Deutsches Historisches Institut Warschau
Quellen und Studien
Band 40

2022
Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Space as a Category for the Research of the History of Jews in Poland-Lithuania 1500–1900

Edited by
Maria Cieśla and Ruth Leiserowitz

2022
Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über https://dnb.de abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the internet at https://dnb.de.

For further information about our publishing program consult our website https://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2022
This work, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright. Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.
Printed on permanent/durable paper.
Printing and binding: Memminger MedienCentrum AG
Printed in Germany

ISSN 0947-4226 eISSN 2751-7586
ISBN 978-3-447-11895-8 eISBN 978-3-447-39311-9

Contents

MARIA CIEŚLA AND RUTH LEISEROWITZ
Introduction 7

I SPACIAL PRACTICES

RUTH LEISEROWITZ
Litvak traders and their spatial dimensions at the transition
from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century 21

CORNELIA AUST
Jewish practices at fairs, courts, and notary's offices.
Was there a 'Jewish space' in Christian places? 37

MARIA CIEŚLA
The court and the market – Jewish-Christian spaces in the town of Słuck
in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries 55

II REPRESENTATIONS OF SPACE

HANNA ZAREMSKA
The relocation of the Jewish community from Krakow to Kazimierz 73

MICHAEL K. SCHULZ
Jews and Christians in the shared spaces of Gdańsk in the late eighteenth
and early nineteenth century 81

MAŁGORZATA HANZL
Forms of Jewish place. Considerations on organisation of space in Jewish
neighborhoods of nineteenth century and early twentieth century central Poland 97

III IMAGINARY SPACES

AGNIESZKA PUFELSKA
The Polish-Jewish 'Berlinertum'. The impact of Berlin's Haskalah on Polish Jews 117

MAŁGORZATA A. MAKSYMIAK
Who was afraid of the East? German discovery of Polish Jews
at the end of the eighteenth century 131

Explanatory Map 145

Contributors 147

Index 151

Introduction

Maria Cieśla and Ruth Leiserowitz

The goal of this volume is to show how *space* as an analytical category can be integrated into research on Jewish history within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the early modern period and the beginning of nineteenth century in general, and in particular on Jewish-Christian coexistence.

We assume a concept of *space* in which different actors (we will touch further on this below) understand space as the result of social practice, such that it can contribute to a reexamination of the Jewish experience in the early modern period. Although *space* has been used in historical research and in Jewish studies, there is as yet no research which has adopted the category for use in research into the history of Polish Jews in the early modern period and the early nineteenth century. The intent of our volume is to analyze Jewish spaces using an interdisciplinary approach. The majority of the papers presented in this volume were discussed during the conference '*Space* as a Category for the Research of the History of Jews in Poland (16th-19th c.)' organized by the German Historical Institute in Warsaw, the Polin Museum of the History of Polish Jews (in the context of the Global Education Outreach Program) and the Tadeusz Manteuffel Institute of History – Polish Academy of Sciences. The main questions asked in this volume are: How were *Jewish spaces* created in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and its successor states? Who were the creators (actors)? In which ways did the *space* influence the creators (actors)? How did the actors experience the *space*? How did the Jews use different *spaces* and share them? In order to contextualize the papers presented in this volume we will offer now a brief description of earlier historical research on *space* in general and Jewish space in particular. Then we will introduce our understanding of *Jewish space* and the papers presented in this volume.

It is obvious that historical interactions take place in *space*. There is a long historiographical tradition of analyzing and describing different spaces. Almost every historical introduction into spatial research begins with a description of the seventeenth century natural philosopher's views of *space*. Special attention is given to the historians connected to the *Annales School*, particularly to the research of Fernand Braudel and his *La Méditerranée*.[1] In similar fashion, local and regional studies, mostly developed in Germany, were recognized as precursors of the *spatial turn*. However, in those

1 Fernand Braudel, *La Méditerranée et le monde méditerranéen à l'époque de Philippe II* (Paris 1949).

works *space* was perceived as given, natural; it was a frame or a background against which history took place. The term itself was not specific and it had little analytical content.[2] Beginning the late 1980s, historians started to use a cultural approach in the research of *space*. Integrating the ideas of sociologists, anthropologists and geographers – among the most significant were Henri Lefebvre, Michel Foucault, Edward Soja[3]– into historical research brought about a set of new theoretical inspirations. The core of the *spatial turn* was identified as a relative or relational understanding of *space*.[4] In this context, the most significant assumption is that *space* itself is a historical concept that is constructed by specific circumstances and perspectives. *Space* is both a precondition and result of social practice. As a projection of social practice, *space* contains not only works and products but also the social relationships from which it emerges. There is thus a dialectical relationship between *space* and actors, since *space* is both created by actors as well as structures their actions. Because of this premise, the problems of power and agency arise along with numerous other questions. With this in mind Doreen Massey – a geographer who influenced the *spatial turn* in the field of history – has argued, that 'space is utterly imbued with and a product of relations of power, but power itself has a geography'.[5]

We put here the focus on agency. On the one hand, scholars are asking how *space* is created and who creates it? On the other hand, it has to be borne in mind that *space* can be a historical actor as well, and it can itself influence the activity of the people and historical events.[6] Writing about *space*, historians mostly use the theory from Henri Lefebvre. In his *Production of Space* (originally published in 1974)[7] he argues that *space* is not given but created (produced) in social action. His model of *space* comprises a conceptual triad which includes three dimensions. We take the liberty of reproducing them here once again, since it is precisely these approaches that are made to bear fruit in our volume. Firstly: *Spatial Practice* understood as *production and reproduction and their particular locations and spatial sets characteristic of each social formation. Spatial practice ensures continuity and some degree of cohesion. In terms of social space*

2 About the use of space in the historical research before the *spatial turn*, see Beat Kümin and Cornelie Usborn, 'At Home and in the Workplace. A Historical Introduction to the "Spatial Turn"', *History and Theory* 52.3 (October 2013), pp. 305-318; Paul Stock, 'History and the uses of space', in idem (ed.), *The Uses of Spaces in Early Modern History* (New York 2015), pp. 1-19.

3 Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith (Oxford, UK; Cambridge, Mass. 1991); Michel Foucault, 'Of other spaces', *Diacritics* 16.1 (Spring 1986), pp. 22-27; Edward Soja, *Postmoderngeographies. The Ressertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London, New York 1989).

4 Gerd Schwerhoff, 'Spaces, places and the historians. A comment from a German perspective', *History and Theory* 52.3 (October 2013), pp. 420-432, here p. 425.

5 Doreen Massey, 'Concepts of space and power in theory and in political practice', *Documents d'Analisi Geographica* 55 (2009), pp. 15-26, here p. 18.

6 Stock, 'History and the uses of space', pp. 8f.

7 Henri Lefebvre, *Production de l'espace* (Paris 1974).

and each member's or given society's relationship to that space this cohesion implies a guaranteed level of competence and a specific level of performance. We can call it: the perceived space. Secondly: *Representations of Space*: *which are tied to the relation of productions and to the 'order' which those relations impose and hence to knowledge, to signs, to codes and to frontal relations*. We can say: the conceived space. Thirdly, *Representational Spaces* embodying complex symbolism, sometimes coded sometimes not, linked to the clandestine or underground side of life as also to art. We can phrase this as: the lived space.[8] This approach, which allows different spaces: concrete, abstract and lived to exist in different historical moments, offers us an interesting scholarly challenge. It will be complemented in the following by some further theoretical details.

It seems that in addition to the spatial model of Lefebvre as part of studying the *spaces* of minority groups (for instance Jews), the works of the German sociologist Martina Löw are also significant in the understanding of space. She argues that constructions of spaces always constitute the difference between the included and the excluded.[9] The questions as to who is inside and who is outside are two of the most significant when analyzing the functioning of the Jews within the Christian society. Examining different *spaces,* one has to remember that its creation is connected to power.

Space as an analytical category thus enables us to use the models already mentioned to analyze complex historical constellations and to examine different experiences and horizons. This is particularly valuable for our field of study and this particular period under study, since many gaps need to be filled in, outdated views need to be revised, and new insights need to be gained. We also see the access provided by *space* as an opportunity to understand relationships that open up what is special and unique. Moreover, it provides tools for investigating more comprehensive processes that would otherwise be difficult to understand in other categories such as: class, race, gender, sexuality, state, expertise or law.[10]

The spatial approach helps to deconstruct the classical and common binary models, such as elitist – popular, sacred – profane, public – private. Spatial analyses are relevant to all gender-specific questions. Finally, applying this approach one can answer questions about agency and causation, and the relationship between material and intellectual life.[11]

We should also mention *imaginary spaces*. In the Jewish context, they can be conceptualized from various perspectives. Different spaces are created in Jewish religious texts, thought and literature. It is worthwhile to remember that in Jewish literary tra-

8 Idem, *The Production*, p. 33.
9 Martina Löw, *Raumsoziologie* (Frankfurt am Main 2001), p. 214.
10 Leif Jerram, 'Space. A useless category for historical analysis', *History and Theory* 52.3 (October 2013), pp. 400-419, here p. 402.
11 Stock, 'History and the uses of space', p. 5.