eheberg (Strasbourg, 1899).

²⁷This is evident from the contract between the Jews of rural Alsace and Strasbourg's magistrates. The magistrates only permitted Jewish commerce in the city on condition that the Jews waived their right to an imperial court; Archives Municipales de Strasbourg (hereafter AMS), III/174/21.

²⁸For the impact of Strasbourg's geography on domestic policies of tolerance, see Lorna Jane Abray, "Confession, Conscience and Honor: The Limits of Magisterial Tolerance in Sixteenth-Century Strassburg," in *Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformation*, ed. Ole Peter Grell and Robert W. Scribner (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 94–107.

²⁹Abray, *People's Reformation*, 84–88.

their wives, children, and their good ways, and come to poverty... Hereupon, we ask each and every [one] of our burghers, subjects, and those who belong to us in the city and in rural areas, that from here on, they borrow or receive nothing, whether a little or a lot, from any Jew ... and no longer in any form, should [they] be burdened [or obligated to] the Jews. Then, whoever will borrow or receive any money or monies from the Jews ... or [whoever] becomes obligated, he or she will be punished with a heavy fine.³⁰

This law is preserved in the city archives and, on its face, has no bearing on the bishop or upon the relations between the magistrates and the bishop. However, the bishop's records, maintained in Strasbourg's Departmental Archives, also contain a copy of this decree. Bernhard Wurmbser shared this new policy with Bishop William. Wurmbser addressed this copy of the decree to William, noting, "We have prevailed upon and decided for our subjects, for good, so that they will not come to ruin by the Jews, through a mandate." Wurmbser also indicated that he was sharing this news since "You, with us, have *gemeinschaft* in several locations."³¹

Both the magistrates and the bishop had various rural areas in Alsace under their respective jurisdictions. In some instances, the magistrates and the bishop had shared or overlapping claims. For example, the villages in the bailiwick of Barr, located twenty-three to twenty-eight kilometers southwest of the city, the magistrates and the Andlau and Bergheim families, who were subjects of the bishop, had *Mitobrigkeiten*, or shared jurisdiction. In other regions, such as Marlenheim, the bishop and the city owned different parts of the larger bailiwick.³² As a practical matter, Wurmbser and the city council recognized that sharing their policy with the bishop would only facilitate its enactment. Despite their strife over the jurisdiction of the city and its faith, the magistrates sought to coordinate their efforts with the bishop by at least sharing pertinent information. The dossier in the archives indicates that a letter from Wurmbser to the bishop, which is no longer extant, was once in the archives. According to the archivist's note, the letter indicates a joint economic policy, for which Wurmbser was seeking William's approval.

Understanding this collaborative policy is difficult, because at least within city walls, the policy was not enforced. Although the law declared contact between Jews and Christians to be forbidden, court cases brought before the magistrates themselves indicate that implementation did not take place. The Jews continued to lend money, and Christians continued to borrow it.³³ Both inside and outside the city in areas under its jurisdiction, Christian men and women borrowed money from Jews in order to purchase basic necessities and in larger amounts suitable for business transactions. Although local urban Christians also lent money to their

³⁰AMS, III/174/20/82.

³¹ADBR, I G 370/1.

³²Gerhard Wunder, *Das Strassburger Landgebiet: Territorialgeschichte der einzelnen Teile des städtischen Herrschaftsbereiches vom 13. bis 18. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1967), 149–82.

³³AMS III/174 contains many documents that record such encounters.

rural Christian neighbors, moneylending between Jews and Christians did not stop with the promulgation of this law.³⁴ Whether it was because there were no official alternatives to moneylending, such as the *monti di pietà* of Italy, or whether it was out of habit—after all, Jews had lent money to the local population for centuries, and the records demonstrate that Christians often borrowed from the same Jews time and time again—the magistrates and the bishop could not control the actions of their subjects.

The need for Jewish moneylending in the city as well as the Jewish need to make money led to a daily influx of Jews into Strasbourg both before and after the 1530 decree. Thus, perhaps in an attempt to exert some control over a phenomenon that had proved unstoppable, the city magistrates drafted a moneylending contract with Jewish leaders in 1534. This contract, referred to as a *Vertrag*, was independent of any collaboration with the bishop, and permitted Jewish commerce and lending in the city under conditions that were favorable to the magistracy.³⁵ Drawn up by Josel of Rosheim and other communal leaders, the contract also reiterated that this arrangement was one between the Jewish and Christian communities, rather than one between individual Jews and Christian authorities. The contract was predicated on the condition that Jews waived their right to a trial in an imperial court and agreed to bring any grievances that they had with residents of Strasbourg to a magisterial court. In addition, the Jews agreed that if they were to receive a pawned item that was actually a stolen good, the item would be returned to the rightful owner and the Jew would not be compensated. In exchange for these concessions, the Jews gained the right to enter the city and to trade and lend money there.

The larger question of why the magistrates promulgated—and continued, for over a century, to reenact, in different forms—a law that they did not (and probably could not) implement, is beyond the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, what we see in the early 1530s is an attempt to control a regional problem with a regional solution. The networks of Jewish moneylenders were scattered throughout various towns and villages and lived under different and competing jurisdictions.³⁶ Any serious attempt to halt moneylending would require a joint policy, and cooperation between various political authorities was essential. As such, religious and political divides were crossed by the magistrates and the bishop in 1530, and would be again several decades later.

The 1534 contract between Jews and Christians created a formal structure for Jewish-Christian interactions in the city. Undoubtedly faced by the impossibility of what they had asked from their subjects, Strasbourg's magistrates devised a system that would address the economic needs and desires of residents, while

³⁴On Strasbourg's Christians and their practice of lending money to inhabitants of the countryside, see Brady, *Ruling Class*, 146–62.

³⁵AMS, III/174/21/96–101; III/174/38/64–70.

³⁶Daniel J. Cohen, *Die Landjudenschaften der brandenburgisch-preussischen Staaten im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert: Ihre Beziehungen untereinander aufgrund neuerschlossener jüdischer Quellen* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1983); Debra Kaplan, "Creating Community in Rural Alsace: Early Modern Jewish Life after the Urban Expulsions," *Leipziger Beiträge* 2 (2004): 59–73.

maintaining and asserting their autonomy as magistrates of a free imperial city. By demanding that the Jews forgo their rights to an imperial court, the magistrates reaffirmed their privilege to adjudicate their own Jewish policy. Collaborating across the religious divide had its purpose; so did restating the city's privileges given the failure of the joint regional policy.

The formulation of this contract also sheds light on another aspect of policy making in the empire during the Reformation, namely, the limits of religious ideals as effective models for policy. Proper understanding of the conflict that surrounded Martin Bucer's advice to Phillip of Hesse in 1538 and 1539 also requires knowledge of these archival sources about Jews.³⁷ Since this episode has been widely debated by historians, a brief summary shall suffice. In 1538, the privilege granting the Jews residence in Hesse, which had been issued in 1532, was set to expire. The landgrave of Hesse, Phillip, turned to Jacob Sturm, former *Meister* of Strasbourg, in an attempt to learn more about Strasbourg's policies toward the Jews.³⁸ Phillip of Hesse sent Sturm's response to several advisors, including Bucer. Following this consultation, two sets of recommendations found their way to the landgrave. One, of unspecified authorship, which was probably initially composed by the Jews, placed certain rather typical economic restrictions on the Jews of Hesse. Bucer drafted his own advice, which left little room for the Jews in the model Christian society. For Bucer, the model community would include only members of the true faith. Indeed, he argued that the task set before political leaders was to ensure that there were no false beliefs under their jurisdictions. Bucer preferred that the Jews be expelled, but argued that if the Jews were to remain, harsh measures designed to punish the Jews' blindness and to instruct them in the truth of Christianity should be employed as policy.

Phillip responded to Bucer, disagreeing with his recommendations and with their theological underpinnings. Ultimately, the landgrave opted for a policy that was more in line with the first set of recommendations that he had received. What prompted Phillip to disregard the advice of a prominent and trusted Protestant theologian, who had already assisted him in dealing with the Anabaptists and with the Sabbatarians?

Although much of the landgrave's response to Bucer includes references to biblical passages, Phillip's interests in devising a Jewish policy clearly were not solely theological. Had his focus been on religion alone, he would have contacted Bucer at the outset. Instead, Phillip opted to ask Jacob Sturm for advice. Some scholars, assuming that Sturm would have had no personal experience with Jews in his native Strasbourg, and thus no standing to advise Phillip, have questioned

³⁷Martin Bucer, "Judenratschlag" and "Von der Juden: Brief an Einen Guten Freund," in *Martin Bucers Deutsche Schriften*, vol. 7, *Schriften der Jahre 1538–1539*, ed. Robert Stupperich (Gütersloh: Kohl, 1964); Salo Wittmayer Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews: Late Middle Ages and Era of European Expansion* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969), 13:241–42; Hasting Eels, "Bucer's Plan for the Jews," *Church History* 6 (1937): 127–36; Carl Cohen, "Martin Bucer and His Influence on the Jewish Situation," *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 12 (1968): 93–101; *Joseph of Rosheim: Historical Writings*, ed. and trans. Hava Fraenkel Goldschmidt (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1996), 313–22. Most recently, R. Gerald Hobbs, "Bucer, the Jews, and Judaism," in Bell and Burnett, *Jews, Judaism, and the Reformation*.

³⁸For more information on Sturm, see Brady, *Protestant Politics*.

Phillip's choice of Sturm for advice. To resolve this "difficulty," scholars have assumed that Phillip must have been unaware that Strasbourg had expelled its Jews in 1391.³⁹ This claim lacks support; undoubtedly, Phillip would have been aware of a historical reality in a neighboring city that was over a century old at the time that he approached Sturm. Much more plausible is that Phillip had reasons to approach Sturm for advice. These reasons are clarified and supported by understanding that in fact Strasbourg had implemented a contract that dictated the conduct of Jewish trade in the city.

Knowledge of this Jewish contract holds the key to understanding both the choice of Sturm as advisor and the ensuing disagreement between Phillip and Bucer. While many historians debate the motivations guiding Bucer and Phillip, it is a thorough understanding of the economic role and function played by Jews in the lives of ordinary people that elucidates their struggle. Despite the collaborative efforts between the magistrates and the archbishop, Jews continued to trade and to lend money in Strasbourg and in areas under its jurisdiction. Such a model would have interested Phillip of Hesse, who was considering "whether it is fitting that a Christian authority should tolerate the Jews living among Christians, and if so, under what conditions."⁴⁰ Jacob Sturm, who had led Strasbourg through much of its Reformation, was an ideal person to contact regarding the construction of a Jewish policy, for Strasbourg's magistracy had developed a highly systematized method for dealing with local Jews.

Given that Jews throughout the empire entered urban spaces in order to trade and to lend money, it is likely that the Jews of Hesse filled a similar niche. Both the resolutions adopted by Phillip and the original draft of a privilege, probably drafted by the Jews themselves, reflect a structure that would permit the Jews to trade in Hesse without harming local guilds and burghers. Alongside these economic strictures, Phillip includes some of the religious restrictions and demands that were recommended to him by the theologians with whom he consulted. These included forced sermons, restrictions on Jewish-Christian theological debates, and prohibitions against the building of new synagogues and against Jews' cursing Christianity and Jesus.⁴¹ With his adoption of these tenets, Phillip synthesized economic needs and theological concerns. Phillip could not accept Bucer's recommendation, for Bucer's vision of Christian space as one in which all residents were theologically unified was not a viable position for the landgrave. The exclusive nature of a *corpus christianorum* did not address the economic realities of the empire, in which Jews were a necessary source of capital and petty cash. The

³⁹Fraenkel-Goldschmidt, *Historical Writings*, 314n5.

⁴⁰This is the title of the document that Phillip submitted to Bucer: "Ob Christlicher Oberkait gebüren müge, das sye die Juden undter den Christen zu wonen gedulden, und was ye zu gedulden, wölcher gestalt und maß."

⁴¹The privilege mandated that debates over theology were only to take place with designated Christians. This may have been a response to some of the informal debating described by Sasson, "Jewish-Christian Disputation." An additional provision, mandating that the Jews were to abandon the Talmud and were to rely solely on biblical texts, was rejected by the Jewish representatives; see Fraenkel-Goldschmidt, *Historical Writings*, 319.

economic needs of the residents of Hesse rendered Bucer's theological demands untenable.

Interestingly, both Strasbourg's Jewish contract and Phillip of Hesse's adopted plan seem to have been drawn up by local Jews. While the conditions for their presence were undoubtedly based on existing precedent as well as conditions set down by the relevant authorities, it is critical to note that the Jews exercised some degree of agency in crafting these policies. Although religion and politics were inextricably tied together during this period, multiple forces were at work when it came to crafting these policies. Religious ideals, pragmatism, and economic concerns of Christians, and possibly, though to a much lesser extent, concerns of Jews, were taken into account in the policies governing moneylending and Jewish trade.

The complex balance of multiple factors can be seen again in 1562, after the Peace of Augsburg had already been enforced to settle some of the jurisdictional and religious questions of the previous decades. In June 1562, Bishop Erasmus of Strasbourg wrote to the city's magistrates, led at that time by the *Ammeister* Adolff Mittelhausen. Erasmus's letter tells of his plans to initiate a decree prohibiting Jewish economic transactions in the areas of Marlenheim, twenty kilometers west of the city. Marlenheim comprised several villages and areas, some owned by the bishop and others by the city. Two decrees ensued. Noting that Christian residents were becoming poor and were abandoning their families, the decree prohibited Jewish economic contact with Christians. It is fascinating that these two decrees were jointly promulgated by the bishop and the city magistrates:

We, Erasmus, from God's grace, Bishop and Landgrave of Alsace, and we, Adolff Mittelhausen, the *Meister* and council of Strasbourg, ask each and all of our dear, faithful and subservient governors, sheriffs, courts and communities, our communities' authorities of the towns and villages of Marlenheim, Kirchem, Northeim, Rumolswyler and Cosswyler...⁴²

This decree documents the persistence of collaboration between the bishop and the magistrates. The extent and degree of such cooperation is demonstrated in several ways. First, this is a joint policy. The decree is enacted with the authority of both governing bodies, as attested to by the use of two seals, that of the city and that of the bishop, on the document. Notwithstanding that the bishop and the magistrates did not officially share power in Marlenheim but each had a claim to a part of the area, they opted to join forces and to unify their stance toward the local Jewish population—at least in theory, if not in implementation.

What motivated the bishop to pursue a joint enactment? The fact that the city magistrates had overlapping claims of jurisdiction with him was clearly an important factor. The bishop's other correspondence from 1562 reveals that he issued similar decrees in his other lands over which the magistrates had no authority whatsoever. In a separate document, Erasmus sent this directive out to Rosheim, Rosenwiller, Kolbsheim, and Traenheim, as well as to various cities, towns, and villages in the *Landvogtei* of Hagenau, specifically Surbourg, Eschbach, Bossendorf,

⁴²AMS, III/174/30/6, 7.

Lutzelse, and Wingersheim. These locales, all north of Strasbourg, did not fall under magisterial jurisdiction: Rosheim, for example, was an imperial city. Thus, the joint legislation promulgated by the bishop and the magistrates was a piece of a larger policy that the bishop wished to implement throughout the lands that he governed. In the case of those lands over which he shared jurisdiction with the magistrates, he opted for a joint policy, perhaps in the hopes that this would be more easily upheld.

Additional records about the bishop's attempts to control moneylending and other Jewish professions, such as medicine, demonstrate that this regional policy was a comprehensive and extensive pursuit to quash Jewish economic activities. In a report to Emperor Ferdinand, he indicated that this policy was also supported by local burghers, knights, political authorities, and imperial scribes. The bishop sent copies of his new law to local Jewish individuals and communities, often specifically targeting those Jews most renowned for moneylending in the region, thereby capitalizing on local Christians' knowledge of their Jewish neighbors to ensure delivery to the proper recipients. The letter that Erasmus presented to the emperor includes the date and hour that the delegates called on each Jewish family or community, as well as rich detail of the receipt of the promulgation. Isaac of Kolbsheim, for example, was ill, and so the promulgation was received by his son-in-law, Helias; most of the Jews from Pfaffenhoffen, Eschbach, Surbourg, and Wintzheim were not at home, as they were attending a circumcision in Hagenau, and so the text of the law was left with wives or with other Jews who were still in town.⁴³

These copious details indicate the vigor with which the bishop pursued this legislation. The fact that twenty-one men of various ranks and locales signed along with the bishop and Strasbourg's magistrates further affirms the rigor of this attack on Jewish commerce. The massive cooperative effort, which included knights, imperial officials, and local burghers and mayors, whose confessions are not specified, alongside the Catholic bishop and the Protestant city magistrates, demonstrates the second point about cross-confessional collaboration. It was not just famine and warfare that encouraged such alliances. Moneylending, which was a normative part of economic life in Alsace, could induce political leaders who were at odds with one another to work together in unlikely partnerships and associations. Attempts to control the most mundane daily activities of individuals could lead political authorities to disregard the religious divide.

Finally, the degree of the collaboration between Catholics and Protestants is demonstrated through the language of the joint 1562 decree. The text refers to common, or shared, deputies, bailiffs, and communities. The notion of shared *Gemeinde* in the discussions of a Catholic bishop and a Protestant city council is extremely striking, since at this time, the process of confessionalization had already begun. The notion of commonality across confession is antithetical to an age when Protestants and Catholics sought to define their groups through distinct identities, policies, and confessions. Dean Bell has suggested that in the fifteenth century, the term *Gemeinde* signified the creation of a Christian community, to

⁴³ADBR, G 1370.

which the Jews did not belong.⁴⁴ By 1562, Strasbourg was a staunchly Protestant city whose *Gemeinde* was Protestant. In this era of confessionalization, when multiple and competing Christian communities were being defined, the use of the term *Gemeinde* to refer to a cross-confessional Christian group, in opposition to local Jews, is quite unusual, especially in an area such as Marlenheim, where there was no official power-sharing structure, but rather, separate claims to different pieces of the larger territory. The desire to control Jewish economic activity eclipsed the divides of confession. It is not just that economic needs could override religious boundaries. An examination of policy toward Jews reveals that there was a perception of a regional, multiconfessional Christian community. Though Christians throughout Alsace were divided in faith, they attempted to unite in order to regulate Jewish economic activity—also regional in scale—that was construed as harmful to Christians. The expression of a shared, mutual Christian community challenges extant assumptions about the possibility for cross-confessional collaboration, despite the intense battles over political and religious control in Strasbourg, and the confessionalization that took place during the so-called second Reformation.⁴⁵

Archival material about the Jews, then, has relevance beyond the interests of the Jewish historian or the narrative of Jewish history. These few examples from Strasbourg enable a better exploration of religion's role in the formation of policy. Phillip of Hesse's actions and decisions are clarified by considering data about the Jews, which elucidate his motives for disregarding Bucer's recommendations for the construction of a proper Christian society. The joint policies regulating Jewish commerce indicate that multiconfessional collaboration was implemented on a much more regular basis than might otherwise have been assumed, and that policy making was a complex process, involving political alliances, feuds, economics, pragmatism, and religion. The data about the Jews adds nuance, clarity, and depth to the Reformation historian's understanding of the interplay among religion, economics, daily life, and policy—issues that are of central importance to the early modern period.

⁴⁴Bell, *Sacred Communities*.

⁴⁵The persistence of a unified Christian front against the Jews even after the dissolution of Catholic Latin Christendom begs the question of whether the Reformation had any impact on the Jews. Elsewhere, Debra Kaplan has assessed the impact that confessionalization had on local Jews. Whereas in this case the confessional divide could be crossed by Christian authorities seeking to control economic policy, in other instances, the spread of Lutheran orthodoxy in Strasbourg by the 1570s also impacted and limited the extent of Jewish-Christian interactions. Jews were no longer seen as necessary for the Christian Hebraist enterprise. In addition, it seems that the local magistrates no longer permitted Jews into the city as per the contract. The magistracy took greater steps to prevent Jews from entering the city. However, Jewish-Christian interactions continued in contravention of the law. See Debra Kaplan, "Confessionalization and the Jews: Impacts and Parallels in the City of Strasbourg," paper presented at conference on "Religion and Authority in Central Europe from the Middle Ages to the Enlightenment," Center for Austrian Studies and Wirth Institute, Minneapolis, April 2006; in *Religion, Politics and Authority: From Medieval Prague to Enlightenment Vienna*, vol. 1, ed. Gary Cohen, Howard Louthan, and Frank Szabo (New York: Berghahn, forthcoming).

JEWS AND COUNTER-REFORMATION POLAND

The content of Jewish sources in a city such as Strasbourg is necessarily economic, as commerce was the primary factor bringing Jews into urban space. As such, the significance of these sources to the history of the city is primarily in the fields of economics and policy. The case of Poland, where Jews were permitted residence alongside Christian neighbors, allows historians to probe a much broader and more extensive range of interactions between Jews and Christians; the relevance of these sources for understanding life in post-Reformation Poland encompasses almost every realm of daily life.

Expulsions of Jews, like that of Strasbourg were common knowledge elsewhere in Europe, and in Poland these events were touted longingly by some Christian writers as an exemplar of how to deal with local Jews. In his well-known 1618 anti-Jewish work, Sebastyan Miczyński, a Polish cleric, private teacher of influential noblemen's sons, and teacher at the prestigious Academy of Cracow, wrote commenting on the origins of the Jews in Poland, "And they expelled the scoundrels [*oszuści*] from the most venerable kingdoms, provinces, and cities. They were expelled from Spain, France, England, Sweden, Denmark, Scotland, Hungary, Czechia [Bohemia], Silesia, from Nuremberg, Regensburg, Strasbourg, Basel, and now just recently from Frankfurt and many other places, and they found a place in Poland."⁴⁶

In his book, Miczyński addressed the noblemen, or the "Sons of the Crown" as he called them, rebuking them for their close contacts with Jews and reminding them that the "son of the slave woman shall not be the heir with the son of the free woman."⁴⁷ Mixing religion, politics, and economy, he reminded them about canon law prohibitions against Jews in public offices and warned them that Jews had already had "an upper hand": "In [our country] an arrendator is a Jew, a physician—a Jew, a merchant—a Jew, a minter—a Jew, a miller—a Jew, a tavern keeper—a Jew, a secretary—a Jew, the most faithful servant—a Jew, and they keep an upper hand everywhere."⁴⁸ Ringing alarm bells, Miczyński told the Sons of the Crown to wake up from a deep slumber, and quoted a poem that expressed both regrets over Titus's conquest of Judea and wishes that Titus should "have left [Jews] in their nest and not spread this unseemly plague around the world."⁴⁹

Miczyński's hostility toward Jews is explicit both in his anti-Jewish rhetoric and in his idealized notion of the situation of the Jews in other places in Europe from which Jews had been expelled, namely, their explicit alienation from Christian society. Christian hostility toward Jews that Miczyński and other writers of the time displayed has generally been taken in modern historiography as a sign of

⁴⁶Sebastyan Miczyński, *Zwierciadło Korony Polskiej Urazy Ciężkie, y Utrapienia Wielkie Ktore Ponosi od Żydow Wyrażające Synom Koronnym w Roku Pańskim 1618.... Teraz Znowu Przydatkiem y Dostateczniej Wydane Roku 1648* (n.p., toward 1618, 1648), 5.

⁴⁷He quotes Gen. 21:10: "Non erit haeres filius ancillae, cum filio liberae. Gen. 21 ad Col. 4" in Miczyński, *Zwierciadło Korony*, 1.

⁴⁸Miczyński, *Zwierciadło Korony*, 3–4. An *arrendador* is a lease holder who leases the right to farm or conduct a specific business for a yearly rent.

⁴⁹Miczyński, *Zwierciadło Korony*, 5.

Jewish alienation from their Christian neighbors and as a symptom of the triumph of the Polish church during the Counter-Reformation. And yet, perhaps paradoxically, these sentiments and their expressions demonstrate a close level of Jewish involvement in the life of Christians, to the chagrin and anger of Jews' vocal enemies. This type of rhetoric, taken, in the case of Poland, as a sign of success of the Polish Counter-Reformation, in fact shows the contrary—a church and Catholic polity weak and insecure, unable to control its faithful.⁵⁰ And just as the archives in Strasbourg show us a different story from that suggested by the expulsion, so, too, do documents ubiquitous in Polish archives challenge the common notion of Jewish alienation in Poland-Lithuania and the triumph of the Polish Counter-Reformation.

In Poland, economic and political realities complicated the application of ideals and desires expressed in prescriptive church documents. Jews in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth did not experience the type of physical marginalization did Jews of the empire and some other parts of western Europe. Despite some efforts on the part of Christian burghers in Polish royal towns, and some efforts by a few members of the Catholic clergy, Polish-Lithuanian Jews were neither ghettoized like Jews in Italian cities or those of Frankfurt and Worms, nor ever effectively expelled like Jews from so many towns and states of western Europe, including Strasbourg.⁵¹ Jews were, indeed, unequivocally an integral part of the social fabric of the early modern Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. They played a crucial economic role, not only performing some of the traditional economic functions in cities as they did elsewhere, but also in smaller towns and rural estates owned by nobles.⁵²

In small towns and rural areas, including those under ecclesiastical jurisdiction, Jews lived in close proximity to Christians, influencing and being influenced by their environment.⁵³ That presence is evident in the archival sources, where

⁵⁰For a fuller discussion, see, Magda Teter, *Jews and Heretics in Premodern Poland: A Beleaguered Church in the Post-Reformation Era* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

⁵¹Despite the fact that there were no ghettos in Poland, some scholars still follow the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century custom describing Jewish urban settlements in Poland as “ghettos.” Among efforts to ghettoize Jews are those by Nuncio Luigi Lippomano in 1556 and the burghers of Poznań in 1740. On debates concerning expulsion of Jews by the gentry, see Adam Kaźmierczyk, “Problem Ekspulsji Żydów w Uchwałach Sejmikowych w Drugiej Połowie XVII Wieku,” in *Z Historii Ludności Żydowskiej w Polsce i Na Śląsku*, ed. Krystyn Matwijowski (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 1994).

⁵²On the importance of Jews in private lords' economies, see Gershon David Hundert, *The Jews in a Polish Private Town: The Case of Opatów in the Eighteenth Century* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992); Rosman, *The Lords' Jews*; Adam Teller, “The Magnates' Attitude to Jewish Regional Autonomy in the Eighteenth Century,” in *Studies in the History of the Jews in Old Poland*, ed. Adam Teller (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1998); idem, “Tafkidam Ha-Kalkali U-Mè Amadam Ha-Hevratí Shel Yehudim Be-Ahuzot Bet Radziwil Be-Lita Ba-Meah 18” (PhD diss., Hebrew University, 1997), recently published as Adam Teller, *Kesef, koah ve-hashpa'ah: Ha-Yehudim ba-ahuzot beit-Radziwill be-Lita ba-meah ha-18* (Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar, 2006).

⁵³Their presence in church-owned towns and villages before the eighteenth century has generally been dismissed, but see late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century documentation of real estate transactions involving Jews in the town of Sawina owned by the bishop of Chełm in Poland, in Akta m. Sawina 1, in Archiwum Państwowe w Lublinie, 43–45, 47–53.

Jews appear in a variety of contexts as active participants in everyday life: merchants, buyers and sellers of real estate, innkeepers, providers of food and lodging for Jews and Christians alike, lenders and borrowers of money, liquidators of stolen goods, helpers of Christians in danger, and friends and companions of Christians. In these sources, they sue both Jews and Christians and are similarly sued in Christian courts. They appear both as victims and perpetrators of crimes, sometimes working closely with Christian criminals devising schemes aimed at bringing all parties involved the most financial gain. They speak the language of their Christian neighbors.⁵⁴ In short, they are part and parcel of the early modern society of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. That is precisely why Miczyński and some perhaps less rabid clergymen expressed their frustrations and penned anti-Jewish works or legislation. Indeed, efforts to separate Jews from Christians in the early modern period have been more successful in the historiography of Poland than in its history.

Traditionally, scholars of post-Reformation Poland have accepted the eventual full re-Catholicization of the country, even if some have argued that the Catholic Church triumphed in Poland by the end of the sixteenth century, while others have pushed the date a bit further to the mid-seventeenth century.⁵⁵ This preva-

⁵⁴This is a highly controversial point, especially given the prevalence of Yiddish among Jews in eastern Europe in modern times. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the question of language was also highly political, aimed to underscore either Jewish otherness and lack of roots in the "slavic soil," or their long-term settlement in eastern Europe and their right to attain equal rights and citizenship. See, for instance, Sergei Aleksandrovich Bershadskii, *Litovskie evrei* (St. Petersburg, 1883), 395; Abraham Elijah Harkavy, *Ha-Yehudim u-Sefat ha-Slavim* (1867); R. Centnerszwerowa, *O języku Żydów w Polsce, na Litwie i Rusi* (Warsaw, 1907); Simon Dubnow, "Razgovornyi iazyk polsko-litovskikh evreev v XVI-XVII v." *Evreiskaia Starina* 1 (1909): 7-40. In more recent historiography this point has been addressed by, for example, Daniel Stone, "Knowledge of Foreign Languages among Eighteenth-Century Polish Jews," *Polin* 10 (1997): 210-19. See also Magdalena Teter, "Jewish Conversions to Catholicism in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," *Jewish History* 17, no. 3 (2002): 257-83, at 279n66. In archival sources such as court records, including criminal interrogations, at least as recorded by Christian scribes, there is no indication that in court Jews spoke any language other than the Slavic language spoken by their neighbors, although there is evidence that Jews were bilingual.

⁵⁵For examples of this view see Waclaw Sobieski, *Nienawiść wyznaniowa tłumów za rządów Zygmunta III-go* (Warsaw: Nakładem S. Dembego, 1902); Jerema Maciszewski, "Mechanizmy kształtowania się opinii publicznej w Polsce doby kontrreformacji," in *Wiek XVIII-kontrreformacja-barok: Prace z historii kultury*, ed. Janusz Tazbir (Warsaw: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1970), 68; Tazbir, *Szlachta i teologowie: Studia z dziejów polskiej kontrreformacji* (Warsaw: Wiedza Powszechna, 1987), esp. chap. 13; Gershon David Hundert, *Jews in Poland-Lithuania in the Eighteenth Century: A Genealogy of Modernity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), chap. 3; Jerzy Kłoczowski, *History of Polish Christianity*, trans. Małgorzata Sady (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 108-16. We use the term "Counter-Reformation" consciously, since this is the term used in historiography of this period in Poland, despite the now-decades-old debate on the usefulness of the term. On the complexity of the term see, for example, Robert Bireley, *The Refashioning of Catholicism, 1450-1700: A Reassessment of the Counter-Reformation* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1999); H. O. Evannett and John Bossy, *The Spirit of the Counter-Reformation* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975); David Martin Luebke, *The Counter-Reformation: The Essential Readings* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1999); John W. O'Malley, *Trent and All That: Renaming Catholicism in the Early Modern Era* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000). For a more detailed argument on questioning the "triumph of the Counter-Reformation" in Poland, see Teter, *Jews and Heretics*.

lent historical narrative stems from the focus on the re-Catholicization of the nobility, among whom the numbers of Protestants and their influence dramatically declined in late sixteenth century and seventeenth century, culminating with the 1658 expulsion of the anti-Trinitarians.⁵⁶ The narrative of early modern religious conflicts in Poland also owes a lot to giving the Protestant-Catholic dichotomy the spotlight. Only occasionally have eastern Orthodox Christians been added to the mix, generally within the contexts of the seventeenth-century wars. Yet, moving beyond the comfortable, if problematic, Catholic-Protestant dichotomy and including Jews in the narrative shifts parameters of the conflict and significantly modifies accepted conclusions. Inclusion of Jews is not the whim of a single historian; any reading even of the church sources begs for such inclusion.

In Poland, as in other places in early modern Europe, Jews became a convenient tool in Catholic-Protestant struggle.⁵⁷ The introduction of host desecration libels against Jews in Poland, for example, is closely related to the Catholic struggle against Protestantism, and as such this aspect of anti-Jewish sentiment is in fact linked to the Counter-Reformation. The first documented trial in Poland took place in 1556 in Sochaczew and became a platform for Catholic-Protestant theological polemic, with Catholics emphasizing the miracles of the host, and Protestants denouncing it as absurd.⁵⁸ The papal nuncio at the time, Luigi (Aloisius) Lippomano, made ardent efforts to make the trial part of such polemic.⁵⁹ For him, Jews were part of the church's overall Counter-Reformation efforts, and at times convenient tools as well. Lippomano's involvement in the trial in Sochaczew cannot be separated from his involvement in the trial of a Polish bishop, Jan Drohojowski, accused of heresy, including a disbelief in transubstantiation, whose trial had begun weeks before then in Sochaczew.⁶⁰ Soon other stories emerged, and they, too, combined stories of Jewish host desecrations with anti-Protestant polemic.

⁵⁶There were fifty-nine non-Catholic senators in 1572, forty-one in 1586, and six in 1632; Tazbir, *Szlachta i teologowie*, 273. That focus on the re-Catholicization of the nobility also explains the attention given to Jesuits, who in that period were crucial in the education of youth, coming predominantly but not exclusively from the nobility.

⁵⁷See, for example, essays in Bell and Burnett, *Jews, Judaism, and the Reformation*. Also, Jonathan Elukin, "Jacques Basnage and the History of the Jews: Anti-Catholic Polemic and Historical Allegory in the Republic of Letters," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 53, no. 4 (1992): 603–30.

⁵⁸On this see, for example, Hanna Węgrzynek, "Czarna legenda" Żydów: *Procesy o rzekome mordy rytualne w dawnej Polsce* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Bellona Fundacji Historia pro Futuro, 1995), 31–46. For a Protestant perspective on the trial at the time, see "O Sochaczowskim wymęczonym, w wypalonym na żydzie Bogu, y fałszywych yego cudach" in *Z wieku Mikołaja Reja: Księga jubileuszowa 1505–1905* (Warsaw: Geberthner & Wolff, 1905).

⁵⁹See, for example, a letter by Luigi Lippomano to Pope Paul IV sent from Łowicz on 21 June 1556, in Henryk Damian Wojtyńska and Luigi Lippomano, *Aloisius Lippomano (1555–1557)*, vol. 3/1, *Acta Nuntiaturae Polonae* (Rome: Institutum Historicum Polonicum Romae, 1993), 206–7, 214–16. His letters were also published in French in Lyon in 1556 and reprinted in Paris in 1586. But the Protestants also seized the opportunity to publish Lippomano's letters to show the voice of the "anti-Christ"; see *Duae Epistolae altera Aloysii Lipomani Veneti Episcopi Veronae* (Koenigsberg: Johan Daubman, 1556).

⁶⁰Bishop Drohojowski's trial took place between 14 March and 15 May 1556. The Sochaczew host desecration trial began on 22 April. Dorota was executed by burning on 23 April; her Jewish codefendant, Bieszko, on 15 May, and the remaining three Jews on 1 June. See the letter of Luigi

In 1583, a Carmelite friar, Thomas Rerus, published a short pamphlet about a host desecration that was supposed to have taken place in Poznań in 1399. According to Rerus's story, a Christian woman had stolen three hosts from a Dominican church in Poznań and taken them to local Jews, who, in turn, stabbed these hosts in the basement of a house on a Jewish street located not far from the main marketplace. Then, Rerus writes, Jews tried to dispose of the hosts, eventually burying them in a swamp outside the city.⁶¹ The hosts were subsequently discovered by a shepherd's son, and in the end, a Carmelite church of Corpus Christi was founded on the site. In his preface, Rerus contended that even though many people thought miracles did not happen at that time, old miracles were to be remembered, for miracles were orchestrated by God for the benefit of the church, especially "in these evil times, when people, through their stubbornness and abandon, fall into various errors."⁶² Miracles, Rerus argued, were no longer witnessed because "now we have cooled our love of God, and the holy places are no longer held in high respect." Miracles were God's reward for people's faithfulness to him.⁶³

In 1609, Tomasz Treter, a noted Catholic author, was a bit more explicit about the religious uncertainties of the time, and also used the 1399 legend of the host desecration in combating those who did not accept the church's teachings. But his strategy was to highlight miracles of the host against the charges of the "new evangelicals," specifically Lutherans and Calvinists, who were mentioned in the introduction.⁶⁴

Seven years later, another Catholic writer, Adryan Zarembiusz, came up with a Polish adaptation of Treter's book. In his dedication to Anna Radziwiłłowa, the wife of a prominent Lithuanian magnate, he overtly stated that his goal was to convince "Evangelical churches" of the "truth of the most holy sacrament," bringing in unimpeachable proofs from most ancient fathers.⁶⁵ The anti-Jewish rhetoric became secondary to Zarembiusz's anti-Protestant polemic.⁶⁶ He cited discord among Protestants as proof of their errors and called Luther an open adulterer, and

Lippomano to Pope Paul IV dated 21 June 1556, Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Archivi Arcis, 4351. For the trial records of Bishop Drohojowski, see Wojtyska and Lippomano, *Aloisius Lippomano*, 367–99; see also Węgrzynek, "Czarna legenda" Żydów, 43.

⁶¹This resembles greatly the story of host libel in Pulkau. See Mitchell B. Merback, "Fount of Mercy, City of Blood: Cultic Anti-Judaism and the Pulkau Passion Altarpiece," *Art Bulletin* 87, no. 4 (2005): 589–642.

⁶²Tomasz Rerus, *Historia o dziwnym nalezieniu Ciąła Bożego: Na tym mieyscu gdzie teraz w Poznaniu kościół Bożego Ciąła zową z niektoremi cudami ktore Pan Bog wszechmogący y po dziś dzień okazwał raczy* (Cracow: Stanisław Szarffenberg, 1583).

⁶³Rerus, *Historia*, unnumbered, penultimate page.

⁶⁴Tomasz Treter, *Sacratissimi Corporis Christi Historia et Miracula quae in Ecclesia Posnanensi Ordinis S. M. Carmelitarum* (Blasius Treter, 1609).

⁶⁵Adryan Zarembiusz, *Wywód historyey o naświętszym Sakramencie, y cudów ktore Pan Bog w poznańskim kościele y Oyców Karmelitanów pokazuie, tudziesz y parergon abo przydatek dla Ewangeli-ków przez Oycę Adryana Zarkaiusza przeora klasztoru poznańskiego Carmelitana do druku podane* (Poznań: Jan Wolrab, 1616), unnumbered fol. 2 in the dedication.

⁶⁶In Jewish historiography such anti-Jewish tales have been seen almost exclusively as part of the history of "antisemitism."

Calvin, an apostate.⁶⁷ He called on the Protestants to accept the authority of the Catholic Church “beside which there is no other Mother or Lover of Christ.”⁶⁸ And after arguing that the 1399 story was not some “monkish or papist rumors,” because it was supported, as legend has it, by King Władysław Jagiełło, Zarembiusz threw down a gauntlet, challenging the Protestants to dare to reject the miracles of the host:

And therefore Dear Evangelical Lords [*Panowie Ewangelicy*] you must acknowledge one of two things: [you must] either admit that there is true flesh and blood of Lord Christ (not a symbol or sign of flesh, but its essence) in the holy Eucharist, which was stabbed by Jews and from which blood flowed profusely; or you must admit that you accuse the pious King Władysław Jagiełło, who saw all this ... of being a false witness, [therefore] committing *Crimen laesae Maiestatis*. But I trust that you would not dare to tarnish such a pious lord [king].⁶⁹

By framing the acceptance or rejection of eucharistic miracles of 1399, and thereby of the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, as a challenge to the authority of the king, Zarembiusz created a framework that would later serve to present Protestantism as treason and a threat against the state, and eventually to eliminate the Protestant nobles' rights and privileges guaranteed under the 1573 constitution. Providing seemingly no options for rejection of Catholic doctrine, Zarembiusz continued:

Thus, Dear Evangelical Lords, you have clear proofs of the true presence of the Lord's flesh in the Eucharist both from the teachings of Lord Christ and holy fathers who agree on this and from the signs and miracles, which you will find in history and which the pious king of blessed memory, Władysław Jagiełło, witnessed. [Therefore] throw away and give up your errors and trust the true church.... And conquer your stubbornness and evil passion [you harbor] against the Roman church. Break your will so that it would not rule over you but be ruled by reason and guided by the Holy Spirit, and beg our Lord God to show you his grace and bring you back, like misguided sheep to their sheepfold the Roman church.⁷⁰

Zarembiusz used the tale of host desecration by Jews to corner Protestants into either acknowledging the presence of Jesus' flesh and blood in the host—and thus confirming Catholic doctrine and the charge against Jews—or expressing distrust of the kings' judgment. By opening doors to the possibility of Protestant rejection of charges against Jews and the Catholic doctrines with it, Zarembiusz succeeded in questioning the loyalty of Protestants, including that of Protestant nobles who were the main political actors in Poland at the time, in matters of the state.

⁶⁷Zarembiusz, *Wywód historyey*, fols. 19v, 29.

⁶⁸Zarembiusz, *Wywód historyey*.

⁶⁹Zarembiusz, *Wywód historyey*, fol. 29v.

⁷⁰Zarembiusz, *Wywód historyey*, fols. 30r–v.

Zarembiusz's book and other contemporarily propagated tales of host desertion by Jews served a triple duty of polemicizing simultaneously against Jews and Protestants and of trying to convince Catholics that their faith was indeed valid, at a time when Catholics' confidence in it may have been weakened. These works were part of a larger effort by the Catholic Church not to lose Poland to heresy, as had happened by then with England and parts of the Holy Roman Empire, and to rally Catholics behind the church. Indeed, the popes sent nuncios who struggled to regain influence, and committed further resources to maintaining control.⁷¹ Luigi Lippomano, and nuncios after him, worked hard to solidify the king's support for the church, though many acknowledged the difficulties posed by Polish multireligious and multicultural society and by Poland's geopolitical location.

Another papal nuncio to Poland, Germanus Malaspina, wrote in his report in 1598, "for the existence and the well-being of Poland nothing is more important than the preservation of the Catholic religion, maintaining good relations with neighbors, and peace among [Poland's] inhabitants."⁷² He further stressed that "preservation and dissemination of the Catholic religion and eradication of heresy is the condition for the existence of Poland."⁷³ Malaspina blamed Henry Valois, who, before becoming the king of France, had promised the Polish nobility to respect religious differences when he briefly accepted the Polish crown in 1574, for the fact that Poland was not "utterly purified of heresy" like Italy or Spain.⁷⁴ Malaspina instructed his successor in what he needed to do in order to strengthen the position of the church in Poland and to attain control over political and social life. Despite these concerted efforts to regain control over Poland, well into the eighteenth century the church continued to struggle to achieve it, voicing the desires of church hierarchy in terms resembling the embattled Pope Boniface VIII's bull *Unam sanctam*.⁷⁵

Achieving this ideal was painfully difficult. Those same nobles that have served historians as symbols of the triumph of the Polish Catholic Church often actually preferred to follow their own interests and desires rather than concede their aristocratic freedoms and become loyal followers of the church. If complaints by nuncio Lippomano that the nobles hated him for trying to implement Catholic reforms in the 1550s may be discounted as made at the height of the Reformation

⁷¹These can be seen in the correspondence of the papal nuncios published in the *Acta Nunciaturae Poloniae* Series. See, for example, Adalbertus Biliński, ed., *Honoratus Visconti (1630–1636)* (Rome: Institutum Historicum Polonicum Romae Fundatio Lanckoroński, 1992); Ioannes Baptista Lancelotti, *Acta Nuntiaturae Poloniae* 12, no. 1 (Cracow: Institutum Historicum Polonicum Romae, 2001); Henryk Damian Wojtyśka, ed., *Zacharias Ferreri (1519–1521) et Nuntii Minores (1522–1553)* (Rome: Institutum Historicum Polonicum Romae Fundatio Lanckoroński, 1992); Wojtyśka and Lippomano, *Aloisius Lippomano*.

⁷²E. Rykaczewski, *Relacye nuncyuszów apostolskich i innych osób o Polsce od roku 1548 do 1690* (Poznań: Księgarnia B. Behra, 1864), 2:77.

⁷³Rykaczewski, *Relacye nuncyuszów*, 2:81.

⁷⁴Rykaczewski, *Relacye nuncyuszów*, 2:81.

⁷⁵Józef Andrzej Zaluski, *Dwa miecze katolickiej w królestwie ortodoksyjnym odsieczy przeciwko natarczywym Pp. dysydentów polskich zamachom* (Warsaw, 1731).

in Poland, complaints by churchmen that persisted into the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries should raise questions about the “triumph” narrative.⁷⁶

The nobles’ defiance of the church was most conspicuously noticed in their relationship with Jews. Already in 1556, Lippomano complained that in Poland he could not even bring up the issue of enforcing papal bulls concerning Jews, referring specifically to the bull *Cum nimis absurdum*, establishing the Roman ghetto, that had been issued by Pope Paul IV just the year prior, because “they receive unbelievably many favors and all these lords palatines are their strong defenders.”⁷⁷ Decades later, Miczyński complained that “Jews are so loved by some Lords [and] enjoy so much freedom that whatever they come to desire [*pokuszą*], they [eventually] get. They hold in control arrendas, tolls, duties, salt mines [*żupy*], mills, and taverns.”⁷⁸ His frustration was shared by more prominent and respectable figures.⁷⁹ In 1636, the papal nuncio to Poland, Marius Filonardi, wrote to Cardinal Antonio Barberini,

The Jews, who in these parts [of the country] are more powerful and richer and much favored than elsewhere, have effectively secured a permit to establish homes and businesses in Masovia [against the 1527 decree *De non tolerandis judaeis*], which is [one] of the main provinces of the kingdom and which till now had remained free of this kind of commerce, [and they] are in such favor with His Majesty not only among the heretics with whom they plot against Catholics [*sono d’intelligenza contri i cattolici*] but also among many Christian Senators.⁸⁰

Jews, whom Filonardi calls “bloodsuckers” [*sanguesughe*] were “in such favor” because they could offer credit to the nobles and the king during the Diets. Similar complaints would be voiced by other church officials well into the eighteenth century.⁸¹

Like many of his Polish contemporaries, Filonardi understood that political elites were needed to enforce the church’s doctrines, laws, and ideals, and he made

⁷⁶See also an instruction given by Cardinal Ludovico Ludovisio to nuncio Cosimo de Torres in 1621; Rykaczewski, *Relacye nuncyuszów*, 2:123. See, for example, the sermons of Antoni Węgrzynowicz, MS. 58 “Kazania w. XVII” in Archiwum OO. Franciszkanów Reformatorów in Cracow, fol. 314. Węgrzynowicz was deeply troubled not only by what he considered the nobles’ questionable daily behavior but also, and perhaps most importantly, by their political assaults on the church and their relationship with Jews. For a full discussion, see Teter, *Jews and Heretics*, 80–82.

⁷⁷Wojtyska and Lippomano, *Aloisius Lippomano*, 276–78. The charge that Jews received support from lords and palatines would later be voiced by other writing clerics complaining that Jews were not persecuted for what the clerics saw as their anti-Christian crimes.

⁷⁸Miczyński, *Zwierciadło Korony*, 25.

⁷⁹On the nobles’ attitudes toward the church and church courts, see, for example, an instruction given by Cardinal Ludovico Ludovisio to nuncio Cosimo de Torres in 1621; Rykaczewski, *Relacye nuncyuszów*, 2:123.

⁸⁰Teresa Chynczewska-Hennel, ed., *Marius Filonardi (1635–1643)*, vol. 1, *Acta Nuntiaturae Poloniae* (Cracow: Academia Scientiarum et Litterarum Polona, 2003), 187–88.

⁸¹Chynczewska-Hennel, *Marius Filonardi*, 188. For similar complaints, see Teter, *Jews and Heretics*, chap. 5; also 667 *Dioecesis Premisliensis* in *Archivio Segreto Vaticano, S. Congregationis*

strenuous efforts to persuade the king and his ministers not to concede to the Jews' requests and their financial offers out of respect for "Lord God and the well-being of the souls."⁸² In Poland, where the church could not count on the increasingly weaker king, nobles were the much needed partners if the church were to succeed in implementing its policies. That is why the rabidly anti-Jewish work Miczyński published in 1618 was addressed to the Sons of the Crown, and it is they whom Miczyński criticized, using Jews as polemical tropes.⁸³

In Christian and Catholic theology, Jews had a very specific place in Christian society. Their social status was to be lower than that of the Christians, and canon law provided a clear delineation of the boundaries between Jews and Christians. Jews and Christians were prohibited from socializing with each other; Christians were not to serve Jews, since Jews were not allowed to be in positions of authority over Christians. Such laws sought to prevent mixing of Jews and Christians in situations leading to intimacy or vulnerability. Polish synods in the early modern period repeated earlier canons reminding Catholic clergy and laity of the rules of engagement between Jews and Christians. But all this seems to have been in vain. Allergic to any efforts that would curtail their liberties, the nobles often chose their own interest over the religious ideals of the church, resulting in an extremely prominent position of Jews in Poland, and in their conspicuously close relationships with Christians, something that their enemies found uncomfortable. The close interaction noted by the frustrated church official can be corroborated by other sources.

Rabbinic responsa and Polish court records are a treasure trove of information about such interactions and shared spaces, even though both are sources from authorities trying to enforce boundaries. A responsum from Rabbi Benjamin Slonik, for example, acknowledges that Jews might stay in Christian homes. Asked whether in an emergency situation it was possible to use utensils/pots of non-Jews to soak meat for salting in cases when "a Jew lodges in a house of non-Jew and he does not have kosher utensils," Slonik allowed the practice.⁸⁴

Another Polish rabbi, Shlomo Luria, too, hinted at practices of Jews that were far from the ideal halakhic norms, including lodging in houses of non-Jews. He was asked whether a Jew was allowed to eat with his head uncovered. In his long responsum, he ruled that it was enough to cover one's head with one's hand, but before articulating the ruling, Luria included some sharp, but revealing, words against hypocrisy of his coreligionists. "And now I shall reveal the shame of the

Concilii Relationes Statu ad Limina, year 1666; Jakub Radliński, *Prawda Chrzesciańska od Nieprzyjaciela Swego Zeznana: To Jest Traktat Rabina Samuela Pokazujący Błędy Żydowskie Około Zachowania Prawa Moyżeszowego y Prziścia Messyaszowego, Którego Żydzi Czekaiaq* (Lublin: Typis Societatis Jesu, 1733), 527–28; Kasper Balsam, *Kazania na święta całego roku* (Poznań: Typis Societatis Jesu, 1762), 265–66.

⁸²Chynczewska-Hennel, *Mariusz Filonardi*, 188. This is discussed at length in Teter, *Jews and Heretics*.

⁸³For more on this, see Teter, *Jews and Heretics*.

⁸⁴Benjamin Slonik, *Masa'at Binyamin*, no. 30.

Ashkenazim surely he who drinks non-kosher wine [*yayin nesekh*] in the lodging of the non-Jews [*ba-malon shel goyim*] and eats fish cooked in their utensils" is still treated with respect "if he is rich and powerful," but if someone eats and drinks kosher food but without head covering he is considered to be someone separating from the community [*tofsim oto keilu haiah yotse min ha-klal*].⁸⁵

But Jews were not only "lodging" in non-Jewish homes or somewhat casually sharing spaces with them, they were also apparently "establishing households" in the houses of "the uncircumcised." In 1679 the Council of Lithuania repeated a ban against Jews who "broke the wall of ordinances and violated the bans of the sages" by "settling and establishing households in the houses of the uncircumcised," despite the "total prohibition of idolatry."⁸⁶ The council specifically noted that this practice often took place during fairs. To prevent both "temporary" and "set" joint residences, the council decided to reissue a total ban stating that "under heavy penalties the houses of the uncircumcised are entirely forbidden to live in, in any way."⁸⁷

Polish court records, too, provide evidence of Jews and Christians living together. In 1674, a Jewish thief tried in Lublin noted that his wife lived with a priest in the village of Powsin, "two miles away from Warsaw."⁸⁸ And of course there were numerous instances of Christian servants living in Jewish homes, who often entered into relationships with their employers that extended beyond official, professional relations. These relations were not necessarily sexual in nature but rather often simply human, in which those involved helped each other and each other's families. In 1685, in Połock, a Christian man killed his wife in an act of what we would call today domestic violence. He came home drunk, after drinking half a gallon (*garniec*) of beer and some vodka, and demanded that his wife give him food. She did not obey, so he began to beat her. Her female neighbors tried to intervene but failed, so they "ran to Joseph the coach-driver[']s house] and told them [what had happened] and I woke the young girl, daughter of the dead woman, who was serving in the Jew's house." They ran back to the house and Joseph with another man managed to subdue the killer husband who was sitting in the house armed with a knife and an ax, and sent him to the magistrate.⁸⁹

Sharing space led to sharing food, customs, and language. In 1668, a Christian woman and a Jewish man were accused of adultery, a capital offense under the

⁸⁵Shlomo Luria, *Shu"t Maharshah*, no. 72 in Bar-Ilan Responsa Project, version 14.

⁸⁶Simon Dubnow, *Pinkas Ha-Medinah* (Tel-Aviv: Dvir, 1925), 193–94, takkanah 773. See also responsa *Havot Yair*, nos. 66 and 73, presented at the Early Modern Workshop in August 2006 and available online: Debra Kaplan, "Jewish Women and Economic Encounters with Christians," <http://www.earlymodern.org/citation.php?citKey=34&docKey=p> (accessed 26 January 2007). Also, an ordinance by the Jewish community of the town of Mir in 1751, "The Meeting of The Holy Council [of the Lithuanian Land] at Mir, November–December 1751" [Va'ad kodesh bekehilat hakodesh Mir behodesh Heshvan try], trans. Adam Teller, University of Haifa. <http://www.earlymodern.org/citation.php?citKey=32&docKey=e> (accessed 26 January 2007).

⁸⁷Dubnow, *Pinkas Ha-Medinah*, 193–94, takkanah 773.

⁸⁸MS Acta Criminalia 140, Archiwum Państwowe w Lublinie, fol. 351.

⁸⁹A Sozonov, ed., *Istoriko-Iuridicheskie Materialy, Izvlechennyye Iz Aktovykh Knig Gubernii Vitebskoi i Mogilevskoi, Khraniashchikhsia V Tsentralnom Arkhivie V Vitebskie i Izdannyye* (Vitebsk: Gubernskaia Tipo-Litografia, 1874), 6:274–88, esp. 280–82.

existing law, after they had been caught apparently socializing—eating a herring and drinking mead locked alone in a room. Both adamantly denied any touching or sexual encounter. After routine interrogation under torture, they were both dismissed.⁹⁰ If food was shared, so, too, were clothes. Benjamin Slonik was asked if lending clothes to Christians when they went to church on their holidays was permitted. No payment or any reward is mentioned, just *mipnei darkei shalom*—for the sake of peace.⁹¹

That Jews and Christians shared clothing finds support also in court cases. A number of robbery cases, for example, suggest that when Christians stole clothing from Jews they were happy to wear them. In Lublin, one Christian robber was captured after robbing Jews, and he appeared in court wearing clothes that he had stolen from them.⁹² In a separate case of robbery, another Christian appeared in court wearing a hat and a coat stolen from Jews. In this case, the hat was the only indication of difference, and it is described as “Jewish,” or “Jew’s” [*żydowski*]. In some cases, however, the descriptive adjective “Jewish”/“Jew’s” is ambiguous and might indicate that the item (like a hat) had simply been previously owned by a Jew, just as for instance an object owned by a Paweł would be called “Pawłowski/a,” or something owned by a Maryna would be called “Marynowski/a.” The case in 1624 in Lublin is an example of this ambiguity, where the court asked the robber “where he got the hat he has on, because it is Jewish/Jew’s [*pytany kędy tę czapkę wziął, która na niem iest gdyż iest żydowska*].” This still might indicate that perhaps male hats that Jews wore were distinct.⁹³ Even so, that distinction may not always have been obvious, as a case of a lowly nobleman tried in 1630 for robbing a church and stealing silver objects from there indicates. In the course of the trial, the nobleman casually mentioned a man, who accompanied a Jewish man to whom he was trying to sell some of the loot, commenting, “I don’t know if he was a Jew or a Christian.”⁹⁴

There are more examples of such mixing and fluidity of boundaries between Jews and Christians: Jews occasionally seeking resolutions to marital problems in Christian courts, Jews taking other Jews to non-Jewish courts, Jews participating in criminal Christian gangs, like the Jew from Włodzimierz, who in 1634 provided information about Jews traveling from Włodzimierz who had lost money to a gang of Christian robbers among whom there were some noblemen. During the 1634 trial of the gang members, one nobleman confessed, “Often visiting the Jew in Włodzimierz, who lives on the outskirts in Xiążęca Wola, this Jew convinced Philipowski and Jaroszkowski to rob certain Jews from Włodzimierz. And so, travel-

⁹⁰Acta Criminalia 140, Archiwum Państwowe in Lublin, fols. 280v–82.

⁹¹Benjamin Slonik, *Mas ʾat Binjamin*, no. 86.

⁹²Acta Criminalia 141, Archiwum Państwowe in Lublin, fols. 286–89, esp 287.

⁹³The phrase in question is “a Jew’s [or Jewish] hat made of fox fur” (*czapka żydowska lisem podszyta*); see Acta Criminalia 141, Archiwum Państwowe in Lublin, fol. 50. Another case might indicate that Jewish hats may have been distinct: Acta Criminalia 141, Archiwum Państwowe in Lublin, fol. 67v. See there also the discussion about a coat, fol. 72, and the somewhat ambiguous phrasing on fol. 273v.

⁹⁴Acta Criminalia 141, Archiwum Państwowe in Lublin, fol. 267v.

ing from Włodzimierz to Lublin, we attacked these Jews just after Piaski.”⁹⁵ Another witness elaborated:

Philipowski knew this Jew Somer for a long time, he lives in Xiążęca Wola in Włodzimierz, and this Jew spied on Jews who carried money from Włodzimierz.... And then Philipowski gave [us] a signal and we traveled to Włodzimierz to [this] Jew [Somer], and there Jaroszkowski gave the Jew a horse [*podjezdek*] and three pieces of pork fat flich, and the Jew himself was supposed to go [with us]. And we traveled from Włodzimierz to Troscianka, and Philipowski with the servant of the late Mr. Sepkowski stayed at this Jew's house, and when these Jews were about to leave Włodzimierz, then Philipowski sent a message to us through the servant, and so we left Troscianka while the Jews left Włodzimierz, and Philipowski trailed behind these Jews from afar.⁹⁶

After traveling hundreds of miles through Chełm, Przemyśl, Krosno, Kraków, and Częstochowa, the robbers finally got caught in Bełżyce because they got drunk drinking mead at a Jewish woman's house [*u Żydówki*] and started shooting, killing at least one person, a local woman.⁹⁷

As this last case, and cases discussed earlier, illustrate, Jews and Christians collaborated together, and entered or shared each other's spaces, food, clothing, and even language. All this, however, is not to say that there were no differences between Jews and Christians. Such differences certainly existed but were perhaps not as stark as modern historians would want us to believe.

Polish court records, for example, unlike those of the English Old Bailey, do not indicate linguistic differences between Jews and Christians as they are interrogated as witnesses, plaintiffs, or defendants. Jews speak like their non-Jewish counterparts without needing translators.⁹⁸ As early as 1560 a court for nonresidents in Przemyśl noted that the testimony of the Jews from the region of Podolia had to be translated into Latin from *Polish*, because “in Podolia Latin was unknown.”⁹⁹ Other records, especially later, also indicate certain differences in language. In one case a Christian woman couldn't remember the full name of a Jewish woman who had entrusted a child with her and then disappeared because that Jewish woman spoke “in a German way.”¹⁰⁰ In a well-known blood libel case from 1636 in Lublin, a Christian servant in the house of the accused and the main

⁹⁵Acta Criminalia 141, Archiwum Państwowe in Lublin, fol. 353.

⁹⁶Acta Criminalia 141, Archiwum Państwowe in Lublin, fols. 362r–v.

⁹⁷Acta Criminalia 141, Archiwum Państwowe in Lublin, fols. 364r–v.

⁹⁸The exceptions are truly rare; for example, in Poznań where in 1679 a Jewish apothecary testified in an ecclesiastical court in a case of an annulment of unconsummated marriage due to the husband's impotence. His testimony was translated into Polish by a German-speaking burgerett. It is unclear if the testimony was in Yiddish or if the apothecary was a German-speaking Jew. *Depositiones Testium XV in Archiwum Archidiecezjalnym w Poznaniu*, fol. 169.

⁹⁹Akta m. Przemyśla 96–Acta hospitalia (1531–60), Archiwum Państwowe in Przemyśl, 417 no. 579.

¹⁰⁰Acta Criminalia (1643–75), 140, Archiwum Państwowe in Lublin, fol. 293.

witness against Jews indicated that he spoke with his Jewish master's wife in Polish, but he claimed that the master spoke late at night with his male acquaintances in Yiddish (*jargotat*).¹⁰¹

* * *

While much prescriptive and polemical literature documents the marginalization of the Jew, sometimes for reasons peripheral to the issues concerning Jews, descriptive archival materials from Poland and from Strasbourg indicate that the Jews played active roles in their societies and economies. Both examples indicate that despite efforts made by both Catholic and Protestant religious elites throughout Europe during the early modern period (and claims by modern national historians), neither Jews nor Christians lived in tightly knit, isolated, and insular communities in most of Europe.

Integrating archival sources about the Jews into larger historical narratives can be useful for adding to and questioning the narratives of general history. Reformation Strasbourg and Catholic Reformation Poland contain similar types of sources about Jews, including laws, economic contracts, letters, criminal records, responsa, and polemics. These sources about the agency of the Jews inform the historical narrative in two related ways. First, Jewish activities did not take place in a vacuum; Jews undoubtedly had an impact on the society in which they lived and were themselves equally influenced by it. Second, sources about Jews illuminate many aspects of general history to which the Jewish experience, at least at first glance, seems irrelevant. In Catholic Poland and in Reformation Strasbourg—a Christian city from which Jews were barred as residents for approximately four hundred years—sources about the Jews lead to new conclusions for the early modern historian. The material from Poland challenges the perception that in post-Reformation Poland the church triumphed politically when the political elites returned to Catholicism. Not only was the church not triumphant in implementing its policies, but understanding Jews' role in society and economy helps explain both the religious rhetoric within the church and the political tensions between prominent nobles and the clergy. Similarly, reading economic and legal sources about Jews from Strasbourg elucidates how politics functioned during the Reformation, revealing surprising alliances between sides otherwise engaged in religious and political struggle.

Perhaps tools given to us by recent theories of transnationalism and transculturalism can be helpful in this process. David Thelen, a scholar of American history, has noted that national historiographies have “self-enclosing habits,” and do not deal well with “boundary-crossing ideas, institutions, and people ... whose

¹⁰¹Acta Criminalia 141, Archiwum Państwowe in Lublin, fols. 394–413v, esp. fol. 411v. Parts are reprinted in Zenon Guldon and Jacek Wijaczka, *Procesy o Mordy Rytualne w Polsce w XVI–XVIII Wiek* (Kielce: DCF, 1995), 102–15, esp. 104, 111. This case was also discussed by Mejer Balaban in his article “Hugo Grotius and the Blood Libel Trials in Lublin, 1636,” in *Polin* 22, ed. Adam Teller, Magda Teter, and Anthony Polonski (Portland, OR: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2009).

liminal experiences and identities could not be easily corralled.¹⁰² Although Thelen's article, like most works on transnationalism and transculturalism, focuses on the modern period, national historiographies have greatly shaped the understanding and study of the early modern period as well. Such national narratives have tended to exclude elements that were not seen as pertinent to national development, ignoring groups who lived in the modern nation-states but were not seen as part of the given nation. Jews have, therefore, often been excluded, and in cases of many multicultural and multiethnic states including Poland, other groups—Ukrainians, Lithuanians, Germans, and most non-Catholics—also suffered the same historiographical fate.¹⁰³

Scholars of transnationalism and transculturalism have urged a look at networks and connections beyond so-called nation-states. Historians of the Jews have begun to work in this way. Whereas earlier Jewish historiography did not escape these nationalistic trends and aimed to demonstrate continuity of Jewish history from antiquity to modern times, recent scholarship has highlighted the various networks to which Jews belonged, including both their relationships to their non-Jewish neighbors and the connections tying Jewish communities across geographical boundaries.¹⁰⁴

By expanding horizontally across geographic and political boundaries, general early modern historians may also begin to see connections beyond the established borders and discover networks, not only of trade, as in the transatlantic studies, but also of high and low culture.¹⁰⁵ As scholars informed equally by modern political, ethnic, and religious divisions as by early modern wars of religion, persecutions, and concentrated efforts to order society, we may have forgotten that Jews and Christians, with all their differences and similarities, belonged to the same society and interacted with each other matter-of-factly. Historiographic trends have rendered this web of people and cultures less visible, but it was one in which Jewish and gentile threads were tightly interwoven, sometimes, to continue the metaphor, from the same fiber.

While direct parallels cannot be made, these two cases demonstrate that, similar to developments in women's history, African American history, or colonial studies before, including what may be considered marginal groups, into the dominant narrative offers a new way of seeing familiar historical developments.

¹⁰²David Thelen, "The Nation and Beyond: Transnational Perspectives on United States History," *Journal of American History* 86, no. 3 (1999): 967, 974.

¹⁰³Jews have been seen at best as appendices to Polish historical narratives, but this was also the case for the Greek-Orthodox Ruthenians, Lutheran Germans, and others.

¹⁰⁴See, for example, Simon Dubnow, *Nationalism and History: Essays on Old and New Judaism* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1958); idem, *History of the Jews in Russia and Poland*, trans. I. Friedlander (Bergenfield, NJ: Avotaynu, 2000). For examples of new findings of connections across geographical boundaries, see Elisheva Carlebach, "The Boundaries of Memory: A Central-European Chronograph from 1665," and M. J. Rosman, "The Authority of the Council of Four Lands Outside of Poland," in *Polin* 22 (see n101 above).

¹⁰⁵See, for example, Peter Mark and José da Silva Horta, "Two Early Seventeenth-Century Sephardic Communities on Senegal's Petite Côte," *History in Africa* 31 (2004): 231–56; Peter Mark, "The Evolution of 'Portuguese' Identity: Luso-Africans on the Upper Guinea Coast from the Sixteenth to the Early Nineteenth Century," *Journal of African History* 40, no. 2 (1999): 172–91.

Indeed, it is the historian, and not the historical reality, that has relegated material about the Jews solely to Jewish rather than to general history. Just as Jewish historiography needs to take a broader context into consideration to avoid historiographic particularism, general history needs to integrate Jews, for like their non-Jewish neighbors, the Jews were not passive onlookers, but rather were active agents who acted, reacted, and interacted. To better understand the lives of all Europeans, one must also look at the broader context in which they lived, and that context almost always included Jews. ❧

The Plague Files

*Crisis Management in
Sixteenth-Century Seville*

ALEXANDRA PARMA COOK and
NOBLE DAVID COOK

"The *Plague Files* affords the reader a unique window into this past world where the majority struggled to survive. For those wishing to understand the realities of urban life in early modern Spain, this elegant text allows the residents to speak for themselves."

—David J. Robinson, editor of *Migration in Colonial Spanish America*

Illustrated, \$40.00



LSU PRESS

Available in bookstores and online at www.lsu.edu/lsupress

