

Jurgita Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė

16 The Image of the *Infidelis* in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania: A Comparison of the Trends in the Creation of Anti-Jewish and Anti-Muslim Stereotypes

In the context of socio-cultural development in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (hereafter referred to as the GDL), *infidel*, or non-Christian, was more than simply a definition that determined the reciprocal relations between different communities in society – it was also a legal term. The Second Statute of Lithuania, introduced in 1566, was meant to define the legal and social status of non-Christian communities – Jews and Tatars – by determining their relation to the Christian community and applying religious exceptionality. The Ruthenian concept of *besurmianin* (non-believer),¹ signifying an infidel, was the legal reflection of the prevalence of Christianity within the GDL. The non-Christian nature of the Jewish and Tatar communities was one of the factors that accounted for their similar legal and social status,² as well as for the similar assessments of these communities and the common stereotypes.

Drawing upon research³ and historical source material relevant to the topic, I will highlight the trends at play in the creation and formulation of the image of Jews, Tatars, and, to some degree, Karaites,⁴ all of whom were regarded as infidels. I will also show how these tendencies shaped both the development of Christian society and the history of non-Christian communities in the GDL. Knowing, as we do, the process by which these images tended to spread – local adaptation, accompanied by subsequent changes in their content, and in the way in which they were understood and expressed – we can uncover the most common trends exhibited in the case of anti-Jewish stereotypes. I will

1 Ruthenian for “non-believer”; cf. Latin *infidelis*. During the seventeenth century, the ‘non-believing Jew’ (Polish *niewierny Żyd*) took root in the GDL’s official chancellery documents.

2 For more about this, see Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė 2009, 116–127; Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė 2010, 68–85.

3 Kalik 2003a, 58–77; Kalik 2003b, 229–237; Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė 2009.

4 In the present paper, the Karaites are distinguished from the Rabbinical Jews (Rabbanites) as one of the communities in the GDL that used the image of Rabbinical Jews when presenting itself to society. Another unique feature of the GDL was the somewhat distinct legal situations of Karaites and Rabbinical Jews. See also the article on Karaite Jews by Veronika Klimova in this volume.

also pose a related question: How, why, and under what circumstances were the negative Jewish stereotypes adapted to create the image of Muslim Tatars in the GDL? These issues are particularly important in identifying the trends of social relations, whether the dominant Christian society unimaginatively falls back upon the universal European image of the Jew, developing an image of the Muslim that is not qualitatively different from that of the Jew, or acts creatively, using the existing possibilities to construct the social formulation of non-Christians at a legal level, and subsequently indiscriminately applies the same stereotypes to all non-Christians.

This article is based on various sources from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries: publications, hagiography, anti-Jewish literature, and the sole anti-Muslim publication to appear in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth: *Alfurkan Tatarski prawdziwy na czterdzieści części rozdzielony* (“The True Tatar Alfurkan, Divided into Forty Parts”; hereafter *Alfurkan Tatarski*).⁵ Anti-Tatar literature offers a promising source that has not been addressed in research on the image of the Jew. True, attention should be drawn to the fact that the Jewish segment there is collateral (rather than primary, as in anti-Jewish works), supplementing or consolidating the image by means of contrast or analogy. However, texts of this nature represent perfectly the complex attitude of a predominantly Christian society to its confessionally-mixed non-Christian sectors, allowing us to distinguish the Jewish stereotypes applied in assessing the Tatars. It is obvious that the scholarly literature addressing the Tatars in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth uses anti-Tatar literature to analyse society’s view of the Tatars, but the question of the origin of these anti-Tatar stereotypes goes unaddressed here.

The evolution of society’s self-consciousness, mind-set, and values plays an important role in the formulation, and even more so the development, of the image of the Jew. Social development, above all Christianization, the characteristics or behaviours attributed to Jews, and the perceived social position of Jews are interrelated.

16.1 The formulation of anti-Jewish stereotypes in the GDL

It is a distinct feature of the GDL’s socio-cultural development that it was late in accepting the Roman Catholic branch of Christianity as the state religion (1387),

⁵ *Alfurkan Tatarski*, written by Piotr Czyżewski, was first published in Wilno (Vilnius) in 1617. I have used this first edition in this article. For a modern scholarly edition of the text, see Czyżewski 2013.

and that it did so at a time when the majority of the population, and even a good portion of the ruling elite, were Eastern Orthodox (and from the late sixteenth century, Unitarians). When Martin Luther proclaimed his famous *Theses* in 1517, Catholicism had been dominant in Western Europe for eight or nine hundred years, while only 266 years had passed since the unsuccessful conversion of King Mindowg (Mindaugas in Lithuanian) in 1251 – he later forsook Christianity. The GDL had only officially become Christian in 1387, and the bishopric of Medininki (Medininkai in Lithuanian) in Samogitia had only been established in 1417.⁶ The romantic presentation of medieval GDL as a pagan state does not reflect historical reality. Predatory Crusades and dynastic politics had resulted in the incorporation of Eastern Slavic lands. From the outset, the GDL was a multi-confessional state, with dynastic and political power in the hands of a pagan minority that was, its paganism aside, strongly influenced by Orthodoxy; administrators of conquered lands often received an Orthodox baptism, and grand dukes were known to marry Orthodox women.⁷ Paradoxically, however, the state, which was home to many Christians, remained officially pagan, in spite of several attempts to introduce the practice of baptism before it gained official backing.⁸ Non-Christian communities had been established in the GDL during the period of pagan ascendancy, but their legal status only began to be regulated following the Catholic baptism of state officials.

In the case of Jewish migration within Europe, the GDL, at the eastern limit of the areas settled, was favourably perceived. Pagan GDL was often seen as a safe alternative to the complicated situation facing Jews in medieval Catholic European states. Although it is common to date Jewish settlement in the GDL to the privilege granted by Witold (Vytautas in Lithuanian) the Great to the community of Brest in 1388 – the first written mention of Jewish settlement – the fact is that by the early fourteenth century, the GDL had already ‘conquered’ Jewish communities: The Rus lands, conquered or integrated into the GDL by dynastic ties, were inhabited by numerous Jewish communities. Typically, the common legends about Jewish settlements⁹ focus on Jews invited to settle in the GDL by the grand dukes.¹⁰ The second wave of migration in the

⁶ These trends were identified by Zenonas Ivinskis (1987, 395–396).

⁷ Ališauskas et al. 2006, 33.

⁸ The sequence of the attempts to introduce baptism into the GDL is as follows: 1317, 1322–1324, 1349, 1351, 1358, and 1373 (according to Ališauskas et al. 2006, 34). When assessing the trends at play in the GDL’s social development in the context of Lithuanian historiography, relations between Catholicism and paganism are discussed, rather than the relation between paganism and Orthodoxy.

⁹ For more on the legends of Jewish settlement, see Weinryb 1962, 445–502.

¹⁰ The idealization of Witold the Great was enduring in the narratives of non-Christian communities, persisting into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

sixteenth century – from Western Europe through Poland – would, however, prove to be important.

Muslim Tatar settlement in the GDL can also be dated to the fourteenth century: There were hired Tatar warriors in the troops commanded by Grand Duke Gediminas (Gedimin). Not only is the legend about the several hundred Golden Horde Tatar families that Grand Duke Witold brought into Lithuania (1397) accepted by the Lithuanian Tatar community even today, but it was also accepted by the Polish chronicler Jan Długosz (1415–1480), writing about eighty years after the events in question. It is likely that there were a variety of circumstances that led different groups of Tatars to settle in the GDL: the relations between the GDL and the Golden Horde; taking Tatars as prisoners of war;¹¹ and Tatar participation in the GDL's military.

The slower, or later, Christianization process and social and cultural development in comparison to other Eastern European states, and a particularly radical and dynamic Reformation and Counter-Reformation, inevitably influenced the formulation of the image of the Jew and created the conditions for adapting the universal pan-European anti-Jewish stereotypes and myths, while interpreting them in a new way.

The existing scholarship has failed to address several important factors that contributed to the formulation of the image of the Jew in the GDL.

First, the gradual Christianization of different layers of society (particularly relevant with regard to the Catholic section of society) should be mentioned – conscious Christianization was accompanied by the gradual assimilation of stereotypes and of a perception of Jews based on a Christian theological interpretation. The importance of religion in shaping both consciousness and mindsets is not pointed out sufficiently in the historiography, although it plays a significant role throughout the course of society's development.

Second, the adoption and spread of the image of the Jew in the GDL took place very rapidly, with the forms of anti-Judaism that had appeared in the states of Western Europe gradually manifesting in the GDL. Prior to the mid-sixteenth century, Jews had been recognized as economic competitors, giving shape to their negative image and providing the impetus for the spread of the

11 Stanisław Kryczyński, an author of Tatar descent, has criticized Polish historiography on this issue. His observations are based on the point at which the monograph was composed – a time when the Tatar national movement was active in Poland and Lithuania, and Tatars were seeking to strengthen their identity. For more on the Tatar version of the events, see Kričinskis 1993, 15–38. For more on the settlement of Tatars in the GDL, see Sobczak 1984, 13–34; Tyszkiewicz 1989, 144–169. See also the article by Krzysztof Kwiatkowski in this volume.

myth of blood libel (admittedly, however, there is only limited evidence of manifestations of the myth of host desecration). At the same time, the non-Christianity of Jews became a focal point, and they began to be accused of endangering Christians and of deicide, establishing a basis for the alleged necessity of their social segregation.¹²

Third, variations on the image of the Jew became more widespread and took root during the brief but dynamic period of the Reformation, which lasted only a few decades, and were consolidated during the Counter-Reformation (when Catholicism became a value and the category of *non-Catholic* took form). The rapid social assimilation of anti-Judaism often resulted in a rather superficial understanding of some of the universal anti-Jewish stereotypes, as well as a simplistic grasp of the ideas that underpinned these stereotypes. This was the basis for the peculiarities and local variations of the image of the Jew found in the GDL.

Fourth, the GDL was not particularly creative in its development and implementation of its adapted image of the Jews. The image of the Jew that gained a foothold during the sixteenth century remained static until the end of the eighteenth century. Rather than creatively expanding upon it, the same image was consistently evoked, in sermons or in printed material. Given the late spread of anti-Judaism in the GDL, in comparison to Central and East European states, there was probably little room for the modification of the existent image of the Jew, which generally focused on two components that directly affected daily life – economic competition and the theological interpretation of certain Biblical passages – and the related collective assessments of the Jews.

16.2 Trends in the adaptation of anti-Judaism in the GDL

Anti-Judaism appeared in the GDL during the first half of the sixteenth century, with unfavourable views about Jews being recorded among society's elite, and the first, still schematic, elements of the image of the Jew beginning to appear. The publicist and public figure Michalon Lituanus provides a particularly extreme example:

¹² For more on the trends at play in the development of Jewish images in the GDL, see Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė 2009, 190–285.

Quam in regionem confluit ex aliis prouinciis omnium pessima gens Iudaica, iam per Omnia Podoliae, Voliniae & alia fertilia oppida aucta, perfida, callida, calumniatrix, quae nostras merces, monetas, Syngrapha, Sigilla adulterat, in omnibus emporiis victum Christianis praeripit, nullam artem praeter imposturas & calumnias exercet: ex progenie Chaldaeorum natio pessima, vt tradunt sacrae literae, adultera, peccatrix, infidelis, nequam, peruersa.¹³

[The most abhorrent of all nations – Jews – flooded this country (the GDL) from Podolia and Volhynia and all the other fertile towns, insidious, crafty, deceitful, forging goods, money, signatures, bills of exchange, and seals, depriving Christians of the means of living in all markets, not knowing better than to deceive and slander, the worst nation descended from the Chaldeans as the Holy Scriptures teach, debauched, sinful, unbelieving, despicable, perverse.]

In this image, collective characteristics and behaviours attributed to Jews were related to economic competition, an aspect that remained dominant in burghers' statements about Jews. Referring to the sources in different genres and to existing research allows us to distinguish the following image of the Jew, one which was to all intents and purposes formulated during the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, and which was occasionally accompanied by blood libel accusations. The characteristics and features attributed to Jews in the GDL remained largely unchanged from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries:¹⁴

13 Quoted in Lietuvis 1966, 25 (facsimile). It is a curious situation that illustrates the tradition of source publication during the Soviet era. In the Lithuanian translation of this essential source, this quotation is missing – it was not translated because of its anti-Jewish content. However, at the end of the same book, the facsimiles of the original text in Latin were published, including this quotation in Latin. When the Russian translation was published several decades later, this anti-Jewish excerpt was included. For more on the translation into Russian, see Litvin 1994, 88.

14 During the eighteenth century, the dean of the Troszkuny parish, Kiprian Lukowski (1996, 161, 170–171) argued:

Niera niejokios biauressnios Diewuy yr Žmoniems wiezliwiems Giminius, kaypo Židiszka, ira isztremtays yr pakumpeys po Swieta. Jra nuog Diewa pamesty dieł sawa netikeima, yr dieł nekałtay per jus iszlieta Krauia Sunaus Diewa, kuri jeme unt sawę y runt Sunu Sunus [...] Diewas istate, idunt ta Gimine nemiela butu paniekiniimi pas cieła Swieta [...] ta Gimine piktadaringa, Giminie perwersta sawa sukimays, apgawimays dayleys pramani-mays, bukleys iszradimais priwiłtomis patogibiomis, prigautais spasabay.

[There is no other tribe more repellent to God and honourable men than the Jews, expelled and scattered to the four corners of the earth. They have been rejected by God because of their infidelity and for spilling the innocent blood of the Son of God, which they brought upon the sons of their sons (...) It is a tribe that does evil deeds, a tribe living off swindling, deceit, trickery, foul inventions, and dishonest ways.]

sly, forgers, slanderers, swindlers, and vilifiers of the Christian religion who distracted Christians from their faith (a baseless fear of what occurred when Christians were hired to work in Jewish households and a genuine fear of the spread of non-Christian religions in the GDL),¹⁵ wealthy impoverishers of Christians,¹⁶ eternal enemies, infidels, and non-believers, whose actions were explained by their hardened enmity to the Christian blood, unfaithful and debauched, rejected by God and humanity, subject to slavery, despicable, and abhorrent. In this case, the information about the non-Christianity and non-Catholicism of Jews, which was provided in religious primers and reinforced in sermons,¹⁷ is central. When analysing the cases of blood libel and its social interpretation, we can presume that the people of the GDL profoundly feared the physical extermination of Christians. For example, during the eighteenth century, Kiprian Lukowski, the priest in the small town of Traskuny (Troškūnai in Lithuanian) said the following in a sermon to his parishioners (it is very important to keep in mind the fact that sermons were not only a way to create anti-Jewish stereotypes, but also allowed for a theological interpretation of Judaism, creating the opportunity to periodically remind parishioners about the danger posed by Jews):

Židas Pagonuy ney gieray, ney piktay darity ne turia, bet apie tay wisokiu rupestiu storoties turia, idunt Krikscioni numarintu yr isz Swieta isznaykintu, o kada to padarity ne gale, idunt ij woktu, apgautu, gaysintu yr naikintu.

15 The fear of the spread of non-Christian religions was apparent in the GDL from the sixteenth century onward. The sources periodically bear witness to the fear of possible activities, especially on the part of Jews, meant to encourage Christians to convert to Judaism (in this case, this fear needs to be distinguished from the interest in Judaism that was particularly characteristic of the Reformation). While this phenomenon still needs to be investigated, one of the possible bases for such a fear may have been the existence of a Judaizing movement within Orthodoxy. A fear of this kind is expressed in the Second (1566) and Third (1588) Lithuanian Statutes (the main compendiums of legal documents), where you find the prohibition: “If you have [people] or their children in pawn, you have no right to persuade them to convert to the Jewish or Muslim faith or to be circumcised.” Statute 1855, chapter XII, art. 5. For engaging in such activities, one could be burnt at the stake. Another unique reality of the GDL’s relationship with non-Christians was that distinctions between Judaism and Islam were not recognized in the sixteenth century.

16 The stereotype of Jewish wealth manifests itself in the image of Jews impoverishing Christians. It often surfaces during attacks against Jews.

17 In this article, numerous quotations come from the Kiprian Lukowski’s volume of sermons. However, for a better understanding of relations to Jews, it is important to refer to the volume of Lithuanian sermons by Kazimieras Klimavičius, *Pawinasties Krikscioniszkas* (Christian Obligations) from 1767. One of the most interesting elements of these sermons is the representation of Jews and confessors of Judaism as non-pagans. See Klimavičius 1767, 60.

[The Jew does not have to do either good or evil to the pagan, but he must make an effort to put the Christian to death, and when he is unable to do so, he must at least rob him, cheat him, and cause him loss.]¹⁸

The negative depictions of Jews in the historical sources can be grouped into several general stereotypes: an enemy and impoverisher of Christians; a vilifier of the Christian religion, and one who is rejected by God and humanity. These stereotypes underpin the aforementioned fear that Jews would consciously harm Christian society. This was a very pronounced fear that functioned in a particular way through the blood libel.¹⁹ This myth, which arose periodically as evidence of the alleged danger posed by Jews, posited extremely inhumane actions on the part of Jews, such as mocking and brutally murdering Christians, desecrating their bodies, and even using their blood. A fear that Jews would consciously harm Christian society was key to the image of the Jew, its different aspects becoming clear, as the all-pervasive harm done by Jews was uncovered.

The established stereotype of Jews as impoverishers of Christians was developed in the urban environment, gradually becoming something akin to the standard description of the economic relations between Jews and burghers.²⁰ When comparing themselves with Jews, burghers, and sometimes noblemen, described themselves as living in poverty.²¹ The behaviour attributed to Jews and their imagined goal of succeeding in business at the expense of Christians soon acquired a new derivative aspect, with people coming to believe that Jewish businesses lacked transparency *per suas machinationes* (through their own mechanisms).²² The stereotype of Jews as impoverishers of Christians became an important part of the imagined damage Jews caused to society. The imagined prosperity of Jews was an accepted fact for both noblemen and townsmen, and it played a role in all spheres of daily life and affected reciprocal relations. The stereotype of wealthy Jews often motivated the nobles in *sejmiks* (local congress of noblemen) to demand an increase in the Jewish poll tax,²³ the im-

18 Lukauskas 1996, 162.

19 For more about this myth in the GDL, see Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė 2008, 201–209. Several examples of this accusation in the GDL are analysed in Węgrzynek 1995; Guldon and Wijaczka 1995. Several cases have been described factographically in nineteenth-century historiography. For more specific case analysis, see Kleyman 1924, 217–232.

20 *Akty* 1901, no. 292; *Archeograficheskiy*, no. 50; *Archiv*, no. 34.

21 For example, a complaint made by residents of Vilnius in 1633 about Jews settling in and spreading throughout the city; *Archeograficheskiy*, no. 50.

22 An instruction from 1735 to the noblemen of the Vilnius Voivodeship; *Akty* 1886, no. 181.

23 The research into the *sejmik* instructions and the requirements for Jews carried out by Adam Kaźmierczyk indicates that Jewish poll tax, the amount collected, the accounting, and its use were primarily of interest to nobles in Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Kaźmierczyk's

position of special tolls, restrictions on the capacity of Jews to develop their economic activities in the towns, and so on.

In the polemics of both the Reformers and Counter-Reformers, Jews (and often Tatars) were chosen as a symbol of evil, and presented as second-rate, as social outcasts.²⁴ The arguments in favour of tolerance towards Jews that appeared in Catholic Counter-Reformation polemics in the GDL (remaining important until the end of the eighteenth century) are to a large extent similar to the attitude found in other European societies,²⁵ and did nothing to alter the basic perspective that shaped society's worldview – “one lord, one religion, one baptism, one God” (Petr Skarga)²⁶ – or how these relations were understood in a multi-confessional society: “Why do we hate them [non-Christians] and persecute them? Simply because we are not related by a common religion and hold different religious views.”²⁷

Of the two common European anti-Jewish myths, viz. the profanation of *Sancta Hostia* and the blood libel, the former was practically unknown in the GDL. The only signs of it were among certain clergy, Catholic, Orthodox, and Unitarian alike. On the other hand, all social strata were aware of the blood libel. This myth, which was known in the GDL by the mid-sixteenth century, was undoubtedly assimilated in a pre-existent form, but then underwent a good deal of local modification, in part, presumably, as a result of a failure to understand the essence of the myth. Early in the seventeenth century, alleged victims of blood libel included both adult Christians and children, both boys and girls, making it seem doubtful that the reliving of Christ's suffering inherent in the myth had been conceptually grasped. The sacralization of the children among the Jews' alleged victims, which had its origins in West Europe, took root in the GDL in the quite modest form of burying the remains in churches.²⁸ I found no evidence of the sacralization of adult victims. Taking these circumstances into account, it seems safe to assume that the burden of Christ's suffering fell exclusively on children, an adaptation of the classical plot of the

research established that 57% of instructions related to Jews in the GDL addressed the Jewish poll tax. Kaźmierczyk 1994, 28–29.

24 Rotundas 2000, 148, 169.

25 Jews were tolerated as witnesses to Christ's suffering who would inevitably be converted to Christianity.

26 Skarga 1972, 59.

27 Rotundas 1996, 292. Augustinas Rotundas (1520–1582) was mayor of Vilnius and a doctor of law, who had studied at the universities of Padua and Ferrara.

28 For more on the unique modifications to myth in the GDL, see Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė 2008, 201–209.

myth, while adults were the victims of the alleged harm Jews did to society and of their thirst for Christian blood.

Arguments about the actions attributed to Jews and explanations of their behaviour remained undeveloped in the GDL, and speculation about the use of blood in Jewish rites did not evolve any further. In fact, up until the second half of the eighteenth century there was no specific knowledge about what Jews were allegedly using Christian blood for, only abstract ideas about the need for Christian blood in Jewish rites. On the other hand, an extremely detailed description of the alleged killing recounted in the myth was constantly developing and expanding. What was exceptional about the changes the blood libel accusation underwent in the GDL was that this myth, which usually targeted Rabbinic Jews, was also applied not only to the Karaites, but – paradoxically – also to the Muslim Tatars (more on this later). Thus, to understand these myths more clearly, a broader European context is necessary.

The state's official position of tolerance, protection of Jewish religious life, and prevention of violence – beginning with the extensive privileges granted by Witold the Great to the Jewish community in Brest (1388) – is key when analysing the development of anti-Judaism in the GDL. Furthermore, on the basis of the pope's bulls, there was a clear prohibition on accusing Jews of “using human blood”.²⁹ Nonetheless, it is important to distinguish the constant official denunciation of anti-Jewish myths from the reality of daily life, where they intersected with official provisions. The divide between the official position and daily practice was characteristic of both the state and the Church, particularly in the cities, where relations were heavily influenced by economic strife. Local modifications were another important and characteristic factor in the development of images, as was the application of the myths in contexts other than that for which they were created. I will discuss the local modifications to the image of the Jew that occurred while adapting the anti-Jewish myths, without going into detail about each of the pan-European stereotypes that took roots in the GDL.

16.3 The image of Jews and the creation of anti-Tatar stereotypes: The case of Piotr Czyżewski's *Alfurkan Tatarski*

The image of the Tatar community in the GDL, beginning in the late fourteenth century, or perhaps even earlier, has not been the subject of much research.

²⁹ Gudavichius and Lazutka 1993, 44–55.

One of the reasons that the image of the Tatar has not been the subject of recent research (as is also the case for studies of anti-Judaism) is the established idea that the multi-confessional GDL was an exceptionally tolerant state.³⁰ A negative assessment of Tatars as Muslims and the pursuant harm they were allegedly doing to society has been noted. Jan Długosz describes the Tatars as “idolatrous” infidel Muslims in his chronicle, that outlines the narrative of the Tatar arrival in Lithuania and describes the presentation of some Tatars as a gift to the King of Poland Jagiełło. However, the image of the “idolatrous” infidel Muslims is fragmentary in the extreme and only encompasses existent stereotypes and assessments in a limited way. In order to understand the image of the Tatars – the only Muslims in the GDL – one should bear in mind a number of political and socio-cultural circumstances in the history of Lithuania, as well as the specific features of the Tatar community. The trends found in the formulation of the image of the Jew, which were outlined earlier, particularly those pertaining to aspects of social development, are also relevant to the formulation of the image of the Tatar.

First of all, for quite a long time, the Tatars of the Golden Horde khanates were among the GDL's political rivals. Traditionally, they had been the ‘Tatar enemies’, and relations with them had been marked by military conflict. I will mention only a couple of these conflicts, which were important in the context of Europe's relations with the Golden Horde³¹ – the march of the Grand Duke Algirdas (Algirdas in Lithuanian) to Blue Waters (1362) is recognized as the deepest penetration of European military forces into the lands of the Golden Horde, and the unsuccessful Battle of Worksla, led by Witold the Great (1399), was the first Crusade³² against the Muslim Tatars. Therefore, in the GDL's assessment of the Muslim Tatars, there were two distinct elements: ‘Tatar enemies’ and ‘local Tatars’. The Vilnius defensive wall symbolized this situation. It was built in the early sixteenth century to defend the city from the attacks of hostile Tatar hordes. One of nine gates of this wall was called the Tatar Gate after the autochthonous Tatars, who lived nearby in part of the suburb Lukiški (Lukiškės in Lithuanian, now part of the city of Vilnius), which was known by

30 For more on the image of the Tatar and its trends in the GDL, see Tyszkiewicz 1989, 288–297; Borawski 1981, 51–66.

31 For more on the political relationship between the GDL and the Golden Horde, see Batūra 1975.

32 In scholarship, this battle is usually described as a Crusade, but the most recent research to discuss this issue raises the question of whether or not the GDL was an active participant in the Crusade following the 1387 baptism, or if the GDL's rulers simply adopted Christian ideology and rhetoric to achieve their goals. For more on this topic, see Rowell 2007, 181–205,

local inhabitants as Tataria. Interestingly enough, the image of ‘Tatar enemies’ did not have any impact on the assessment of ‘local Tatars’. On the contrary, as can be seen in Michalon Lituanus’ treatise *De moribus Tartarorum, Lituorum et Moschorum* (*On the Customs of Tatars, Lithuanians, and Muscovites*), which was published in Basle in 1655, even the hostile Tatars of Perekop were to some degree assessed as a model of endurance, indulgence, support, charity, abstention from alcohol, and of effective domination of women.³³

Second, the Tatar community in the GDL was socially heterogeneous. Some of the Tatars served in the rulers’ military in exchange for land, thereby playing a socially necessary role, and as a result were seen in a positive light.³⁴ Tatars who served in the military far outnumbered those who lived in cities and suburbs, farming, raising cattle, or practising crafts. In the Statutes of Lithuania, the latter were attributed the status of the lowest social stratum of the members of an unfree family. Because they served in the military, Tatars were seen as playing a far more socially useful role than, for example, the Jews, who paid a monetary equivalent of military service – the poll tax (Polish *pogłównie*) – to the state treasury. The heterogeneity of the Tatar community and the different activities and interests of its members must be taken into account to avoid the risk of reconstructing an image of the Tatar that does not correspond to historical reality. There was only one way in which the attitude of Christians about Tatars could be regarded as unanimous; the assessment of Islam as a false, erroneous religion created by the Prophet underpinned Christian claims to dominance.³⁵

Third, a very significant trend in the formulation of the image of the Tatars was the groundwork laid by the early adaptation of anti-Jewish social images. (In my opinion, the adaptation or regeneration of the image of the Jew in the formulation of anti-Tatar and anti-Islamic stereotypes in the GDL should be the subject of research in its own right.) My assertion is that the image of the Jew was a significant, potentially key, factor in shaping the attitude towards Tatars in the GDL. I base this supposition in no small part on an exceptional source – the anti-Tatar pamphlet *Alfurkan Tatarski*.³⁶ It was published in Vilnius in the early seventeenth century, and we know of at least three editions – 1617, 1640, and 1643. The author of this popular pamphlet signed his work with the pseudonym Piotr Czyżewski. This document is unique for the GDL (and, indeed,

33 Lietuvis 1966.

34 For research on the social status of the Tatars in the GDL, see Sobczak 1984.

35 On this assessment of Islam, see also the articles by Jonathan Adams and Stefan Schröder in this volume.

36 A facsimile is available online at the Jagiellonian Digital Library: < jbc.bj.uj.edu.pl/dlibra >.

also for the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth). The way in which the author characterizes the Tatars allows us not only to see the wide range of anti-Tatar stereotypes, but also to identify cases of anti-Jewish stereotypes being applied to Tatars. The thoroughness of this source raises a question: Which of these stereotypes and interpretations actually played an important social role at that time, and which are the result of the author's misconceptions and intolerance?

As is the case in many anti-Jewish works, in *Alfurkan Tatarski*, two broad and problematic areas are discussed as one – assessments of religion, or rather of religious rites, as perceived by an outside observer, and the criticism of Tatar lifestyle and social functions, as part of exposing the threat Tatars posed to Christians. Much about the approach taken was undoubtedly borrowed from anti-Jewish works. This fact, as well as Czyżewski's writing style and the structure of the work (each section is introduced with a statement that is then followed by its proof), which is both evocative and instructive “not only for reading, but also for memorizing”,³⁷ and which remains appealing to the reader even when it is insulting, presents an associative interpretation that suggests the author of *Alfurkan* was entirely familiar with the various “anti-literatures” of his time (anti-Jewish, anti-Christian, anti-Catholic, anti-Reformation). Like almost every inhabitant of the GDL at that time, he had a profoundly negative view of Jews and embraced countless anti-Jewish social myths and stereotypes.³⁸ The fact that these assessments were so deeply ingrained in the mindset and worldview of his day encouraged Czyżewski to compare the Tatars to the Jews. This comparison provided the author with both a powerful and evocative means of grounding his statements in a way that would easily resonate in the GDL and an associative approach to formulating the image of the Tatars. The Tatar and the Jew, who, according to the author, were both similar and different in numerous ways, upon comparison are found to be the “great and principal enemies not only of the Christian faith, but also of all Christian nations and their prosperity”.³⁹

The scope of this article does not permit me to describe the image of the Tatars presented in *Alfurkan Tatarski* in greater detail, so I will focus primarily on the adoption of anti-Jewish projections in passages addressing the Tatars. The most striking case is the attribution of the ritual murder of Christians to the Tatars, removing one component of this myth – the alleged use of Christian

37 “nie tylko do czytania, ale też y do upamiętania”; *Alfurkan Tatarski*, p. 1.

38 For more on the development of anti-Jewish stereotypes and the sources representing them, see Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė 2009, 190–302.

39 “są wielkimi y głównymi nieprzyjaciółmi nie tylko tylko wierze Chrześciańskiej ale y wszy[s]tkiemu narodowi y mаетnościam Chrześciańskim”; *Alfurkan Tatarski*, 70.

blood in religious rites. However, the supposed goal of exterminating Christians commonly attributed to the Jews in the GDL (as in other medieval European societies) was, in this case, also attributed to Tatars. A related example would be the discussion about the inherent stench of Tatars and Jews – in analogous West European commentary, the stench of Jews was related to the devil, while Czyżewski felt that it was the stench of goat sweat and excrement that he smelled in his interactions with Tatars. In the pamphlet, he asked, “Why do Tatars stink of goat sweat and excrement, just as the Jews stink?”⁴⁰ The models for Christian society’s relationship to the Jews – e.g., their expulsion from the state to promote Christianization and various legal and social restrictions – are presented in *Alfurkan Tatarski* as effective, and it is recommended that they be applied to relations with the Tatars as well. Interestingly enough, Czyżewski did not only draw his anti-Jewish examples from the GDL (in fact, it seems he rarely did), but from West European states as well. As can be seen from the way the author presented these relations, suggesting anti-Tatar restrictions, he was attempting to reproduce the restrictions applied to the Jews. For example, as one of ten means potentially encouraging the conversion of Tatars to Christianity, Czyżewski suggested that Tatars should be obliged to attend Sunday services at Catholic churches⁴¹ (an adaptation of the occasional requirement for Jews to attend Catholic services as was the case in several West European countries), and that the ban on Jews having Christian subjects should also be strictly applied to the Tatars: “We must ensure that Tatars not only cannot have Christian servants but also not serfs and slaves [...] it would be right for Tatars to serve Tatars but not Christians [to serve Tatars].”⁴²

40 “Czemu Tatarowie kobylem potem, kożim parkiem tak iako y Zydzi śmierzda, abo wonią?” *Alfurkan Tatarski*, 68.

41 The order existing in Italy was presented as an example (*Alfurkan Tatarski*, 33):

Jest w Rzymie, a bezmała y po wszystkiey Włoskiej Ziemi ta wstawa, iż Zydowe powinni pod wino na każdy Sabbat w każdym mieście, do naznaczonego kościoła Katolickego schodzić się, y tam kazania słuchać [...] Też wstawę wniesć do tego Państwa, y Tatarom toż przykazać, co Zydow we Włoszech.

[There is in Rome and almost in all Italy, the law that on every Shabbat after wine Jews in all places must go to the specified Catholic church and listen to the sermon there (...) The law that is (established) in Italy for Jews (should be) established in this country for Tatars.]

42 “włożmy się wto, aby Tatarowie, nie tylko czeladzi Chrześciańskich, ale też y poddanych, y niewolnikow [...] nie chowali [...] dobrzeby aby Tátarzyn Tátarzynowi służył, nie Chrześcianin”; *Alfurkan tatarski*, 47.

Given these examples, it would appear the GDL lacked the creativity necessary to formulate independent images and instead drew upon existing anti-Jewish resources. Alternately, it is possible that the problem was not of great interest, given that there are few extant sources with which to reconstruct the image of the Tatar in the GDL. Furthermore, the stereotypes presented in these sources are underdeveloped and often schematically repetitive.

In concluding, allow me to digress briefly and draw the reader's attention to the image of the Karaites. A different strategy was used to formulate the image of this Jewish community. As early as the Reformation, Karaites were perceived as an exceptional group of 'righteous' Jews who did not observe the Talmud, and who proved to be of greater interest to foreigners than to the GDL or the Kingdom of Poland. In response to late eighteenth-century plans to reform the position of the Jews in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the Karaites began to differentiate themselves from Rabbinic Jews (the identity of the Karaites in Lithuania and part of East Europe would later be reshaped).⁴³ The image of the Rabbinic Jews became the reference point for the emerging image of the Karaites, who had been identified as Jews up to this point. The image of the Rabbinic Jew was not adapted to the Karaites, as was the case with the Tatars. Instead, the Karaites juxtaposed themselves with the Rabbinic Jews. By comparing themselves with Rabbinic Jews, who had a negative image, the Karaites were able to present themselves as more socially attractive and less crafty – they were even perceived as being more fluent in Polish. This strategy for formulating an image led to the Karaites being perceived very positively in writings from the first half of the nineteenth century, which was an exception to the generally negative view of non-Christians.

A separate, but no less interesting potential topic that has not received adequate research attention is the image of other non-Christians held within these communities themselves – e.g., the Tatars' image of Jews – as well as how these stereotypes were adapted and the role they played in Tatar communities. This aspect of social relations was invisible to the dominant Christian community, although Christian views certainly influenced the form these relations took.

It seems to me that the trends identified and the observations included in this article might indicate the need for a more refined elaboration of the idea that within society's communicative space the image of the Jew, who was situated at the bottom of the social hierarchy, became a kind of associative means of communication that facilitated an understanding that was acceptable not

⁴³ For more on the creation of Karaite myths and their relation to the Tatars, see Troskovaitė 2012.

only to different social layers of Christian society, but also to non-Christians in the GDL. The overly negative image of the Jew made it easy to appear more attractive, better, and more useful to society and to one's fellow believers. On the other hand, the image of the Jew, or its individual aspects, in any case, were far more deeply embedded as social knowledge than was the image of the less numerous and less economically active Tatars. Theological interpretations also undoubtedly served to further strain relations. It was probably not by chance that the Karaites initially sought to establish their distinction from the Rabbinic Jews by claiming that when Christ was crucified, they were no longer present in Jerusalem.

16.4 Summary

The factors that most influenced the formulation of anti-Jewish stereotypes were the late (in terms of European history) official Christianization of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (1387) and the rapid cultural and social changes that occurred thereafter. The initial emergence of anti-Jewish stereotypes among society's elite can be dated to the early sixteenth century. By the mid-sixteenth century, different forms of anti-Judaism (stereotypes, blood libel, and attacks) had penetrated all social strata. Among the burghers and in the Second Lithuanian Statute (1566), a *besurmianin* non-Christian group was legally distinguished. Muslim Tatars were incorporated into this group alongside Jews, including Karaites. In the GDL in the Middle Ages, Tatars were alternately associated with hostile acts against the state and with local Tatars, some of whom served in the GDL's military. Oddly, the image of the Tatar as an enemy did not play a role in how local Tatars were evaluated. The image of these local Tatars was created very simply by adapting the ubiquitous anti-Jewish stereotypes and myths. As a result, a comparative study of Christian attitudes about different non-Christian groups in the GDL opens the way to a discussion not only about the spread of stereotypes, and their variations, adaptations, and local modifications, but also about the adjustments made to anti-Jewish stereotypes when assessing the Tatar community. In the context of European history, the spread of anti-Jewish and anti-Muslim stereotypes in the GDL should be seen as one of the youngest examples of the pan-European stereotypes that had already spread through Christian society for several centuries.

Bibliography

Primary sources

- Akty 1886* = *Акты издаваемые виленскою археографтческою комисиєю для разбора древних актов*, т. 13. Вильна: Русский Починь, 1886.
- Akty 1901* = *Акты издаваемые виленскою археографтческою комисиєю для разбора древних актов*, т. 28. Вильна: типография Киркора, 1901.
- Alfurkan Tatarski* = Czyżewski, Piotr. *Alfurkan Tatarski prawdziwy na czterdzieści części rozdzielony*. Wilno: Józef Karcan, 1617.
- Archeograficheskiy 1867* = *Археографтческий сборник документов относящихся к истории Северозападной Руси*. т. 4. Вильна: Печатня А.Сыркина, 1867.
- Archiv 1859* = *Архив юго-западной России*, часть 1, т. 1. Киев: Университетская типиграфия, 1859.
- Czyżewski, Piotr. *Alfurkan tatarski prawdziwy na czterdzieści części rozdzielony*. Ed. Artur Konopacki. Białystok: MKJdruk, 2013.
- Gudavichius and Lazutka 1993 = Гудавичюс, Эдвардас, и Станисловас, Лазутка. *Привилегия евреям Витаутаса Великого 1388 года*. Москва – Иерусалим: Еврейский университет в Москве, 1993.
- Klimavičius, Kazimieras. *Pawinasties krikščioniszkas arba katechizmas kuriame duodase wysokie pamokslai ka tyrey koznas Krikščioniszkas zmogus tykiete, zinote, kaypo pagal Diewu snatiway giwendamas ant swieto [...] par storones kuniga Kazimiera Klimawiciaus dziekona Alsiedziu, plebona łayžuwos surasitas*. Vilna: Drukarnioy Akademijos Societatis Jesu, 1767.
- Lietuvis, Mykolas. *Apie Totorių, lietuvių ir maskvėnų papročius*. Vilnius: Vaga, 1966.
- Litvin 1994 = Литвин Михалон. *О нравах татар, литовцев и московитян*. Москва: Изд-во МГУ, 1994.
- Lukauskas, Kiprijonas. *Pamokslai*. Ed. Juozas Karaciejus. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla 1996.
- Rotundas, Augustinas. “Apie tikėjimo laisvę ir santarvę.” *Lietuvos filosofinė mintis. Chrestomatija*. Ed. Gediminas Mikelaitis. Vilnius: Aidai, 1996. 292–294.
- Rotundas, Augustinas. “Lenko pasikalbėjimas su Lietuviu.” *Šešioliktojo amžiaus raštija*. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2000. 115–200.
- Skarga, Piotr. *Kazania Sejmowe*. Ed. Janusz Taszbir. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich 1972.

Literature

- Ališauskas, Vytautas, et al. (Eds.). *Krikščionybės istorija Lietuvoje*. Vilnius: Aidai, 2006.
- Batūra, Romas. *Lietuva tautų kovoje prieš Aukso Ordą: nuo Batu antplūdžio iki mūšio prie Mėlynųjų Vandenų*. Vilnius: Leid. Mintis, 1975.
- Borawski, Piotr. “Tolerancja religijna wobec ludności Tatarskiej w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim (XVI–XVIII wiek).” *Przegląd Humanistyczny* 3 (1981): 51–66.
- Guldon, Zenon, and Jacek Wijaczka. *Procesy o mordy rytualne w Polsce w XVI–XVIII wieku*. Kielce: DCF Wydawnictwo, 1995.

- Ivinskis, Zenonas. *Krikščionybė Lietuvoje. Rinkiniai raštai*. Vol. 4. Rome: Lietuvių Katalikų Mokslo Akad., 1987. 395–396.
- Kaźmierczyk, Adam. *Sejmy i sejmiki szlacheckie wobec Żydów w drugiej połowie XVII wieku*. Warszawa: Wydawn. Sejmowe, 1994.
- Kalik, Judith, “The Attitudes towards the Jews in the Christian Polemic Literature in Poland in the 16–18th Centuries.” *Jews and Slavs* 11 (2003a): 58–77.
- Kalik, Judith. “The Orthodox Church and the Jews in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.” *Jewish History* 17 (2003b): 229–237.
- Kleyman 1924 = Клейман И. “Караимский ритуальный процесс в 17 веке.” *Еврейская старина* 11 (1924): 217–232.
- Kričinskis, Stanislovas. *Lietuvos totoriai. Istorinės ir etnografinės monografijos bandymas*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1993 [First edition: Kryczyński, Stanisław, “Tatarzy Litewscy. Próba monografii historyczno-etnograficznej.” *Rocznik tatarski* 3 (1938)].
- Rowell, Stephen C. “Naujieji kryžiaus žygiuotojai: LDK ir Bizantijos santykiai XIX-XV a. sandūroje. Ar Vytautas Didysis buvo Lietuvos kryžiaus žygių prieš turkus bei totorius pradininkas?” *Kryžiaus karų epocha Baltijos regiono tautų istorinėje sąmonėje. Mokslinių straipsnių rinkinys*. Eds. Rita Regina Trimonienė and Robertas Jurgaitis. Šiauliai: Saulės delta, 2007. 181–205.
- Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė, Jurgita, “Blood Libel Accusation in Multi-Confessional Society: The Case of Grand Duchy of Lithuania.” *East European Jewish Affairs* 38.2 (2008): 201–209.
- Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė, Jurgita, *Žydai Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės visuomenėje: sambūvio aspektai*. Vilnius: Žara, 2009.
- Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė, Jurgita. “The Social and Legal Status of Jews in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and its Influence on the Status of Tatars and Karaites.” *Central Europe* 8.2 (2010): 68–85.
- Sobczak, Jerzy. *Polożenie prawne ludności tatarskiej w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1984.
- Troskovaite, Dovilė. “Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės vaizdiniai Lietuvos ir Lenkijos karaimų tautiniame naratyve.” *Naujausios tyrimų kryptys ir perspektyvos*. Eds. Violeta Meiliūnaitė and Nadežda Morozova. Vilnius: Europos kalbų ir kultūrų dialogo tyrėjų asociacija, 2012. 48–67.
- Tyszkiewicz, Jan. *Tatarzy na Litwie i w Polsce*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1989.
- Węgrzynek Hanna (Ed.). “Czarna Legenda” *Żydów. Procesy o rzekome mordy rytualne w dawnej Polsce*. Warszawa: Bellona, 1995.
- Weinryb, Benjamin W. “The Beginnings of East-European Jewry in Legends and Historiography.” *Studies and Essays in Honor of Abraham A. Neuman*. Eds. Meir Ben-Horin, Bernard D. Weinryb, and Solomon Zeitlin. Leiden: Brill, 1962. 445–502.