







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 Cieřła 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 978-3-447-11985-8

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 HANZI	
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 Cieřła 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*.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> 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<sup>3</sup> – 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*.<sup>4</sup> 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’.<sup>5</sup>

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.<sup>6</sup> Writing about *space*, historians mostly use the theory from Henri Lefebvre. In his *Production of Space* (originally published in 1974)<sup>7</sup> 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 Cornelia 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 Reassertion 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.<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup>

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.<sup>11</sup>

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.



ditions *space* always had an ambiguous meaning. Essential for its understanding is the Hebrew word *makom* (concept). On the one hand it means ‘place’, but on the other Ha-Makom is one of the names for God. Amir Eshel pointed out that this double meaning generated ‘the irresolvable tension between cosmos and *makom*. The historical fact that through the centuries Jews inhabited almost the entirety of the human cosmos went hand in hand with a constant striving for being in and with *makom*.<sup>12</sup>

The *spatial turn* came to Jewish studies with a delay. Through the ages Jewish history was solely examined in non-spatial terms.<sup>13</sup> It was generally accepted that the Jews lived almost exclusively in the dimension of time.<sup>14</sup> In popular and scholarly works Jews were perceived as ‘wandering’ and ‘rootless’ and as the ‘people of the book’; the diaspora was described as temporary and ‘ageographic’ and ‘spaceless’. Traditionally, both in Jewish education and research in the field of Jewish studies, the focus was concentrated first and foremost on an examination of different (sacred) texts.<sup>15</sup> In Jewish history *space* appeared only in two contexts. The first one was religious. Historians analyzed the functioning of *sacred spaces*, for instance, the Temple, synagogues, *Eruv*, the archeology and geography of the Holy Land. The second context was the situation after the establishment of the state of Israel. Then *space* was researched in connection with political geography and the political struggle in the Middle East. Traditionally Israel was perceived as the central (the only) Jewish space in the world.<sup>16</sup>

Since the late 1980s, an increasing interest in *space* has become noticeable in Jewish studies. Of real significance has been a positive redefinition of diaspora and the political changes that occurred after the fall of Communism.<sup>17</sup> The now unhindered access to areas in Eastern Europe, which before the Second World War had large Jewish populations with a centuries-old Jewish culture, and which for the most part became the scene of the Holocaust, now aroused great scholarly interest. In 1996, Diana Pinto published an article examining social phenomena in which *Jewish space* was created. She argued that those processes were connected with a gradual integration of the Holocaust into the national historical narrative. Thus, it was possible to create *Jewish*

12 Amir Eshel, ‘Cosmopolitanism and Searching for the Sacred Space in Jewish Literature’, *Jewish Social Studies* New Series 9.3 (Spring/Summer 2003), pp. 121-138, p. 122; ‘Makom. Space and places in Judaism. On the meaning and construction of local references in European Judaism’ was the title of the Research Training Group of the ‘Jewish Studies’ program at the University of Potsdam, funded by the German Research Foundation and the State of Brandenburg 2001-2007. Several research projects inter alia the works from Julia Brauch, Anna Lipphardt and Alexandra Nocke were done here.

13 Julia Brauch et al., ‘Exploring Jewish Space. An Approach’, in eadem (eds), *Jewish Topographies. Visions of Space, Traditions of Place* (London 2008), pp. 1-23, here p. 6.

14 Abraham Joshua Heschel, *Sabbath. Its Meaning for Modern Man* (Boston 2003).

15 Neil G. Jacobs, ‘Introduction. A Field of Jewish Geography’, *Shofar* 17.1 (Fall 1998), Special Issue: *Studies in Jewish Geography*, pp. 1-18, here p. 4.

16 Charlotte Elisheva Fonrobert and Vered Shemtov, ‘Jewish conceptions and practices of space’, *Jewish Social Studies* New Series 11.3 (Spring/Summer 2005), pp. 1-8.

17 Daniel Boyarin and Jonathan Boyarin, ‘Diaspora. Generation and the Ground of Jewish Identity’, *Critical Inquiry* 19.4 (Summer 1993), pp. 693-725.

*spaces*. She thought about places (e.g. Jewish museums, monuments, festivals of Jewish culture), in which the Jewish people and their culture which had vanished in the Holocaust could be remembered.<sup>18</sup> Research on such Jewish spaces is still being conducted. It has become a significant component in Jewish memory studies.<sup>19</sup>

Later on, in the first years of the twenty-first century, the category of *Jewish space* was introduced into Jewish social studies and into the research on Jewish-Christian encounters. In this context, of significant importance is the volume *Jewish Topographies. Vision of Space, Tradition of Place* edited by Julia Brauch, Anna Lipphardt and Alexandra Nocke, which was a first successful attempt at a comprehensive analysis of *Jewish spaces*.<sup>20</sup> The editors' definition was inspired by sociologists and spatial theorists, mostly by the theory of Henri Lefebvre. Consequently, they defined *Jewish space* as 'spatial environments in which Jewish things happen, where Jewish activities are performed, and which in turn are shaped and defined by those Jewish activities'.<sup>21</sup> In contrast to Diana Pinto, there is a clear difference between space and place. They define the second as both geographically located and bound to specific locations. In their understanding, a significant feature of *Jewish space* is 'a deep-seated internal and external trans-locality and trans-culturality'. Such a conceptualization arouses interest in the Jewish agency and the production of space.<sup>22</sup>

In recent years, the concept of *space* has also been used as an analytical category in the research on Jewish-Christian coexistence; an example would be the volume *Jewish and Non-Jewish Spaces in the Urban Context*, edited by Alina Gromova, Felix Heinert, Sebastian Voigt.<sup>23</sup> The editors argue that 'Jewish spaces develop only in relation to non-Jewish space'.<sup>24</sup> Similar perspectives can be found in the volume *Space and Spatiality in Modern German Jewish History*, where the editors Simone Lässig and Miriam Rürup point out that they 'understand spaces and their boundaries as based on communication and experiences, simultaneously limiting and opening up opportunities'.<sup>25</sup>

For the purposes of this volume, *space* will be conceptualized following the theory of Henri Lefebvre, with *space* understood as result of social practice. Simultaneously

18 Diana Pinto, *A New Jewish Identity for Post-1989 Europe* (London 1996).

19 Cf. for instance, Eszter B. Gantner and Jay (Koby) Oppenheim, 'Jewish Space Reloaded. An Introduction', *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures* 23.2 (2014), pp. 1-10; Research about memory spaces in Poland, see Erica Lehrer and Michael Meng (eds), *Jewish Spaces in Contemporary Poland* (Bloomington and Indianapolis 2015).

20 Brauch, 'Exploring'.

21 Brauch, 'Exploring', p. 4.

22 Brauch, 'Exploring', pp. 2-4.

23 Alina Gromova et al., 'Introduction', in eadem (eds), *Jewish and Non-Jewish Spaces in the Urban Context* (Berlin 2015), pp. 13-25.

24 Gromova, 'Introduction', p. 14.

25 Simone Lässig and Miriam Rürup, 'Introduction. What Made a Space "Jewish"? Reconsidering a Category of Modern German History', in eadem, *Space and Spatiality in Modern German-Jewish History* (New York, Oxford 2017), pp. 1-20, here p. 7.

we share the understanding of *Jewish space* offered by Brauch, Lipphardt, and Nocke.<sup>26</sup> However, we are interested as well in power-relations and thus in what the Christian spaces created for the Jews and the question as to how Christians perceived *Jewish spaces*.

The timeframe for this volume extends from the early modern period to the initial phase of the modern period, yet some of the authors refer to spaces of earlier periods (e.g. the Middle Ages in the contribution from Hanna Zaremska) or later (e.g. the modern period in the contribution from Małgorzata Hanzl). The geographical spectrum of this volume is limited to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and its successor states.

It should be borne in mind that the Commonwealth was the ‘home’ for numerous Jewish communities in the diaspora in the early modern period and the beginning of the modern period. In 1764 about 750,000 Jews lived there, which was more than half of the entire Jewish population of the world. As has been shown in previous research, favorable privileges given by the kings and magnates to the Jews gave rise to a rapid development of the Jewish communities in the Commonwealth. The Jews constituted a majority of the town- and city-dwellers; their strong position in economic life was seen throughout the whole country. At the same time, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was one of the most significant places for religious life and rabbinic studies. Significant as well were the autonomic institutions – the *kabals* and the *Vaads*.<sup>27</sup>

*Jewish space* in the early modern period in general and in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in particular has seldom been a subject of research. The spatial approach was perceived as useful especially in the research of modern Jewish history.<sup>28</sup> Early modern historians paid attention to space only in their examinations of Jewish religious places (e.g. synagogues, cemeteries) or Jewish streets/quarters. It has to be stressed that the selected timeframe allows one to show the development of *Jewish space* independently from the classical political events; for example, the partitions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. In this way Jewish topics can be placed centrally in the research focus without being artificially periodized by the usual political *caesurae*. Of significance are the contributions here which look at spaces at the end of the eighteenth and in very beginning of the nineteenth centuries (Cornelia Aust, Ruth Leiserowitz, Michael K. Schulz). It seems that there is almost no previous research on the social history of Polish Jews for this short but significant time period. Finally, yet importantly, research on the history of Polish-Lithuanian Jewry in the early modern period and beginning of modern times is strongly focused on economic issues. One of

26 Brauch, ‘Exploring’, pp. 2-4.

27 About the Jews in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, see Gershon David Hundert, *Jews in Poland-Lithuania in Eighteenth Century. A Genealogy of Modernity* (Berkeley, Calif. 2004); Moshe Rosman, ‘Innovative Tradition. Jewish Culture in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth’, in David Biale (ed.), *Cultures of the Jews 2* (New York 2006), pp. 217-271.

28 Lässig and Rürup, ‘Introduction’.



the aims of our volume is to show that Jewish history and in particular the Jewish-Christian encounters can be studied from a cultural and social perspective.<sup>29</sup>

The organization of the book follows Lefebvre's definition of space. Our volume is divided into three different sections, corresponding to Lefebvre's spatial triad. The first section, called *spatial practices*, is devoted to the constructions of spaces through everyday activities. In this part of the volume, the concept of space is used as a tool for a new interpretation of the Jewish-Christian encounters. Thus, the focus is put on urban spaces and 'contact zones' created in reciprocal actions between Jews and Christians.

In the first paper, *Litvak traders and their spatial dimensions at the transition from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century*, Ruth Leiserowitz analyzes the special practices and the representation of space from Lithuanian Jewish merchants (referred to as Litvaks) in the end of the eighteenth and in the beginning of the nineteenth centuries. This timeframe is significant; the activity of the Jews is presented against the background of tremendous political transformations. The aim of this paper is to analyze the changes in the commercial spaces created in everyday practice by Jewish merchants. The focus is on the Jewish actors. Ruth Leiserowitz introduces four different perspectives: the Lithuanian territory and its trade routes, the region of Samogitia, the Prussian border, and the town of Vilkomir (today Ukmergė). To begin with, a slow development of the country's road system caused an increase in the activity of the Jewish merchants. Secondly, political changes (for instance the wars in the eighteenth century, and a new Prussian policy which facilitated Jewish economic activity) brought about a development of Jewish cross-border trade. Finally, a close examination of the Jewish spaces in the town of Vilkomir reveals that after 1830, the Jewish economic involvement and the imperial administration encountered one another on the central square. We can see that the spatial activities of the Litvak merchants in the first half of the nineteenth century were essentially strengthened.

The paper of Cornelia Aust, *Jewish practices at fairs, courts, and notary's offices. Was there a 'Jewish space' in Christian places?* focuses on spatial aspects of the micro-practices of contracts. Aust analyzes the interaction between Jews and Christians during fairs in Frankfurt an der Oder and in court and notary offices in Warsaw. Markets, fairs and courts were places where Jews and Christians met on a regular basis. Although it seems that these places are neutral, less charged with religious meaning, Aust argues that these were clearly Christian spaces in which Jews had to submit to the rules of the Christian world in order to operate in them. It should be stressed that Christian commercial activity took place in accordance with the Christian religious calendar; similarly, in court and notary offices Christian symbols were common. Aust shows here that the spaces she analyzes, which have always been characterized by specific cultural practices and dynamic social relations, were also Jewish spaces. Ashkenazic traders had

---

29 Adam Teller, 'Polish-Jewish Relations. Historical Research and Social Significance. On the Legacy of Jacob Goldberg', *Studia Judaica* 15.1-2 (2012), pp. 27-47.

important positions and opportunities for action in these institutions created by Christians, developed through constant negotiations about their own position and by cultivating their social relationships. Her examples illustrate the following: There was no binary opposition between Jewish and Christian space, and the analysis of spaces should take aspects such as gender and social status into consideration. The last paper of this section, *The court and the market – Jewish-Christian spaces in the town of Stuck in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries* by Maria Cieřła, also takes a similar approach to *Jewish spaces*. It presents a case study of the Belarusian town of Stuck. The focus here is on *spaces* which were ‘produced’ in shared Jewish-Christian actions. A detailed micro-historical examination of the ‘market’ and ‘court’ reveals that the Jewish-Christian shared spaces were created primarily through economic activity. It should be stressed that the Jewish calendar dominated the economic life of the town; Jewish stall keepers provided the majority of goods to Christian inhabitants. Similarly, Jews and Christian met in courts; lawsuits connected to economic activity or simple conflicts between neighbors were very common. Maria Cieřła shows by means of examples in the sphere of the court that Jews and Christians used the jurisdiction equally. She argues that behaving according to the same legal code, and the use of many different languages led to the creation of a shared Jewish-Christian space. Surprisingly a micro-historical analysis of the topography of the town reveals that although the Jews and Christian lived very close one to another, a shared private space was not created.

The second part of the volume is devoted to the *representations of space*. With this dimension Lefebvre is referring to the discourses of a society. By discourses he means all the language and sign systems that serve to represent *space*. This abstract examination of *space* makes it possible to connect individual details of reality and to recognize different spaces in their entirety. The focus is put on the question as to how Christian laws and regulations contributed to the creation of the Jewish spaces, and how those spaces were shaped by the Christian laws, as well as conflicts and agreements with the Christian authorities. The most important actors who created Jewish space in these sections were the Christian authorities. Hanna Zaremska, Michael Schulz and Małgorzata Hanzl present case studies analyzing situations in Krakow, Danzig/Gdańsk and central Poland (Mazovia and the region of Lodz).

In the first paper, *The relocation of the Jewish community from Krakow to Kazimierz*, Hanna Zaremska examines the events connected with the relocation of the Jewish community from the town of Krakow to Kazimierz in the fifteenth century. The resettlement of the Jews caused a rapid development of the Jewish community, which became one of the most significant in the Ashkenazi diaspora. Zaremska carefully reconstructs different privileges given to the Jewish community, examining the agreements between the Krakow *kahal* and the Christian authorities. She argues that contemporaries regarded the resettlement as an outcome of an agreement between the king and the Jews. The *Jewish space* in Kazimierz was formed through a consolidation of properties that previously belonged to Jews. Nevertheless, this process triggered conflicts with local

authorities. In Zaremska's interpretation, the relocation of the Jewish community and the formation of a new *Jewish space* was an outcome of the conflict between the king and church authorities. So, this example illustrates the connection between *space* and *power*. With the resettlement to the other bank of the Vistula, however, a new development of the Jewish community was able to take place. It became an important center of the Ashkenazi diaspora and a center of Jewish teaching. However, such cases of urban and spatial autonomy were rare in Eastern Europe.

Michael Schulz presents in his paper *Jews and Christians in the shared spaces of Gdańsk in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century* a case study of Danzig/Gdańsk during this period. He analyzes the following issues: firstly, the Jewish relocations from suburbs to the city; secondly, the anti-Jewish riots of 1819 and 1821; thirdly, the Jewish presence at the stock market; and finally, the concept of citizens (*Bürger*). The analysis is focused on a time of tremendous political changes in the city. The use of the concept of *space* allows one to demonstrate how it influenced the position of the Jews within the city's society. Schulz demonstrates how new regulations introduced after the partitions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth generated the creation of new *Jewish spaces* within the city walls. The process of a renegotiation of the new *Jewish spaces* was determined by conflicts, for instance the anti-Jewish riots of 1819 and 1821. Schulz argues that an ongoing 'mental revolution' and modernization of the city allowed the Jews to seize new spaces in the town. Examples of wealthy Jewish merchants, who were allowed to trade in Danzig/Gdańsk, again show that additional factors such as social status and wealth are to be considered by an analysis of the different spaces. The old 'mental map' had served its time; for the decades following, Jews and Christians divided the urban space. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, a resettlement of the Jews was no longer conceivable. Similar to Hanna Zaremska's paper, Schulz examines the connection between *space* and political power.

The *Forms of Jewish place. Considerations on organisation of space in Jewish neighborhoods of nineteenth century and early twentieth century central Poland* by Małgorzata Hanzl explains the phenomenon of the organization of the Jewish places which were created in central Poland (Mazovia and the region of Lodz). Combining the research methods of urban morphology and design with anthropology and cultural studies, the author seeks to answer the question about the impact of socio-cultural conditions on urban settings. The paper raises questions as to how the Jewish communities of the pre-war Poland lived and how their everyday practices modeled their way of contributing to the urbanization process. Hanzl argues that the modernization processes of the Jewish community which took place in the nineteenth century caused transformations in the urban landscape; for instance, the location of synagogues and 'workspaces' changed. Significant for the urbanization processes as well was the development of several secular Jewish institutions. Hanzl demonstrates that the Jewish quarters were organized following social hierarchies and internal connections (the division between different spaces, e.g. religious, private, and the space for work activities) recognizable only to