

## INTRODUCTION

History and Politics have often been connected, and this is particularly true with regard to the Jesuits. Nevertheless, the Jesuits' historical production is much more complex and never limited to the narrative or political function. In one sentence, it is possible to state that Jesuits did history to educate. However, such an education has to be understood in its wider sense: it was a historical, political, rhetorical, and mainly moral tutoring. Such a position will be demonstrated in the present research. This essay will investigate Albert Wijuk-Koialowicz's book *Historia Lituana* in order to set the basis for a deeper analysis of Lithuanian Jesuits' historical thought. The study is carried out by the means of a comparative approach. The terms of comparisons are other coeval Jesuit historical and polemical works, focusing on the literary production related to the Bohemian insurrection of 1618. I will try to find similarities and analogies between the Koialowicz book and the writings of other Jesuits, such as Adam Tanner and Martin Becanus. Tanner, Becanus, and Albert Wijuk-Koialowicz were all actively engaged in the struggle against insidious heresies, but while the two Germans preferred the polemical attitude, Koialowicz adopted one more congenial to his nature: the pedagogic one. An educator in all his works, Koialowicz took part in the battle against heresy in a more subtle way, creating a psychological and cognitive space in which the fantastic reinvention, activating memory, imagination, affections, and intelligence were trained to observe reality in an ordered, conscious and orientated manner. A manner orientated, of course, toward the preservation of an order whose legitimacy resided in the religious, political, and moral orthodoxy.

PHILOSOPHICAL MATERIALISM AS A HISTORICAL METHOD: CONSCIOUSNESS  
AS A SOCIAL PRODUCT

Writing this essay on the anniversary of the death of one of the most influential style critics and philologists, I cannot avoid underlining a methodological truth: starting from the particular it is possible to reach the universal. Basing himself on the German Romantists and G. W. F. Hegel, whose influence was combined with that of Giambattista Vico, Erich Auerbach (1882–1957) was certain it is possible to seize the universal in the concrete, the totality in the fragment. He was not just a theorist: all the lectures of *Mimesis*<sup>1</sup> begin with the detailed interpretation of a determined passage and proceed like a spiral to the “comprehension of a moment of the history of style, a conception of the world, a human conscience historically determined as it is that of the interpreter”<sup>2</sup>. Starting from the particular – something that, in a different way, both Leo Spitzer and Ernst Robert Curtius theorized about and applied – the universal will be reached. This is possible because the universal is concrete itself; it is not made of laws and categories. On the contrary, it is – as Auerbach wrote in *Literary Language and Its Public in Late Antiquity and in the Middle Ages* – “the conception of a historical course, something like a drama that does not contains in itself a theory but a paradigmatic conception of the human destiny”<sup>3</sup>. Even if he was referring to literature, such a methodological position has to be applied to historical research, too, in order to understand the European historical production as a whole.

Auerbach’s method will be employed in this essay to study Albert Wijuk Koialowicz’s book *Historia Lituana* in order to set the basis for a deeper investigation of Lithuanian Jesuits’ historical thought. The choice to begin with this author is two-fold: first of all, his literary and historical production is relatively wide and one of the most significant and articulated among Lithuanian Jesuits. Therefore, it can be easily recognized as a reference point for the development of a wider research. Second, his production is representative of a very common ambition and way of thinking of 16<sup>th</sup> – 17<sup>th</sup> century Europe. It is the ambition to the ecumenical union of the besieged Christianity. In other words, the way Koialowicz makes history might well be the particular (or the fragment, to use Auerbach words) from which to start to try to achieve a “comprehension of a moment of the history [...] a conception of the world.” In other words, it is possible to redefine Koialowicz’s work as one that expresses the Jesuits’ historical and political understanding during the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries.

<sup>1</sup> Auerbach Erich, *Mimesis. Dargestellte Wirklichkeit in der Abendländischen Literatur*, Bern and Munich, A. Francke Verlag, 1946, vol. 2, p. 749 (Trans. by Willard Trask, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2003).

<sup>2</sup> Anonymous, “Erich Auerbach”, *Il Manifesto*: XXXVII n. 242, October 13<sup>th</sup> 2007, p. 21.

<sup>3</sup> Auerbach Erich, *Literatursprache und Publikum in der lateinischen Spätantike und im Mittelalter*, Bern, A. Francke Verlag, 1958, p. 220 (Trans. by Ralph Mannheim, *Literary Language and Its Public in Late Antiquity and in the Middle Ages*, Pinceton, Princeton University Press, 2003, 456 p.).

Although this essay will focus on Albert Wijuk Koialowicz, the European dimension – the totality, Auerbach would say – will always be the imperceptible background on which the study is based. Particular and universal will constantly merge in order to understand Koialowicz's writings as productions of a historically and socially determined human consciousness.

Understanding this single human consciousness will not only allow a deeper knowledge of Koialowicz's works, of his personality, and of his historical thought; it will contribute to the comprehension of a moment of European historiography. In other words, the historical production of Koialowicz and his historical thought will be related to the peculiar situation of Europe in that period and to his status as a Jesuit in order to draw a historically determinate figure.

Numerous monographic studies on Koialowicz's works could be cited, but for the purpose of this study – to understand his ideology and the function of history in it – two exemplify a typical approach. I'm referring to the research of Giovanna Brogi Bercoff on the image and function of Eastern Slavs in the writings of Koialowicz<sup>4</sup> and Darius Kuolys's study on the founding of the republic<sup>5</sup>. Both these studies aim not only to better analyze the work *Historia Lituana*, but to provide a new understanding of its author's historical method. However, the two scholars use different approaches: while Brogi Bercoff analyzes the image of the Eastern Slavs through a series of examples included in the Koialowicz text, Kuolys adopts a "political-narrative" method focusing on passages that seem to provide a national and political basis for the self-consciousness of Lithuanian society. Obviously, the different approaches lead to partially different conclusions about Koialowicz's aims and historical thought. Nevertheless, both studies share the same limitation: the historical background is somehow limited to a local reality (even if this statement applies to Brogi Bercoff's research to a lesser degree). By the expression *background* I refer not only to a political or historical situation, but to the whole sphere of knowledge, and by *limitation* I have in mind the lack of a comparative dimension in the frame of the European culture.

It is possible to state that Kuolys's article is a treatise on *beginnings* because it is a study of the genesis of a modern concept: the "political self-consciousness of a nation." Moreover, it is a treatise on origins as it aims to define a base for the development of the process of conceptualization of a nation. Kuolys recognizes in Koialowicz's book one of the first historical conceptualizations of the Lithuanian Republic. A representation that, according to the Lithuanian scholar, had an impact on historical and literary works of the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries. In my opinion, this assumption is based on

<sup>4</sup> Brogi Bercoff, Giovanna, „Rytų slavų įvaizdis ir funkcija Alberto Vijūko-Kojalavičiaus SJ raštuose“, in Darius Kuolys (ed.), *Lietuvos istorijos įvairenybės*, vol. II, Vilnius, Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2004, p. 334–347.

<sup>5</sup> Kuolys, Darius, „Alberto Vijūko-Kojalavičiaus istorinis pasakojimas: Respublikos kūrimas“, in Darius Kuolys (ed.), *Lietuvos istorijos įvairenybės*, vol. II, Vilnius, Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2004, p. 368–410.

a reverse process that retroactively applies the *forma mentis* of the 18<sup>th</sup> century to the age of Koialowicz. In other words, a modern interpretation of the work of Koialowicz is transferred to the work itself in order to describe it as an origin. Moreover, Kuolys seems to forget the critical distance that separates him from the author of *Historia Lituaniana* when he states that “such a doctrine [...] was created as an antithesis both to the *tyranny of Moscow*, and to the myth of the Slavic *Sarmatian empire*, led by the Polish”<sup>6</sup>. This antithesis is, in fact, a much more recent concept, the result of a diachronic process. Even more important, the idea of a Jesuit of the 16<sup>th</sup> century creating the basis for an historical-political antithesis between entities on the border of a besieged Christian Europe is more than unlikely: it is anachronistic. The authority of Robert John Weston Evans, an expert on cultural history of Central and Eastern Europe, can support this statement. In his book *Rudolf II and his World. A Study in Intellectual History* the British historian, referring to the Bohemian insurrection of 1620, states that in this period there “was prevalent a unitary cultural conception, in fact the 17<sup>th</sup> century has been the last period of cultural unity known by Europe”. He even states that “it was a period of great cosmopolitanism, in fact it was a cosmopolitanism by far greater than that known in every period of the next century”<sup>7</sup>. This cosmopolitanism became, in the texts and actions of a large group of religious scholars, an ecumenical conception of Europe. As this essay will demonstrate, a current of thought spread, in this period, among Christian scholars that used history and literary production to promote a sort of “political ecumenism.” The only antithesis in their writings was between a Christian world and the Turks surrounding and threatening it. Even if this was a mainstream tendency, and like all mainstream tendencies was surrounded by hundreds of “unorthodox” exponents, we will demonstrate that Koialowicz was actually an exponent of this “ecumenical thought.” It is unquestionable that, as Kuolys states, “the historical narrative by Kojalavičius [...] made a certain impact on the historical and literary works of the 17<sup>th</sup>–18<sup>th</sup> century Grand Duchy of Lithuania” and that “the Romantic Lithuanian historiography of the 19<sup>th</sup> century also drew on the narrative by the Jesuit historian.”<sup>8</sup> Nevertheless, the reasons of this influence have to be found in the variety of possible different evaluations of Koialowicz’s book, not in his supposed “ardent defense of the idea of the Lithuanian Republic” or because of the promotion of “an antithesis both to the *tyranny of Moscow*, and to the myth of the Slavic *Sarmatian empire*, led by the Polish.” In other words, a historical contextualization makes it more realistic that Koialowicz did not mean to create such an antithesis, although his work was fit for this interpretation supporting the new conceptions arising in the 18<sup>th</sup>–20<sup>th</sup> century.

The study carried out by Kuolys is affected, to use Marc Bloch’s words, by “the idol

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., p. 411.

<sup>7</sup> Evans, Robert, *Rudolf II and his World. A Study in Intellectual History, 1576–1612*, Oxford, 1973, p. 18–19.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 412.

of origins.” “Naturally esteemed by peoples that make the past their main subject of research, the explication of the present by the past has dominated our [the historians’] studies. In its most characteristic form, this idol of the historians tribe has a name: it’s the myth of the origins.” The problem, according to Bloch, is whether the term is intended to denote the beginning or, alternately, the cause. However, “for the majority of historical realities, the notion of this initial point itself is extremely elusive: a matter of definition without any doubt. A definition that, regrettably, we have for too long forgotten to give.” Moreover, the two meanings are quite often attributed together at the same time effecting a contamination: “in the current vocabulary, the origins are an explicative beginning. Even worse: a beginning that is enough to explain. There is the ambiguity. Here the danger”<sup>9</sup>. Following the French historian, it would be interesting to understand this obsession so marked in all the exegetes’ researches. This obsession is understandable regarding the study of Christianity (and some other faiths) as it is *par excellence* a historic religion. “Now, due to an undoubtedly inevitable contagion, these preoccupations that, in a certain form of religious analysis, could have had their reasons are transposed to other fields of the research in which their legitimacy is definitely more contestable.” Focusing a study on the research of the origins is illegitimate not only methodologically but also theoretically, as it can lead to a double kind of fault. First, a necessary knowledge of the past, and of the evolution of the past, should not lead automatically to the individuation of the origin; second, studying a phenomenon, the awareness of its beginnings should not be enough to explain it. These mistakes implicitly conduce to a more deprecatory fault because a history centred on the origins can be easily used to make remarks about values, as it has often been done<sup>10</sup>. Besides, the counterpart of this adoration of “the demon of the origins” is often “the other satanic enemy of historic truth: the mania of judgement.”

Summing up, it is possible to state that a first gap in this study about *Historia Lituana* has to be recognized in the theoretical background as it is based on a postulate— that the doctrine of Koialowicz about the Lithuanian Republic “was created as an antithesis both to the *tyranny of Moscow*, and to the myth of the Slavic *Sarmatian empire*, led by the Polish” – that is affected by the need to find an origin to explain and justify a modern conception (or at least an 18<sup>th</sup> century conception). Second, if anyhow accepted, this postulate is not enough to allow a comprehension of the ‘Founding of the Republic’ in all its phases. Nor it is enough to explain the consciousness of Koialowicz because this consciousness itself is historically determined and thus the product of a diachronic process. In fact, “never, in a word, is a historic phenomenon

<sup>9</sup> Bloch, Marc, *Apologie pour l’histoire ou métier d’historien*, Paris, Armand Colin, 1949, p. 6.

<sup>10</sup> In this respect, the example provided by Bloch himself can be illustrative: “[...] this is another example of a historical research focused on the beginnings to be used to recognize values. Studying the ‘origins’ of the France, what was Taine doing if not trying to condemn a political issue, to condemn what he believed to be a false human philosophy? [...] the past has often been actively used to explain the present in order to justify or condemn it.” *Ibid.*, p. 7.

explicable with the synchronic study of it. It [the condition of the moment] is the result of all the steps of its evolution”<sup>11</sup>. That is, even if Koialowicz really meant to promote the idea of a Republic, the synchronic and non-comparative study of his production and ideology can lead to the definition of *Historia Lituana* as a beginning and not as the result of a diachronic and dialectic historical process.

While the research of Kuolys lacks chronological depth, that of Brogi Bercoff is not supported by a strong comparative approach. Such an approach, in fact, seems to be the only one possible when, in the beginning of her essay, she states that “Kojalavičius uses *exemplum* from medieval history [...] mainly in order to raise the idea of the union of all the Christian peoples in their joint struggle against Muslims, which was a very important idea for the Europe of that time”<sup>12</sup>. The “Europe of that time” is the environment where the historically determined consciousness of Koialowicz formed. This setting should be the dialectic counterpart of a relation with the book, but in this study it dissolves as a faded background. Consequently, the well realized internal analysis of the passages is not balanced by a comparative section that could better demonstrate the main thesis: “the Jesuit historian is an ardent supporter of the union between Christian Eastern Slavs and Rome”<sup>13</sup>.

To sum up, studying the function of the examples in Koialowicz’s work, Giovanna Brogi Bercoff provides an evaluation of it that is quite different from that of Kuolys. *Historia Lituana* is now represented as an expression of an ecumenical will rather than a national one. Even if quite appropriate, the analysis provided by the Italian scholar does not develop toward “a conception of the world, a human consciousness historically determined.” It remains a very good analysis of the particular or, to use Auerbach words, “the interpretation of a fragment.”

Finally, it should be pointed out that most of the previous researches use the term *Jesuit* as a simple title even if it means much more. It should be remembered that the man carrying that title is *perinde ac cadaver* – well disciplined like a corpse. Therefore, while his consciousness is historically determined, his work is the expression of absolute self-abnegation, of obedience to his superiors and to the Pope. This simple remark should be enough to induce to adopt a new study perspective. In other words, this essay aims to provide a balance for researches like the one of J. Matusas Sedauskas, *Albertas Vijukas-Kojelavičius kaip Lietuvos Istorininkas* [Albert Vijuk-Koialowicz as Lithuanian Historian] that completely forgets the public status of the author<sup>14</sup>. To

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>12</sup> Brogi Bercoff, Giovanna, Op. cit., p. 346.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Sedauskas Matusas, “Albertas Vijukas-Kojelavičius kaip Lietuvos Istorininkas”, *Praeitis*, 1, 1930, 318–329. See also from the same author “Ar Albertas Vijukas-Kojelavičius buvo garsus Lietuvos Istorininkas ir Patriotas?”, *Tiesos Kelias*, 1, 1929, 252–255. The position of these articles should be connected with the time they were written as they are affected by what Alfredas Bumblauskas defined “baltophilia” (referring to Kuolys’s book *Man, Nation and State in the Historic Literature of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania*). See Bumblauskas Alfredas, “About the Lithuanian Baroque in a Baroque Manner”, *Lituanus*, vol. 41, nr. 3, 1995.

the Lithuanian historian I will try to oppose a Jesuit historian whose consciousness is the product of his time and status.

Despite my criticism of the previous studies of *Historia Lituana*, it is from them that I will start. Both Kuolys and Brogi Bercoff agreed on two points: first, both individuated the presence of a recurring rhetoric structure in the text: the example. Second, they agreed claiming that these examples had a didactic function. By consequence, “fragments” to start with have already been individuated in the single examples.

To summarize, in the beginning I will briefly individuate the examples in the text in order to analyze their structure and function. To do this I will mainly base myself on the research of Giovanna Brogi Bercoff mentioned above. Second, I’ll try to justify the presence of such examples in *Historia Lituana* by drawing the historical framework that should have determined Koialowicz’s attitude toward society, politics, religion, and history. I will try to delineate the political and historical situation of the period and pay particular attention to the regions of Bohemia, Transylvania, and Poland-Lithuania, which in a way constituted border between Christian and Turkish Europe. Finally, it will be necessary to see how the Society of Jesus conceived of the unity of Christianity. To achieve this aim, I will provide the reader with a meaningful example: to grant Brogi Bercoff’s request (at the conclusion of her essay) asking for a comparative study with the Bohemian situation, I will analyze the position of the Jesuits during the conflicts that characterized that region in the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. In this section I will mainly focus on the polemical work of two Jesuits involved in the conflict: Adam Tanner and Martinus Becanus. I will, in fact, outline the strong similarities the *Apologia* of the authoritative Jesuit Adam Tanner shares with *Historia Lituana*. This process will not only try to better define the work of Koialowicz, but will also define the more general ideological position of Jesuits toward ecumenism, the political condition of 17<sup>th</sup> century Europe, and the spontaneous confessional activism that characterized that period.

#### RHETORIC AS MEANS OF EDUCATION

It is widely recognized that Koialowicz had an important educational role. He was not only a scholar, but mainly a Jesuit, a member of a group that made of education one of its main weapons in shaping society (mainly the upper classes). Certainly, this Jesuit was a pedagogue in all his activities, not least as director of the Academy of Vilnius. Doubtless this educative attitude influenced the writing of *Historia Lituana* too. This position is especially clear in the first part of the book (the one published in Gdansk in 1650) because of the analogies that the described period allowed to draw with the coeval situation. Analogies, metaphors, and examples were mostly used by Jesuit in theater and literature in order to allow a double-level reading (or understanding) that

remained as a more vivid reminder in the memory of the spectator or reader. We can transpose the comment of Giovanna Zanlonghi about the function of the theater in the Jesuit educative system to the function of literature in the same system. The Italian scholar states that “the inseparability of word and image in the Jesuits’ theatrical experience was based on a rhetorical project created to serve man. [...] The recourse to theatricalism in the didactic of the Jesuit colleges has to be understood as the creation of a psychological and cognitive space in which the fantastic reinvention, activating memory, imagination, affections and intelligence, educated to watch the reality in an ordered, conscious and orientated manner”<sup>15</sup>. In the attempt to steer consciousness, even historical narration could be understood as “fantastic reinvention” that can often activate both memory and imagination. Acting directly on these two spheres is certainly much more effective than the simple didactic: “in the dialectic tension between the didactic simplicity of the scholastic manual and the complex logic of the commentary neo-scholastic, the interpretative space carves itself a space that conquers the sphere of the sensible, of the corporal, and of the pre-conceptual; that is, the imaginative power as inner place in which reason and affectivity settle”<sup>16</sup>.

This approach is exactly the one the Jesuit Cipriano Soares pointed out as the best rhetorical instrument in education. *De arte rhetorica* of Soares represents the archetype of the Jesuits’ rhetoric and its message can be summarized in the sentence “the figured speech is a reverberation of the truth shining through what can be perceived”<sup>17</sup>. The manual of Soares, written in 1569, has been re-printed hundreds of times and was still very popular in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Therefore, it is quite realistic to think that a Jesuit, expert in the field of education and ready to write a history of his country directed to people in need of education, knew of this handbook.

In literature, the obvious result of the above consideration is that an attempt to orientate consciousness by acting on memory, sensibility, and imagination should be realized through the “reinvention” of historical events that can easily evoke pre-logical sensations. In turn, this can be obtained by both using terms that evoke sensations and describing dramatic events wrapped in myth. This was the way the ecclesiastical polemicists adopted to support their own thesis. They had recourse to a mystic tone rich in expression evoking a sense of fear, majesty, or the supernatural.

Those criteria are met by a series of examples in the first book of *Historia Lituana*, all of them connected with the narration of the wars against the Tatars. First of all, these examples refer to events quite far in the past, but still able to evoke a mighty threat, a holy war, and the horrors connected. Second, all these examples are characterized by a recourse to terms like *ferocia*, *feroce* (ferocity), *desperatio* (desperation),

<sup>15</sup> Zanlonghi, Giovanna, *La psicologia e il teatro nella riflessione gesuitica europea del Cinque-Seicento* Memorandum, 2003, 4, p. 61.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> Quoted from Zanlonghi, Op cit., p. 61.

*violentus* (violent) and *periculo* (danger) that aim not only to describe but to call forth sensations. At the same time, terms like *summa* (supreme) and *moltitudine* (multitude) contribute to provide an idea of magnitude typical of the apocalyptic tone. This tone became even more evocative when animal attributes are used to refer to humans: the threat comes like an infestation (*infestationis*) and is brought by people on the border of humanity, a *barbarum exercitus* (barbarian army) that is not aggressive or dangerous, but *ferocem* (ferocious) like animals.

Such a narration of an historical event is likely to aim to go beyond the didactic simplicity of the scholastic manual and conquer the “spear of the sensible, of the corporeal, and of the pre-conceptual, that is, the imaginative power.” This is the case of the excursus on the Tatars invasion of 1211. It deserves to be quoted *in toto* as one of the most representative examples of the concept discussed above.

An. 1211 Scytharum in Russiam eruptio prima

Aliquot posthac annis, Scythae gens barbara ab Hyrcano mari Caucaseisque montibus egressa, ex Oriente Occidentem versus, fedes ac arma transferebat. Primi erant Poloucii, in quorum agros trajecto Volga ea proluvies exundavit. Egerunt illi diu pro aris e focus fortiter, neque infeliciter. Sed ejusmodi bellum erat, in quo victoria absolvi aliter non poterat, nisi interneccione alterutrius populi: Scythis pro occupandis fedibus, Polouciis pro retinenda patria, summa vi pertinacique ferocia connitentibus. Verebantur tamen hi, ne (quo evenit) sub moltitudine hostium virtus sua tandem concideret. Missa itaque legatione, auxilia apud Russos quaesiverunt. Admissus ad Kijoviensium Ducem legatus Polouciorum: Hostes esse qui auxilia peterent, non dissimulabat. Sed nunc demum in potestate Russorum esse, Ajebat, ne amplius hostes forent: si novo beneficio aeternas amicitias inchoare vellent. Meminissent Russi: quoties vel ad domesticam Tyrannorum potentiam frangendam, vel ad Polonam vim sustinendam, Polouciorum opera usi essent. Suis equidem non adeo rem domi desperatam esse, ut ferendo diutius hosti non fit: finitimorum tamen arma implorare; quod recte intelligerent, non cum suo magis, quam illorum hostem bellum agi: atque ideo, communibus studiis opibusque, propulsandum. Advertere vellent Russi, Scythas fedibus suis egressos, non Polouciorum praedis invitatos; ubi ex militari gestate, aut potius parsimonia, nihil invitandae cupiditati haberetur. Esse aliquid amplius, quo illi, animo ac desiderio, tenderent: Russiae, proviaciae opulentae, illos inhiare: ejus jugulum, per Polouciorum latus, peti. Occurrerent igitur mature periculo: jungerent vires cum Polouciis: ne his sublatis, totum belli onus in solam Russiam decumbat. Barbarum exercitus moltitudine ferocem, ad ipsa belli initia, duplicibus copiis facilius reprimi posse, quam postea, rerum successu violentiu provectum; & velut rupto aggere summo impetu ruentem.

This tone continues in the next session:

Bellum Russi contra Scythas decernunt & infeliciter pugnant\*

AEquissima petere visus. Magno itaque apparatu suppetias Russi occupant. Mfcislaus Romanides Kijoviae, Mfcislaus Mfcislaides Haliciae Duces, aliique plures, Russia cum exercitu egressi ad Protocolcos Polouciis junguntur. Inde duodecimis castris in conspectum hostium pervenerunt. Scythae, ut prima adventantium signa comparuerunt, militem omnem instructa acie in campum educunt; neque spatium ex itinere respirandi datum: fessos integri

magno impetu adorti, pugnare prius, quam consistent, cogunt: atque primo prope icursu vincunt, caedunt. Russorum quidem ea tempestate, tota strages, intra exercitus & aliquot Ducum caedem, vel captivitatem stetit: at Polouciorem populus, multum ea clade attritus, vim deinde sustinere non putuit: sed subsefutis praeliis internecone deletus est. Tum fere magnam Europae partem quam nunc incolunt Scythae, occuparunt. Inde Postea Bateii & Caydani ductu, annorum aliquot continuis infestationibus, ita attrita est Russia; ut amissis praecipuis regulis, in potestatem Scytharum venerit: & imperatum in annos tributum, diu penderit. Alienis malis, in suarum rerum incrementa, Litvani per ocium usi, sensim fines in Russiam Proferebant.

This example opens the series proposed by Giovanna Brogi Bercoff in the above-mentioned essay and refers to the defeat suffered by Lithuania and Russia at the hands of the Tatars. Koialowicz believes that the crushing blow was due to a lack of cooperation between Russia and Lithuania. It puts the blame on a lack of unity of the countries on the borders of Christendom for allowing the infidel barbarian to triumph. Only the union of all the nations against the common enemy will permit them to save the freedom of their motherland. It should be a union that does not take into account the different religions as its purpose is to save what in a word could be described as “civilization.” It is clear that Koialowicz had in mind two aims: first, to create a mental association between the Tatars of the past and coeval Turks; second, to support the idea of a union of Christians whether Catholic or Orthodox. In the example, in fact, Koialowicz describes the pagans of the 13<sup>th</sup> century as if they were the 16<sup>th</sup> century Christians. As Brogi Bercoff states, “Koialowicz uses *exemplum* from medieval history [...] mainly in order to raise the idea of the union of all the Christians in their joint struggle against the Muslims.” The religious unity is, in the works of the Lithuanian Jesuit, strictly connected with that of the political union. The respect for the Lithuanian-Polish union is regarded as a necessary protection against external enemies.

#### THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT: A FORCE THAT SHAPES CONSCIOUSNESS

Now that we have individuated the examples and agreed with Brogi Bercoff about their second level of meaning, it is necessary to understand why Koialowicz felt the need to draw such a parallel between the Tatars and the Turks. If a man’s ideology is the result of pressure from the environment, than the understanding of Koialowicz’s attitude passes through the analysis of the historical context.

The traditional division between the medieval age and modern times is mainly conventional. Nevertheless, this periodization can be useful while looking at long term processes and at the events that characterized the 16<sup>th</sup> and the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The fall of Constantinople at the hands of the Turks, in 1453, caused a semi-permanent military threat to Europe, contributing to the growth of the idea of a third Rome in Moscow, isolating the Balkans from the rest of the European conti-

ment, and stimulating the Western intellectual progress. No need to mention the fact that the fall of Constantinople had a direct impact on Hungary and Poland, with consequences even more drastic after the battle of Mohács. Europe was changing and the perception of Europe was changing, too. The new idea of Europe, a consequence of the events listed above, lasted for one and a half century, at least until the middle of the 17<sup>th</sup>.

The political situation influenced the cultural development. The tendency toward territorial consolidation proceeded naturally in Eastern Europe where the dynasty of the Jagiellons lost dominion over Bohemia and Hungary in favor of the Habsburgs. The European countries under Turkish domination began to be politically perceived as non-European entities and as a consequence their cultural development diverged from the European one. These divergences became clear when the Hungarian defeat in Mohács (1526) brought about the division of the state in three parts. In all the countries on the border of the Turkish Empire, the culture seemed to develop in the sultan's shadow, as demonstrated by the works of the Hungarian national writer and lyric poet Bálint Balassi and those of the great Croatian playwright Marin Držić. Both lived in the shadow of the Turks and, in fact, the anti-Turk theme is dominant in the works of most Croatian and Hungarian writers of the 16<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> century. In their work, it is possible to discern the development of a new idea of a united Europe, the one opposed to the Turks.

The other important national system in Eastern Europe was that of the Jagiellons, based mainly on the cooperation between the members of the dynasty: due to the stronger position of Poland and its regents, the Jagiellonian dynasty tried to influence Hungarian politics to give Ladislaw a stronger position in Bohemia – through the nomination of a Jagiellon prince in Silesia. Because of the Habsburg aspirations to the crowns of Saint Venceslaw and Saint Stephan, an opposition between the Habsburgs and the Jagiellons arose. In an attempt to put some pressure on Poland and Lithuania, the Habsburgs supported the Teutonic Knights and Moscovite Russia. However, the conflict was settled when in Vienna, in 1514, a congress was held that aimed to drive the Habsburgs out of the anti-Jagiellon and reached a solution with a marriage settlement that guaranteed the succession of the dynasty surviving in Hungary and Bohemia. Louis Jagiellon married Mary of Habsburg while Ferdinand of Augsburg married the sister of Louis, Anne (a typical example of the famous politics of the Habsburgs that some verse of the period celebrated as follow: *Bella gerunt alii, tu felix Austria, nubes*).

The settlement of the conflict, according to some Czech and Hungarian historians, was also reached because the Jagiellons handed over Prague and Buda in exchange of the benevolence and neutrality of the Habsburgs. This thesis is questionable, but it is true that Hungary should have appeared to them, sometimes, as a heavy burden because of the internal disorder and corruption. For example, an attempted crusade against the Ottomans caused the Peasants' Insurrection guided by Dózsa against the

lords. Hungary was divided between a pro-Habsburg faction, consisting mainly of magnates, and the national party based on the small nobility that refused to accept foreign sovereigns. The young Louis II would hardly have been able to restore the power of the monarchy, or ensure its defense. The frontier garrisons, without funds and lacking effective forces, fought a useless struggle against the Ottomans: in 1521 Belgrade, actually Hungary's southern gate, fell into the hands of the Turks.

Sigismund the Old of Poland, Louis's uncle, vainly tried to reinforce the position of Buda. Sigismund, mindful that the anti-Turkish Polish intervention in Moldavia brought about the breakdown of relations with the suspicious Hungary, moved carefully so as not to fall out with the Ottoman Empire. The two entities, in fact, signed a perpetual peace in 1533.

However, an event occurred in 1526 that changed the course of Eastern European history: Louis II of Hungary died, thus clearing the way for the Habsburg succession. In fact, Louis II died in 1526 during the battle of Mohács, where his army, assembled in a great hurry with big contingents of Czech, German, and Polish mercenaries together with the high Hungarian nobility, was destroyed by the Turks. The poet Mihály Vörösmarty defined Mohács as "the immense cemetery of the national ambitions" and it is true that this event started a chain reaction that changed the course of European history. The immediate consequence was the double election as kings of Hungary of both Ferdinand of Habsburg and Zápolya. The latter, anyway, was soon defeated by the Habsburg. In the next years, Zápolya cooperated with Poland (he was the brother-in-law of Sigismund) and together with the Turks, unprofitably besieged Vienna in 1529. Once the negotiation to reunite the lands of Habsburg and those of Zápolya failed, Ferdinand tried to conquer the whole country, but the Turks intervened and, just before the middle of the century, occupied Buda and Central Hungary. Notwithstanding repeated diplomatic efforts, especially those of Cardinal Martinuzzi (Utišinović), "the only authentic statesman of the century"<sup>18</sup>, a triple division of the country became irreversible: it created a royal Hungary in the west that included a part of Slovakia and Croatia and was ruled by the Habsburgs; a Turkish Hungary, turned into a province of the Ottoman Empire; and the Principality of Transylvania, a tributary of the Empire, but relatively free<sup>19</sup>.

<sup>18</sup> Wandycz Piotr, *Il prezzo della libertà*, Bologna, 2001, p. 96.

<sup>19</sup> Martinuzzi (1482–1551). Born in Kamicac, Croatia. Son of Gregory Utje-Šenovic, a Croatian gentleman who died combatting the Turks; He usually signed himself *Frater Georgius*. Prior of the monastery of Czestochowa, Poland; and later, of the monastery of Sajolad, near Erlau, Northern Hungary. Elected bishop of Csanád in 1538 he concluded the Treaty of Nagyvárád with King Ferdinand; the treaty invested János with the royal title and most of the Hungarian territory; and King Ferdinand as successor to the Hungarian crown. Transferred to the see of Nagyvárád, May 30, 1539. King János I died on July 21, 1540 and on his deathbed, he repudiated the treaty and left the crown to his young son, János Zsigmond, born only nine days before his father's death. The late king in his will had appointed Bishop Martinuzzi and Peter Petrovich as guardians of the child and they proclaimed him king and the Sultan Süleyman promised to recognize him but later, in 1541, occupied Buda, the capital of Hungary.

Bishop Martinuzzi, as guardian and regent, was able to retain Transylvania as an independent principality in 1542 under Turkish suzerainty. Fighting off the intrigues of Izabella, the mother of János Zsigmond, Bishop Martinuzzi returned to the original plan of unification of Hungary under the Austrian Habsburg dynasty in order to resist Turkish expansion. After convincing Queen Izabella and her son János Zsigmond to resign and to leave Transylvania, he finally concluded an agreement with King Ferdinand in 1551, by which he continued to be governor of Transylvania and was rewarded with promotion to the Metropolitan See of Esztergom and a cardinal's hat. In 1551, when the Turks took Csanad and other places, Cardinal Martinuzzi and the imperial generals Giovanni Castaldo and Sforza Pallavicini united their forces against the common enemy. The cardinal's letter to Rome concerning the danger of the Turks was read in the consistory of November 16, 1551. In order to delay an attack by the Turks, he secretly resumed paying a tribute to the sultan in December 1551! These secret contacts provoked the suspicion of General Castaldo, who accused him before King Ferdinand of treason and asked permission to eliminate him if necessary; the king acquiesced. The cardinal's secretary, Marco Aurelio Ferrari, was hired, and he stabbed his master from behind at the castle of Alvinczy while he was reading a letter; the cardinal, although he was sixty-nine years old, fought for his life, and was only killed with the aid of Pallavicini and a group of his soldiers.

The other big territory on the European border, Transylvania, became an important political actor especially under Stephan Báthory, who in 1576 also became king of Poland. His eleven years of reign brought a period of relative inner tranquillity and some successes in foreign policy mainly because of the wise contribution of Jan Zamoyski. This foreign policy was in a way connected to plans for a crusade against the Turks and the reunification of the Hungary. Zamoyski, for his part, preserved Poland from a clash with the Turks mainly by means of buffer states that entered into the sphere of Polish influence but maintained, at the same time, good relations with the sultan.

The seventeenth century began in the same way the previous century ended: the writings of Central and Eastern Europe are full of allusions to the dangerous situation and to the impending threats to the region. Politicians, preachers, and writers felt desperate talking about wars, social diseases, and economical problems. In Poland, it seemed that the optimism of the sixteenth century disappeared; moralists saw a sign of the divine anger in the Cossack insurrection of 1648 and used to interpret the royal initials ICR (Ioannes Casimirus Rex) as *Initium Calamitate Regni*. As stated by Piotr Wandycz, "the famous thinker and pedagogue Jan Amos Komenský (Comenius) used the same terms to describe the catastrophe of the Thirty Years War: his renowned work, *The Labyrinth of the World*, describes a pilgrim looking for order and harmony in a world full of frightful contradictions and probably symbolizes the diffuse concerns about the conflict and desegregation of the culture of that age."

The crisis of the seventeenth century came to a conclusion in Eastern Europe thanks to the dynastic continuity in the Habsburg family and the action of the counter-reformation. In 1627 in Bohemia and in 1687 in Hungary there was imposed the hereditary domination of the family that brought the entire eastern portion of Christian Europe under its sometimes indirect control. However, Habsburg absolutism was peculiar in that it was characterized by a tendency to “unify with tolerance.” This must be understood as both political tolerance and as respect for the local character of the multi-ethnic empire. “Without any doubt”, wrote Piotr Wandycz, “it was the counter-reformation [...] which had the strongest impact on the form of absolutism of the Habsburgs, especially in Bohemia and Hungary.”<sup>20</sup> In Croatia the counter-reformation produced the important literary and political figure of Juraj Križanić that strongly defended the cause of the reconciliation of the Churches, the Latin and the Orthodox, as a mean to re-unify all the Slavs. The same ambition has been expressed in the works of two coeval writers: the Hungarian Cardinal Pázmány and the Bohemian Bohuslav Balbín (even if the latter always defended the local traditions and the Czech language).

Both Pázmány and Balbín were Jesuits, and the Jesuits constituted undeniably the avant-garde of the Catholic offensive in all of Europe, but mainly in the lands of the Habsburgs where the number of priests was inadequate. The successes of the Jesuits were due to their organization and their activities mainly in the fields of education. The net of Jesuit universities, colleges and houses constituted a basic structure for a connected Europe (at least in the field of education) and influenced, by the means of the education, the gentry’s perception of this Europe.

The Catholic Church itself was very active in promoting the unifying role of the Habsburgs, reaching even those lands in which the German dynasty did not have a political role. Where the unifying role of the state seemed to be in crisis, as in Poland, important ecclesiastics tried to act the way Bishop Szyszkowski did in criticizing the anarchic tendencies of the *szlachta* and attacking the liberty that became the “huge oppression exercised by few”<sup>21</sup>. The Church was asking for a stronger unity of the country based on the Christian faith. Political and religious unity were, in fact, strongly interconnected in the mind of the churchmen.

It wasn’t just the ecclesiastics who saw such a connection between faith and politics: Miklós Zríny, the Hungarian governor of Croatia, consecrated his life to the freeing of Hungary; at the same time he defended religious tolerance as an instrument for the alliance of the Protestant gentry and the Catholic nobility. The achievement of such an alliance allowed the Habsburgs to win against the Turks in 1664 during the battle of Szentgotthárd.

<sup>20</sup> Piotr S. Wandycz, *Op. cit.*, p. 374.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. W. Czapliński, *O Polsce siedemnastowiecznej; problemy i sprawy*, Warsaw, 1966, p. 83.

THE SECOND LEVEL OF UNDERSTANDING OF *HISTORIA LITUANA*: RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL

This brief historical excursus pointed out some elements of interest with regards to the possibility of reading the examples given by Koialowicz as a parallel between Tatars and Turks. Moreover, it demonstrated the legitimacy of the thesis that holds the Lithuanian Jesuit to be a supporter of the idea of a religious union to back up the political one with regards to the Christian Europe. First of all, the supposed aim of *Historia Lituana* to create an antithesis between European entities has become manifestly weak from a historical point of view: if it would have been realistic in the middle of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, when Eastern Europe was disputed between the Habsburgs and the Jagiellons, the Europe of the 17<sup>th</sup> century is mainly under the control of the Habsburgs and most of the political conflicts had been settled. The second point of interest is that clearly the conflict between Christianity and the Turkish Empire strongly influenced the literature of the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries: in the works of Mihály Vörösmarty, Bálint Balassi, and Marin Držić the continuous reference to the Turks is obvious. Even writers further from the border with the Turks demonstrated this attitude, as did Adam Tanner and Martin Becanus, both Jesuits. The events of Mohács stoked the European imagination, as did the fall of Constantinople.

Among these works, the *Amuletum Castrense* written by the already mentioned Adam Tanner is particularly interesting, mainly due to its strong similarities to Koialowicz's *Historia Lituana* with regard to the indirect reference to the Turks. It deserves to be better analyzed in order to highlight the functions of the image of the Turks in the examples of both books.

The *Amuletum Castrense* of the Jesuit Adam Tanner has to be counted among the apologetic works produced during the Bohemian insurrection of 1618; but its function was not that of defining the Christian position on the juridical and doctrinal field: on the contrary, it was written in order to exalt, once the war had begun, the values and the elements that could give cohesion to this group and to guide it to victory.

No titles, in fact, could better express the aspiration to exorcize the danger of death, be it corporal or spiritual, of the '*miles christianus*' described as

Intrepidus animus, etiam inter pericula quae nunquam absunt in bello. [...] Aliquando robur hostium terret, alias multitudo obruit. [...] In his omnibus casibus valet imperterrita animi fortitudo et masculum robur, non ab humanis viribus sed a divino praesidio accitum. [...] Nec timendum est militi Christiano, exigente necessitate etiam mori pro iustitia, pro patria, pro religione. Haec militis professio est.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Adam Tanner, *Amuletum Castrense, sive antidotum adversus perniciosos calumniarum afflatus, tristesque bellorum motus, ex Boemico tumultu enatos, Auctore Adamo Tannero e Soc. Jesu theologo*, Ingolstadt, ex Typographeo Ederiano, 1620.

The work of the theologian, written in Ingolstadt in 1620, the decisive year for the destiny of Catholicism in Germany, introduces itself as a militant work with the very aggressive attitude typical of the spirit of the Thirty Years' War. The text strictly prescribes how to conduct the war, how to maintain discipline, how to pay soldiers, and at the same time it casts anathemas against the financial speculations on the armies. Speculations that caused the lack of results.

[...] inauditum scelsum eorum qui per avaritiam communes belli sumptus, ex pauperum sudore ac sanguine extractos, intervertunt ac in proprios usus vertunt: quo fit, ut aout milites ad bellum necessary non conducantur, auc conductis stipendia debita non solvantur.<sup>23</sup>

Not to mention, proceeded Tanner, the tradition to send back home the veterans and to conscript new, inexperienced, soldiers only to have the opportunity to save money with smaller salaries. That is the reason why victory does not come, the princes loose their honor, and the cities are destroyed.

Accusations too precise not to remind of the terrible experience suffered by the Church in the period of the bloody and unlucky campaigns conduced against the Turks in Hungary. The forces and resources of the Pope and of many leaders and soldiers, mainly sent from Italy, were swallowed up by the speculations and the avidity of the generals. It was the troops sent by the Church that suffered the most cruel consequences in terms of human lives and suffering<sup>24</sup>.

More generally, the work of Adam Tanner is "deeply pervaded by the conviction, not only of the author, but of the whole Church, that the war against the heresy in Germany could be compared to a *bellum Christianum* against the infidels"<sup>25</sup>. If not for other reasons, then at least because the religious conflict in Eastern Europe was perceived by Christendom as a direct help to the threatening power of the Ottoman Empire. The heresy is a cancer that is spreading quickly, maintained Tanner; it brings with it quarrels, discords, and wars as the tumults and devastations caused in Germany by the Lutheran *renovatio* demonstrated. As Tanner concluded: "Et quod inde consequens est, id ipsum etiam, contra Turcas omnesque Imperii hostes, inoppugnabile propugnaculum"<sup>26</sup>.

The heretics, on the contrary, always took advantage of the Turkish threat to ask for concessions, as in 1532, when, in fear of the invasion of Austria, it was to extort the tolerance for the Confession of Augusta<sup>27</sup>. Luther himself, continued the theologian, expressed contradictory ideas on this point, but, to say the truth, his followers

<sup>23</sup> Adam Tanner, Op. cit., p. 188.

<sup>24</sup> See, for example, L. von Pastor, *Storia dei Papi*, vol. XI, p. 225.

<sup>25</sup> Gui Francesco, Op. cit, p. 349.

<sup>26</sup> Adam Tanner, Op. cit., p. 69.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 74. In that year it was decided to tolerate the *Confessio*, with the clause to not divulgate it until the Council. It seems that the Augustan Confession was approved according to the same scheme that brought tolerance to the *Confessio Bohemica* in 1575, an event rendered official only in 1609.

understood finally that the Ottoman threat was a real one. On the contrary, the Calvinists continued to use the Turk pressure as a weapon of blackmail. The same applies to the Utraquists (the adherents to the “Husso-Piccard-Lutheran-Calvinist religion,” as ironically described by Tanner), who did not hesitate to sing a *Te Deum* when Bethlen Gabor, vassal of the Turks and a Calvinist, devastated the provinces of the Christian and Catholic king<sup>28</sup>. The Jesuit theologian further stated that, while Catholics and Lutherans fight against the Turks (it is necessary to underline that the Elector of Saxony – even if Lutheran - was allied to the Emperor and therefore treated with respect by Tanner), the Calvinists are ready to contribute to the wars of the Infidel in order to see the papacy fall. “Has someone seen a Calvinist fight in battles like that of Lepanto?” asked the Jesuit. On the contrary, they drove the Mari to invade Spain (allusions to the Dutchmen). “The Pope remains the biggest bulwark against the Turks,” Tanner once again reiterated. This argument should have been quite convincing also to those who did not know yet about the extreme step taken by the Bohemians: now ready to risk everything on a single throw, during the last days of 1620 they decided to send a big delegation to Constantinople to ask for the support of the Turks<sup>29</sup>.

In conclusion, the work of Tanner drew an equation between war against Calvinism and the war against the Turks, absolving the Christian from all the possible doubts about the legitimacy of a military action against the Bohemians. To the sensible and doubtful readers who examine their conscience about the licit instruments for a good Catholic to bring all these calamities to an end (but also to those thinkers who referred to the pacifist pre-Christian literature about the tolerance), the theologian replied, as Becanus did:

[...] si forte Turcarum aliorumve pacis et Religionis hostium iniquitas et violentia cogat, bella Domini, hoc est in causa Domini, ex voluntate Domini, ad honorem Domini, non quidem iuxta normam artis bellicae, cuius professionem olim in Philosopho reprehensam scio, sed ex praescriptolegis divinae, ac iuxta praecepta et documenta ipsius scripturae sacrae pie feliciterque gerat (miles Christianus).<sup>30</sup>

With a sensible respect to the tradition that claimed Christianity to be more sensitive to the values of peace compared to the pagan culture, Tanner re-legitimated, by the light of the Holy Writ, the positiveness of war, as long as it was fought for the faith and religion. Therefore, if the war against the Calvinist rebels was like a war against the infidel, then, deduced Tanner, victory was assured for the Christian army. How could God not help those who were fighting for his glory?

His igitur in bello aequae contra Turcas, ac quoslibet fidei ac publicae pacis hostes suscepto observatis, minime dubiam victoriam sperare debemus. Primo, quia tale bellu iustissimum

<sup>28</sup> Ibid, p. 1–2.

<sup>29</sup> Anton Gindely, *Geschichte der Böhmischen Brüder*, Prague, 1857, p. 183.

<sup>30</sup> Adam Tanner, *Op. cit.*, p. 178.

est; bello autem iusto favet Deus. Secundo, quia bellum contra hostes Dei suscipitur; quisquis enim verae Religionis aut publicae tranquillitatis hostis et oppugnator est, Dei hostis est, quem Deus non patietur inultum. Tertio, quia hoc modo non propria et privata, sed communis Dei causa agitur, cuius honos et vera Religio defenditur: quomodo autem Deus causam suam deserat?<sup>31</sup>

Incitements like these match the events of the day of the White Mountain, when Catholic preachers got among the soldiers just as it happened during the *bellum Turcicum* to incite them to battle “pro Deo et Religione.”

The appeal of Tanner to the unity of the Christianity against the infidels, whether they were Turks or Calvinists, is not the only request for a certain kind of concord; the above-mentioned Martinus Becanus, too, argued for the political unity of Christian Europe.

Becanus, Jesuit, theologian, and confessor to Emperor Ferdinand II from 1620, was, like Tanner, involved in the political-theological debate that sprang from the Bohemian insurrection<sup>32</sup>.

“Pax Republicae sine unitate fidei conservari non potest” stated Becanus in the second part of *Theologia Scolastica*, concluding the passage with a meaningful “Maior probata est, quia pax Christiana est duplex: una Ecclesiastica, quae consistit in unitate fidei et Sacramentorum; Altera politica, quae consistit in externa iustitia et tranquillitate”<sup>33</sup>. The core concept this essay is supporting is perfectly summed up in these few words. Religious pluralism is incompatible, in the Jesuits’ thought, with the tranquillity of the state. After all, the men of the Society, determined to achieve the true religious-political peace, paradoxically preferred the hypothesis of a war against the enemy – no matter whether Calvinist or Turk – instead of a peace obtained with the tolerance. Becanus echoes the words of Gaspar Schopp who asked for a brutal and decisive military intervention. “In fact, the idea of a final war against the heretical enemies of the faith, assimilated – in a significant way – to the infidel Turks, had already been in the air, long before the Bohemian events provided further justifications for a repressive action. Already in 1616, Gaspar Schopp, the German polemist, informed the Holy See about the conclusion of his *Classicum belli sacri* written in order to ex-

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., p. 197.

<sup>32</sup> Martin Becan is presented by the Catholic Encyclopedia as a controversialist, born at Hilvarenbeck, Brabant, Holland, 6 January, 1563; died at Vienna, 24 January, 1624. He entered the Society of Jesus, 22 March, 1583, taught theology for twenty-two years at Wuerzburg, Mainz, and Vienna, and was confessor to Emperor Ferdinand II from 1620 until the time of his death. His writings were directed principally against Calvin, Luther, and the Anabaptists; of these, his “Manuale Controversiarum,” Mainz, 1623, treating of predestination, free will, the Eucharist, and the infallibility of the Church, passed through several editions. His chief theological work, “Summa Theologiae Scholasticae” is in great part a compendium of Francisco Suárez’s Commentary on St. Thomas Aquinas.

<sup>33</sup> Martinus Becanus, *Manuale Controversiarum huius temporis de fide ac religione*, Wuerzburg, 1623. See Joseph Lecler S. J., *Storia della Tolleranza nel secolo della Riforma*, Brescia, 1967, p. 341–345.

<sup>34</sup> Cfr. Mario d’Addio, *Il Pensiero Politico di Gaspare Scioppio e il machiavellismo del Seicento*, Milano, 1692, p. 765.

hort the emperor to wage war against the heretic and sacrilegious princes”.<sup>34</sup>

The sacrilegious princes were, in fact, a problem even greater than that of heretics: as Francesco Gui states, Becanus himself individuated in the “desperate predestination” of Calvin the origin of the “homines politici”

Qui hoc modo ratiocinantur: De aeternitate nihil ad nos; Deus iam pridem statuit de uno quoque nostrum [...] Totum ergo stadium nostrum sit in temporali administratione Republicae, de fide et Christo sit silentium. Ex hac Calvini doctrina orti Libertini et politici, qui et libertatem religionis probant et omnium sectarum mores ac personas induunt.<sup>35</sup>

It is Gui that openly draws a similitude between Calvinists and Turks in the Jesuits’ imagination: “the *patres* – like the monks that, in the Hungarian campaign, advanced against the Turks by hoisting the image of the Madonna – lived the experience of the war against the Calvinists as a *bellum sacrum*, rich in presages and miraculous events”<sup>36</sup>.

#### THE THIRD LEVEL OF UNDERSTANDING OF HISTORIA LITUANA: MORAL AND GNOSEOLOGIC

The holy war seems now an inner problem more connected with a political issue. A political issue that is, in turn, strictly interconnected with religious and moral problems. Blaise Pascal was one of the first to point out this kind of interconnection in Jesuit thought. The first ten “Provincial Letters” of Blaise Pascal appear to be written by an anonymous Parisian who, in order to defend his associates of Port Royal, addresses a friend in the province to explain to him the doctrinal debate that was going on in the French Capital. In the others letters this fiction is abandoned and the letters are addressed directly to the Jesuits. In writing these letters Pascal’s intention was to influence public opinion, and mobilize it against the Jesuits. Pascal inveighed against their alleged moral sluggishness. In the letters eleven though sixteen he directly addresses the “reverend fathers of the Society of Jesus”. By attacking the flimsy morality of the Jesuits he introduced political concerns into the quarrel. Specifically, the thirteenth and fourteenth letters condemned, without distinction, the moral and the political action of the Jesuits. In Pascal’s vivacious style morality and politics merge with the doctrinal issue, which, on the whole, does not distinguish between the different spheres of the intellectual activity of the members of the Society of Jesus<sup>37</sup>.

With regard to Jesuit activity, the inextricability of doctrine, theology, politics, and intellectual expression was clear from the initial creation of the Society. Although

<sup>35</sup> Martinus Becanus, *Opera Omnia*, vol. II, p. 829. Cfr, Gui Francesco, *Op. cit.*, p. 21–22.

<sup>36</sup> Gui Francesco, *Op. cit.*, p. 22.

<sup>37</sup> Pascal Blaise, *Pensées. The provincial letters*, New York, 1941.

with polemical intention, G. Huber underlines the same necessary interrelations:

A closed-rank phalanx, dominated by an absolute thought, held under an iron discipline, inflamed of enthusiasm for the cause of the Roman Church and ready to all sacrifices to achieve the triumph, fitted with all the spiritual and material forces necessary to the accomplishment of its mission [...], such as the Society of Jesus. [...] Mighty and difficult was its mission: it dealt with the conquest of the European society and its submission to the papacy; it dealt with the spread of the Christian doctrine among the infidels; it dealt, finally, with the reform of the morals and culture of the Catholic clergy, to wake up the morbid religion of lay society.<sup>38</sup>

Huber, indirectly, acknowledges the mixture of “spiritual and worldly forces” in the Society of Jesus – a mixture that mirrors that of its aims: secularly the submission of society to the Catholic Church and spiritually the reform of the morals of both clergy and laity.

This deep interconnection is widely recognized by scholars. Francesco Gui, studying the Bohemian insurrection of 1618, pointed out that everyone who want to undertake a research on Jesuit political history must be aware of “the strong connection between religious and political spheres that characterizes the Jesuitical militancy”<sup>39</sup>. This is the reason why it is not possible to research Jesuit political thought, but only to study the moral, theological, and doctrinal implications of their activity in the world.

The study of Jesuits’ political thought is an inquiry into intersections and connections between the internal issue of the organization of the Society itself and general political matters; intersections and conflicts caused by a ‘double loyalty’ – the loyalty to the local sovereign and to the General in Rome; and conflicts between the role of court confessors and the involuntary influence on political decisions. All these issues have a common thread. It is the aim that guided Jesuits’ actions in the world: the fight against gnoseological relativism and moral laxism, the main obstacles to the domination of the Church over lay society.

There is no need to analyze in depth all the local realities to understand that it is not possible to reduce all the single and peculiar actions to a ‘Jesuit’s political thought’. Asserting that the Society of Jesus as a whole had a political thought would mean entering into the mode of polemical writings. Nevertheless, it is possible to individuate a ‘common factor’, a common point that oriented their activity in the world: morality.

This can be well exemplified by the analysis of the Bohemian Insurrection of 1618. The Insurrection developed from 1618 to 1620 and is considered part of the so-

<sup>38</sup> Huber G., *I Gesuiti: Storia, dottrine, organizzazione, pratiche, azione politica e religiosa della Compagnia di Gesù*, Roma, Artistica, 1909, p. 93.

<sup>39</sup> Gui Francesco, *I Gesuiti e la Rivoluzione Boema: alle Origini della Guerra dei Trent’Anni*, Milano, F. Angeli, 1989, p. 15.

called ‘revolutions of the seventeenth century’. It was, at the same time, the spark that caused the Thirty Years’ War to break out.

The choice to study it through the history of the Jesuits in those countries allows a better understanding of the moral implications in their political activity not only in Bohemia but in the whole of Europe. The members of the Society of Jesus were, in fact, in the medulla of that vast Catholic front extended from Spain, Italy, Austria, Bavaria Poland, and the other Habsburg possessions. The Jesuits were, therefore, directly involved in the conflict and were able to produce a huge amount of documents about it.

Before the Insurrection, they imposed themselves on the Bohemian scene and became the strongest opponents to the evangelical states in the kingdom of Saint Wenceslaw. Analyzing the insurrection, it became possible to understand why the first act of the revolutionary government, soon after the defenestration, ordained the expulsion of the *Societas* from the kingdom. Even during the nineteenth century, the Society of Jesus had to defend itself from the terrible accusation of being the main force that caused and upheld that war<sup>40</sup>.

It is necessary to point out the strong connection between the religious and the political spheres that characterizes the Jesuitical militancy. It is necessary to stress the non-linearity of their political actions too: Jesuits had a conflictual relationship with both the local sovereigns and the ecclesiastic hierarchy. It is in no way possible to reduce their political activity to the defense of the Roman Church or to the fight against the evangelical heresy. As pointed out above, many criteria come into play, and morals, theology, and politics merge in an indistinct whole, as confirmed by the theologian Martinus Becanus:

Pax Republicae sine unitate fidei conservari non potest [...]. Haeretici magis perturbant pacem Christianam, quam homicide, fures, adultery: at si hi juste puniuntur poena capitis: Ergo, multo magis illi. Maior probata est, quia pax Christiana est duplex: una Ecclesiastica, quae consistit in unitate fidei et Sacramentorum; Altera politica, quae consistit in externa iustitia et tranquillitate.<sup>41</sup>

The religious pluralism is therefore incompatible, in Jesuits’ thought, with the tranquillity of the *polis*.

The opposition to the religious pluralism originated from a series of complex reasons and exceeded the limit of a seventeenth-century event. Hidden under the faith and the confessional tolerance and in the pretext of peace, the *patres* perceived the seep of gnoseological relativism and moral laxism that are waivers of the truth and

<sup>40</sup> See the polemical works collation in Duhr Bernhard, *Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Laedern deutscher Zunge*, Freiburg, 1913, vol. 2, p. 378.

<sup>41</sup> Martinus Becanus, *Manuale Controversiarum huius temporis de fide ac religione*, Wuerzburg, 1623. See Joseph Lecler S. J., *Storia della Tolleranza nel secolo della Riforma*, Brescia, 1967, p. 341–345.

the ‘good’ that the Church cannot accept. Neither can be accepted by the political authority – claim the Jesuits – that can not reduce its function to that of the guarantor of public order. The words of the Jesuit Adam Tanner support this statement:

Invenias qui pacem usque adeo exoptent, ut iustitiam omnem, religionemque ei posthabendam censeat [...] quod si causam inquiras reperies pacem ab eis non alio fine tantopere exopatri, quam ut ventri, et illicitibus voluptatibus liberius indulgeat: bellum eos non aliam ob causam exhorrescere, nisi quia vel invitos a consueta vitae licentia arcet, atque ad aliquam modestiam et moderationem voluptatumque abstinentiam cogit.<sup>42</sup>

The picture become more complex. While on the external front there stand the heretics, in the internal one an even more insidious enemy is active: the *politiques*, the libertines who, with their indifference, supplanted the religious values from bottom up.

However, it would be naive to believe that the invective of Tanner rose simply from his phobia for the sins of the flesh. “The central point on which the supremacy of the Church over the other aspects of the worldly sphere resides is the scission between religion and politics, between the traditional morality and a Machiavellism widespread in the common mentality”<sup>43</sup>. A ‘new science’ of power, stimulated by the recent scientific discoveries, is spreading among the society at all levels. At the top it is producing the ‘phantoms’ of State Reason, of which the *patres* perceived the consequences in terms of abuse of power and systematic violence; among the reformed nobility it generated the *taciturnitas conspiratoria*; but among the acculturated classes, those of the ‘pseudo-politicians’, it disseminated prejudicial hostility and diffidence toward the authorities both secular and spiritual.

A clear accusation of the ‘scientific approach’, of the politics and its connection with the scientific discoveries appeared during the Bohemian insurrection. It is the letter intercepted by the Vallonian soldiers during the campaign of Bohemia and published by the Catholic authorities, as an example, in 1620 with the title *Epistola Wenceslai Meroschwa Bohemi ad Ioannem Traut Norimbergensem* (in Biblioteca Vaticana Chigi IV.22214)<sup>44</sup>.

<sup>42</sup> Adam Tanner, *Amuletum Castrense*, Ingolstadt, 1620, p. 167–168.

<sup>43</sup> Gui Francesco, *Op. cit.*, p. 20.

<sup>44</sup> See Rosario Villari, *Elogio della Dissimulazione*, Roma-Bari, 1987, p. 20–21. Here appears the comparison between the discovery of the lens by Galileo and the ‘specularia’ of the ‘*politicus novus*’ prized by Meroschwa (taken from Klopp O., *Der dreissigjaehrige Krieg bis zum Tode Gustav Adolfs*, Paderborn, 1891, p. 512): Nunc quemadmodum novi Mathematici per tubos suos novas in firmamento stellas, novas in Sole maculas reppererunt; Ita quoque politicismus novus sua habet specularia, opticeque, in qua alia membra divisionis addita priscis relucet.

The new consciousness allowed to better appreciate the techniques of power and to adopt them to defend from the machination of the sovereigns:

Totus mundus fucō utitur, cum Vulpibus vulpinandum est. Nec infame est violasse iurisiurandi religionem. Fecerunt hoc nostri Principes; nos cariores habebunt, si non modo pro eis patiamur et belligeremus sed etiam peieremus.

In other words, the men of the Society, resolute to achieve the ‘true’ political-religious peace, seemed to prefer the hypothesis of a *bellum sacrum* rather than promote the dangerous consolidation of a ‘false peace’ characterized by confessional spontaneity and political indifference. It would be wrong to state that they were promoting the war directly to give the control of that region to the Roman Church. Many internal conflicts with the local clergy, the central authorities in Rome and the Catholic sovereigns characterized the political life of the Society of Jesus during the Bohemian insurrection. What in the beginning appeared to be a surprising fact – the opposition of Jesuits to the peace when it seemed to be possible to achieve it under the control of the empire, the paladin of the Catholic orthodoxy – is now the clear expression of their thought: politics and morals are indissolubly bound. The reasons for the opposition to the possible peace have to be found in its price: religious tolerance. Hidden under the faith and confessional tolerance and in the pretext of peace, in fact, the *patres* perceived the seep ofgnoseological relativism and of moral laxism. These, in turn, were the main dangers as well as the biggest obstacles against the achievement of the Jesuits’ supreme aim: the preservation of an order whose legitimacy resided in the orthodoxy and in the hierarchical subordination to Rome.

## CONCLUSION

To sum up the argument, the Jesuits in the 16<sup>th</sup> century seemed to be promoting the idea of a united Europe, united both politically and with regard to faith in order to defeat the external enemy, the Turks. Nonetheless, that external enemy became a simple pretext for the claim of an internal unity. This internal unity appeared to be in crisis as it had never been before, a crisis due mainly to the Reformation that turned out to be more insidious than even the Turks. The Reformation, in fact, did not present itself as a dangerous enemy, but as an innovative force able to change the society from within. Particularly dangerous seemed to be the spread of the Calvinist “heresy.” A heresy that created, together with the new philosophy of science, the *politiques*, the libertines who, with their moral laxism and a new political philosophy, supplanted the religious values from the bottom up. It was Becanus who individuated in the “desperate predestination” of Calvin the origin of the *homines politici*. This pseudo-politicians are disseminating prejudicial hostility and diffidence toward the authorities both secular and spiritual. The whole system is in danger. If it is true that the peace of the Republic cannot be preserved without the unity of the Faith (*Pax Republicae sine unitate fidei conservari non potest*, stated Becanus), it is even more true that the peace of the Christianity is twofold: one Ecclesiastic, the unity of faith, the other political (*pax Christiana est duplex: una Ecclesiastica, quae consistit in unitate fidei et Sacramentorum; Altera politica, quae consistit in externa iustitia et tranquillitate*). The

most dangerous enemy was the Calvinist heresy because it was acting on both the ecclesiastical sphere and on the political one.

Adam Tanner, Martin Becanus and Albert Wijuk-Koialowicz were all actively engaged in the struggle against the insidious heresy, but while the two non-Lithuanians preferred the polemical attitude, Koialowicz adopted one more congenial to his nature: the pedagogic one. An educator in all his works, Koialowicz took part in the battle against the heresy in a more subtle way “creating a psychological and cognitive space in which the fantastic reinvention, activating memory, imagination, affections, and intelligence were trained to observe reality in an ordered, conscious and orientated manner”. A manner orientated, of course, toward the preservation of an order whose legitimacy resided in the religious, political, and moral orthodoxy. The examples that compose *Historia Lituana* have to be read in three levels: there is the historical-narrative level that describes the events of the past like the wars against the Tartars; there is a religious level, that tries to raise the idea of the union of the Christian Churches in the struggle against Muslims evoking the danger of the lack of unity among Christians; and, finally, there is a more complex level in which morals, religion, and politics merge in the internal fight against thegnoseological relativism and the moral laxism arising from the Calvinist heresy and the new scientific thought.

Moreno Bonda

#### ALBERTAS VIJŪKAS-KOJALAVIČIUS KAIP ISTORIKAS JĖZUITAS

##### Santrauka

Straipsnio autorius per Lietuvos istoriją siekia parodyti Alberto Vijūko-Kojalavičiaus pažiūras, lygina jas su kitais dviem to meto jėzuitų autoriais – Adamu Tanneriu ir Martinu Becanu. Autorius gina tezę, kad visiems trims rūpėjo kova su „nuožmia erezija“, tačiau abu nelietuviai tai darė tik polemizuodami, o Kojalavičius pasirinko artimesnį savo pašaukimui metodą – pedagoginį. Lietuvos istorijos autorius visa savo siela buvo mokytojas, jis siekė palaikyti tvarką, kurios pateisinimą užtikrino religinė, politinė ir dorovinė ortodoksija.

Kojalavičiaus tekste straipsnio autorius išvelgia tris lygmenis. Tai istorinis-naratyvinis, aprašantis praeities įvykius, kaip antai karas su totoriais; religinis, iškeliantis krikščionių bažnyčių vienybės idėją, kuri labai svarbi kovojant su musulmonais; galop trečias lygmuo, kur dorovė, religija ir politika susipina vidaus kovoje sugnoseologiniu reliatyvizmu ir moraliniu laisvumu, kylančiais iš kalvinistinės erezijos ir naujojo mokslinio mąstymo.

Straipsnio pradžioje autorius polemizuoja su ankstesnėmis Dariaus Kuolio ir Giovannos Brogi Bercoff studijomis apie Kojalavičiaus Lietuvos istoriją: pirmuoju atveju pažymi interpretacijos anachronizmą, o antruoju – pasigenda stipresnio komparatyvistinio pagrindimo. Tačiau šios dvi studijos tampa išeities taškais paties autoriaus svarstymams.