

LIETUVIŲ KATALIKŲ MOKSLO AKADEMIJA / LITHUANIAN CATHOLIC ACADEMY OF SCIENCE

BAŽNYČIOS ISTORIJOS STUDIJOS, VI

KRIKŠČIONYS IR
NEKRIKŠČIONYS
KITI

STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY, VI

CHRISTIANS AND
THE NON-CHRISTIAN
OTHER



VILNIUS, 2013



Projekto kodas: VP1-3.2-ŠMM-V-02-002

Periodinių mokslo leidinių leidyba

LKMA METRAŠTIS, t. XXXVII / LCAS ANNUALS, vol. XXXVII
Serija B: Bažnyčios istorijos studijos / Series B: Studies in Church History

BAŽNYČIOS ISTORIJOS STUDIJŲ REDAKTORIŲ KOLEGIJA / EDITORIAL BOARD

Dr. LIUDAS JOVAIŠA (vyr. redaktorius / chief editor)
Vilniaus universitetas / Vilnius University

Dr. VYTAUTAS ALIŠAUSKAS
Vilniaus universitetas / Vilnius University

Dr. DARIUS BARONAS
Lietuvos istorijos institutas / The Lithuanian Institute of History

Dr. MINDAUGAS PAKNYŠ
Lietuvos kultūros tyrimų institutas / Lithuanian Culture Research Institute

Dr. ARŪNAS STREIKUS
Vilniaus universitetas / Vilnius University

Dr. PAULIUS SUBAČIUS
Vilniaus universitetas / Vilnius University

MINGAILĖ JURKUTĖ (ats. sekretorė / executive secretary)

Tomo sudarytojas / Editor of volume dr. ARŪNAS STREIKUS

LKMA Metraščio redakcinės kolegijos pirmininkas LKMA akademikas /
Chairman of the LCAS Annuals editorial board LCAS academician

vysk. dr. JONAS BORUTA SJ

Pilies g. 8, Vilnius, LT-01123
contacts@lkma.lt, www.lkma.lt

© LKMA, 2013

ISSN 1392-0502

TURINYS

<i>Sudarytojo pratarė</i>	5
<i>Editor's Comment</i>	7
S. C. ROWELL	9
Christian Understanding of the Faith through Contacts with Non-Christians in the Late-Mediaeval Grand Duchy of Lithuania	
PAWEŁ KRAS.	23
An Overview: The Conversion of Pagans and Concept of <i>Ius Gentium</i> in the Writings of Cracow Professors in the First Half of the Fifteenth Century	
YVES KRUMENACKER	55
Can We Give the Gospel to Those Who Have not Heard of It? Reformed Theological Discourses about the Salvation of Pagans in the Early Modern Era	
HARTMUT LEHMANN.	71
Martin Luther and the Turks	
VAIDA KAMUNTAVIČIENĖ.	77
Catholics and Jews in the Diocese of Vilnius in the 17th Century According to the Catholic Church Visitations	
WIOLETTA PAWLIKOWSKA-BUTTERWICK	87
The Vilnius Cathedral Chapter and the Jews in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: Cases from the Acts of the Cathedral Chapter	
SERGEJUS TEMČINAS	105
Jewish Attitudes to Byzantium's Troubles? The Definition of Hebrew <i>Kaftor</i> in the Cyrillic Manuscript Manual of Hebrew (According to the Extant Sixteenth-Century Copy)	
ELENA KEIDOŠIŪTĖ.	115
What Should a Catholic Know? Shifting Trends in the Preparation of a Jewish Catechumen for Baptism in the 18-20-Century Lithuania	

PHILIPPE DENIS	133
Mission, Civilisation and Coercion in Colonial Natal. Abbot Frantz Pfanner and the African “Other” in Mariannhill (1882–1909)	
JOSÉ ANDRÉS-GALLEGO	155
Christians in Search of Non-Christian Certitudes: Naturism, Spiritualism, Theosophy (From Catalonia to Asiatic Cultures, 1917–1930)	
ANTÓN M. PAZOS	169
Vision of the Other for Catholics, Christians and Non-Christians in the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939)	
GAŠPER MITHANS	189
On the Field of Conflict: Power Relations Among Catholics, Serbian Orthodox Christians, Muslims and State Authorities in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia	
ANDERS JARLERT	207
The Application of the Nuremberg Race Laws on Christian and Non-Christian Jews by the Church of Sweden, 1935–1945	
BERNARD ARDURA	219
Effects of the Second Vatican Council: Pope John Paul II’s Attitude Towards Non-Believers	
MARIA PETROVA	229
Religious Situation in Post-Communist Russia	
<i>Santraukos / Summaries</i>	241
<i>Asmenvardžių rodyklė / Index of Persons</i>	253
<i>Vietovardžių rodyklė / Index of Place Names</i>	263
<i>Apie autorius / Notes on Contributors</i>	271
<i>Guidelines for Submissions</i>	277

SUDARYTOJO PRATARMĖ

Krikščionybės istorijos tyrimų skatinimas visuomet buvo ir tebėra prioritetas Lietuvos katalikų mokslo akademijos veiklos baras. Tęsdama prieš kelerius metus pradėtą Lietuvoje vykdomų Bažnyčios istorijos tyrimų integravimą į tarptautinį akademinį diskursą, 2013 m. birželio 6–8 d. akademija, bendromis pastangomis su Tarptautine lyginamosios Bažnyčios istorijos komisija (Commission Internationale d'Histoire Ecclésiastique Comparée), surengė mokslinę konferenciją „Christians and the Non-Christian Other“. Konferencija, kurioje pranešimus skaitė dvi dešimtys Bažnyčios istorikų iš Lietuvos ir užsienio šalių, nors ir turėdama aiškiai apibrėžtą teminį rakursą, išsiskyrė plačia chronologine bei geografinė aprėptimi. Krikščionių santykis su nekrikščionimis nagrinėtas pradedant kryžiaus žygių epocha ir baigiant šiuolaikine tradicinių krikščionių konfesijų bendravimo su nekrikščionimis bei netikinčiais problematika. Nors dauguma konferencijos pranešėjų pristatė krikščionių konflikto ar sugyvenimo su nekrikščionimis (daugiausia žydais ir musulmonais) pavyzdžius iš Europos istorinės patirties, juos tikrai įdomiai papildė Dominikonų ordino brolio, Kvazulu-Natalio universiteto istorijos profesoriaus Philippe'o Deniso pranešimas apie krikščionių misionierių patirtį XIX a. pabaigos Pietų Afrikoje.

Šeštajame Bažnyčios istorijos studijų tome publikuojami šioje konferencijoje skaitytų pranešimų pagrindu parengti straipsniai, išsamiau pristatantys konferencijoje dažnai tik punktyrine linija nužymėtas temas. Nors ne visi konferencijos dalyviai savo pranešimams ryžosi suteikti tekstinį pavidalą, galima tvirtinti, kad 15 spausdinamų tekstų ir pakankamai reprezentatyviai atspindi konferencijos pobūdį, ir sudaro solidų teminį straipsnių rinkinį. Palydėdamas jį į viešumą, viliuosi, kad jis atras savo vietą ne tik Lietuvos akademinėse bibliotekose, bet patrauks ir užsienio tyrinėtojų dėmesį. Taip jis padėtų išsipildyti konferencijos organizatorių vilčiai, kad tokie renginiai gali būti prasmingi ne vien nedideliame specialistų būreliui.

Arūnas Streikus

EDITOR'S COMMENT

The promotion of research on the history of Christianity always has been and continues to be a priority field of the activities of the Lithuanian Catholic Academy of Science. Continuing the integration of the on-going studies of the history of the Church in Lithuania into international academic discourse started several years ago, on 6-8 June 2013 the Academy together with the International Comparative Church History Commission (Commission Internationale d'Histoire Ecclésiastique Comparée) organized the scholarly conference "Christians and the Non-Christian Other". Even though it had clearly defined thematic perspectives, the conference, at which a score of Church historians from Lithuania and foreign countries gave presentations, was distinguished by its wide chronological and geographical coverage. The relations of Christians with non-Christians was analyzed beginning with the era of the Crusades and ending with the modern problems of the interaction of traditional Christian denominations with non-Christians and non-believers. Although most of the conference speakers presented examples of the Christian conflict /coexistence with non-Christians (mostly Jews and Muslims) from the historical experience of Europe, they were really supplemented in an interesting way by the report of the Dominican friar, KwaZulu-Natal University history professor Philippe Denis, OP about the experience of Christian missionaries at the end of the 19th c. in South Africa.

The sixth volume of Studies in Church History contains articles based on the papers presented at the conference, discussing in more detail topics often only outlined at the conference. While not all of the participants at the conference decided to give the text of their reports, it can be argued that the 15 texts printed in this volume reflect in a sufficiently representative manner the nature of the conference and make a solid collection of thematic topics. With its public appearance, I hope that it will find its place not only on the shelves of Lithuanian academic libraries, but will also attract the attention of foreign researchers. In this way it would fulfill the hope of the conference's organizers that such events can be meaningful not just for a small circle of specialists.

Arūnas Streikus

S. C. ROWELL

CHRISTIAN UNDERSTANDING OF THE FAITH
THROUGH CONTACTS WITH NON-CHRISTIANS
IN THE LATE-MEDIAEVAL GRAND DUCHY OF
LITHUANIA

It goes without saying that we often define ourselves by comparison with others, whom more likely than not we regard as different and perhaps dangerous, as it suits us. Fourteenth-century Lithuania was defined by her Catholic enemies as a quintessence of Otherness, a dangerous place on the very edge of Christendom, where pagans, schismatics and Tatars abounded.* This geographical definition of Lithuania's position in the physical and spiritual worlds was accepted by Lithuanians themselves once the country officially had become Roman Catholic in 1387, and they exploited the established cliché for their own benefit. In the fifteenth century, for example, newly elected bishops of Vilnius or Žemaitija used the argument that they lived *in partibus, in confiniis christianitatis*, as lambs surrounded by ravenous wolves in the form of Mohammedan Tatars, pagans and Orthodox schismatics to obtain release from their duty to travel to Rome, *ad limina apostolorum*; ring the pagan bell and the Pavlovian Pope might grant your supplication for a spiritual privilege, or award princes the right to deflect funds owed to Rome towards pressing local needs¹. We might therefore be justified in imagining that relations between Lithuanian

* This paper was given as part of a research Project funded by EU Global Grant No. VP1-3.1-ŠMM-07-K-03-008.

¹ S. C. Rowell, "Kaip šaukė, taip ir atsiliepė: XV a. lietuvių katalikų gyvenimas ir pagonybės liekanų mitas", in: *Lietuvos didžiosios kunigaikštystės istorijos kraštovaizdis: Mokslinių straipsnių rinkinys skirtas profesorės Jūratės Kiaupienės 65-mečiui*, ed. Ramunė Šmigelskytė-Stukienė, Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos institutas, 2012, pp. 295–320.

Christians, Catholic, Unionist and Orthodox and the non-Christian other, in this case Rabbinical Jews, Karaites and Muslim Tatars, might be exclusively inimical, or at least limited to strictly professional spheres². It may appear that an eighteenth-century manuscript Tatar *kitab*, which adapts a sixteenth-century Polish translation and adaptation of a Jewish apocryphal story of Adam and Eve from a Catholic Latin text, popular in Poland during the fifteenth century, is no more than an accident out of time and space. This is the *Vita Adae et Evae* which appeared in Krzysztof Pussman's 1551 *Historyya bardzo cudna*³.

Late mediaeval Lithuanian Catholicism was a vibrant, exoteric religion of action rather than contemplation, whose officials were incapable of maintaining as much control of popular devotions and church building as they wished⁴. Stereotypically, (in historical studies) Jews were acknowledged financial experts in government employ and physicians, while Tatars served as a loyal defence force guarding the Grand Duchy from attacks by Muscovites and Steppe Tatars. It is interesting to note another safely-defined area where the expertise of these two communities might be called upon by the grand dukes' Christian subjects. There is some evidence of theological communication between the different faith communities in Lithuania before the Reformation and Counter Reformation which introduced a sectarian requirement to consider what True Religion is in the face of Other Christians (whereby rudimentary Catholic practices were declared to be pagan⁵) and the non-Christian Other, in response to

² Jews (Rabbinical and Karaite) were expelled from the Grand Duchy by Grand Duke Alexander between 1495 and 1503. They were re-admitted to the realm after agreeing to provide more subventions for the on-going military conflict against Muscovy.

³ Czesław Łapicz, "Chrześcijańsko-musulmańska interferencja religijna w rękopisach Tatarów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego", in: *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės kalbos, kultūros ir raštijos tradicijos*, (ser. *Bibliotheca archive lithuanici*, 7), Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos institutas, 2009, pp. 293–310; Teresa Michałowska, *Średniowiecze*, Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 2008, pp. 594, 596, 597.

⁴ S. C. Rowell, "Was Fifteenth-Century Lithuanian Catholicism as lukewarm as reformers and commentators would have us believe?", in: *Central Europe*, vol. 8, no. 2, 2010, pp. 86–106; S. C. Rowell, "Kaip šaukė, taip ir atsiliėpė".

⁵ Most clear perhaps in Martynas Mažvydas' fifth letter (addressed to the duke

which the great Karaite divine, Isaac ben Abraham of Trakai, wrote his defence of Judaism, making use of, *inter alia*, Christian texts to confound Christian attacks on his Faith⁶.

A few years ago an edition of a curious manuscript formulary of unknown parentage and provenance, now in the Czartoryski Library in Kraków, was published. In the nineteenth century it belonged briefly to the legal historian Tadeusz Czacki⁷, but we do not know where or how he acquired it. The compiler of Czartoryski Ms 1399 had an interest in, among other legal and political issues, disputes with non-Christians over the nature of Christ which took place at the court of a King Casimir, who seems from circumstances to have been the fourth of that name (grand duke of Lithuania, 1440–1492, king of Poland 1447–1492). This manuscript points to a rather more elaborate development of Judaeo-Christian relations in Casimir IV's reign than the usual historians' tales of Jewish doctors and tax collectors (professionals performing specific tasks and living under particular conditions and subject to special rights discretely from other social groups) interspersed with the dullard anti-Semitism of a Capistrano, Oleśnicki or Długosz. Polish sermons on Jewish desecration of the Host are well known from the fifteenth century

of Prussia in 1551) which refers to his protestant parishioners who cross the border into idolatrous Lithuania: "parrochiani, quibus papisticae caeremoniae placent, eo proficiscuntur et abominandam ibidem idololatriam complent... ceteri... domi incesnis ad parietem candelis cereis sanctorum patrocina implorantes more idololatrium festa eadem colunt..." (Martynas Mažvydas, *Katekizmas ir kiti raštai / Catechismus und andere Schriften*, Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 1993, p. 674).

⁶ Marek Waysblum, "Isaac of Troki and Christian controversy in the XVI century", in: *The Journal of Jewish Studies*, vol. 3, 1952, pp. 62–77. A new Lithuanian translation of *Hizzuq 'Emunah* with a specialist introduction was published in 2009: Izaokas ben Abraomas Trakiškis, *Tikėjimo sutvirtinimas*, translated by Kristina Gudytė with an introduction by Jurgita Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė and Golda Achiezer, Vilnius: Aidai, 2009. On shared Jewish, Muslim and Christian patriotism in the sixteenth-century Grand Duchy see S. C. Rowell, "Lietuva, tėvyne mūsų? Tam tikrų XVI a. LDK raštijų pavyzdžiai", in: *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, vol. 6, 1998, pp. 123–137.

⁷ Kaji Sayaka, "Research on the History of Lithuania at Vilnius University in the early nineteenth century", in: *From Kraków to Vilnius: Report of the 2nd international itinerant seminar "The Common Heritage of Eastern Borderlands of Europe" (2010)*, Tokyo: Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, 2013, pp. 47–53.

as giving grounds for pogroms⁸. Processions in honour of, and devotion to the Blessed Sacrament were particularly popular in Lithuania during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, and indeed the first mention in the Vilnius Chapter Records of theoretical Jews in Vilnius also refers to desecration of the Host, but in this case the desecrator is a simple Lithuanian Catholic, apparently ignorant of his *Pater noster*, who takes Communion on Christmas Day 1523 in St John's Parish Church without having been to confession and removes the host from his mouth and puts it in his pouch⁹. He later desecrates it in front of a woman, who is suitably shocked at this sacrilege. When detained by guards, he claims that he had been paid a generous sum of 20 groats by Jews to steal the Host with the (incredible) promise of a further 1200 (*viginti sexagenas*) groats on delivery. The story makes little or no sense, since according to tradition, Jews were supposed to pay a Christian to

⁸ *De expulsione Iudaeorum*, ed. Aleksander Semkowicz, (ser. *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, V), Kraków, 1878, pp. 785–9; K. Bracha, “O cudzie hostii i ekscesach antyżydowskich wokół egzemplum w kazaniu *De corpore Christi* z tzw. Kolekcji Piotra z Miłosławia (XVw.)”, in: *Ecclesia et civitas. Kościół i życie religijne w mieście średniowiecznym*, ed. Halina Manikowska, Hanna Zaremska, (ser. *Colloquia Mediaevalia Varsaviensia*, III), Warsaw: Instytut Historii PAN, 2002, pp. 483–491.

⁹ On devotion to the Blessed Sacrament in late-medieval Lithuania see: S. C. Rowell, “XV a. LDK vyskupų atlaidos raštai Vilniaus katedrai bei miestui: Tekstas ir kontekstas”, in: *Lietuvos pilys*, vol. 3, Vilnius, 2008, pp. 94–104; the 1523 desecration – *Manuscript Department of the Wróblewski Library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences*, f. 43, b. 210/1, fol. 66v: “sacrilegium Eucharistie venerabilis Sacramenti in parrochiali Sancti Joannis Vilne commissum. Eodem die Natalis Domini [1523 m.] quidem homo simplex Lythuanus veniens ad ecclesiam parrochiale Sancti Joannis Vilne infra missarum sollennia et inter ceteros Christifideles communicans, non premissa confessione nec sciens *Pater noster* divinissimum Sacramentum Eucharistie suscepit eoque suscepto exiens de ecclesia manu propria ipsum Sacramentum de ore exemit et in marsubium posuit ut demum per denunciationem cuiusdem mulieris, cui horridum sacrilegium aperi... et in carcerem coniectus. Postmodum feria tertia extunc immediate sequente, facta inquisitione contra eum, post multos errores, quibus pauper sacrilegus implicitus fuit, dudum se esse corruptum a Judeis et habuisset viginti grossorum pro quovis ab eis et adhuc expectare viginti sexagenas pecuniarum ... ”; summary in: Jan Kurczewski, *Kościół zamkowy czyli katedra wileński w jej dziejowym, liturgicznym, architektonicznym i ekonomicznym rozwoju*, Część III, Wilno: Drukiem Józefa Zawadzkiego, 1916, p. 17, 1912, p. 17.

provide a Host, which they would desecrate themselves in synagogue. Perhaps the court scribe inferred Jewish connivance in the incident, or the criminal attempted to excuse his actions on the basis of nonsense he had heard in an anti-Semitic sermon.

The Czartoryski story, for want of a better definition, presents us with an *exemplum-cum-anecdote*, which, although not free from violence, is hardly (or at least not brazenly) anti-Semitic. It is unclear whether this evidence comes from the court in Kraków or Vilnius and it may even be fictional, but even if it is, it presumes that such an association between Casimir and non-Christian divines was credible¹⁰.

The main episode, which is related in almost dramatic form, involves a learned Jew, named Zub, whom Casimir endowed with favours, an equally learned Tatar named Tymyrza and a Catholic canon called Stanisław. The names are all stereotypical to the point of bordering on nicknames (such as “Toothy” – *Zub*) and we know no more about these men than the details given in the manuscript. However, Casimir’s sons had a chamber servant named Zub, who is recorded as the recipient of gifts from Casimir in the royal accounts for 1476; but he is unlikely to have been Jewish¹¹. Records of fifteenth-century Kraków Jewry, as published by Bożena Wyrozumska, record no one of this name¹². In Lithuania there was a “Trakai Jew” (*scilicet* Karaite) named Zubets, with a business later in Kaunas, who received favours from the grand duke, according to the *kniga danin*, and it seems more likely that a Jew would encounter a Tatar at court in Lithuania rather than Poland, a pre-figuration of the confessional debates fired by Isaac ben Abraham of Trakai in the next century¹³. The Muslim name Timur is so common that

¹⁰ On the problem of reality and fiction in formulary texts see Maria Koczerska, “Rzeczywistość i fikcja w formularzach polskich XV wieku”, in: *Literatura i kultura polskiego średniowiecza. Człowiek wobec świata znaków i symboli*, ed. Paulina Buchwald-Pelcowa and Janusz Pelc, Warszawa: Instytut Historii Sztuki, 1995, pp. 23–38.

¹¹ *Rachunki królewskie z lat 1471–1472 i 1476–1478*, ed. Stanisław Gawęda et al., Wrocław-Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1960, pp. 132, 196, 208.

¹² Bożena Wyrozumska, *Żydzi w średniowiecznym Krakowie. Wpisy źródłowe y ksiąg miejskich krakowskich*, Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1995.

¹³ “Zubets of Trakai”, in: *Lietuvos Metrika: Knyga Nr. 4 (1479–1491). Užrašymų*

it is impossible to track our disputant down. As for Canon Stanisław, this is a name which is also almost generic, although we know of three Vilnius canons from the second half of the fifteenth century bearing that name, not to mention clerics in Kraków¹⁴. Queen Elisabeth's chaplain was named Stanisław.

In short, the Muslim Tatar strikes the Jew in the king's presence for referring to Christ as the carpenter's son. When asked to explain his action, Tymyrza explains that his religion does not tolerate blasphemy against Jesus Christ. The canon laughs because this debate has been going on between the most learned Christians and Jews "for more than two hundred years" and the Tatar thinks he will find an answer "quickly by breaking a pate". The person recalling this event clearly has some acquaintance with both Jewish and Muslim worlds and the varying degrees of respect owed to Jesus. The period of time mentioned, "for more than two centuries" may refer back to the Council of Lyons in 1274, when Pope Gregory X called upon the head of the Dominicans to propagate greater devotion to the Holy Name and recognition of the Divinity of Christ¹⁵. The cult of the Holy Name was certainly popular in fifteenth-century Catholic Europe. The reference to *filius carpentarii* may be based on the Gospel text – Matthew xiii.55, where Our Lord is referred to by Jews offended by his teaching in synagogue as *fabri filius*. St Joseph is not mentioned in the Koran, which respects the Virginity of Mary (surah 3: 38–48); however, the popular fifteenth-century Persian

knyga 4, ed. Lina Anužytė, Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos institutas, 2004, pp. 36, 79; *Akty Litovskoi metriki*, ed. F. I. Leontovich, vol. 1, Warsaw, 1897, no. 5 dated 1495-09-24; Isaac ben Abraham – see above, note 5.

¹⁴ Jerzy Ochmański, *Biskupstwo wileńskie w średniowieczu. Ustrój i uposażenie*, Poznań: UAM, 1972, p. 35.

¹⁵ Gregory X to John of Vercelli, on 20th September 1274 (xii kal oct 1274): "We have also judged it proper to persuade the faithful to demonstrate more reverence for that name above all names, the only name in which we claim salvation- the name of Jesus Christ, Who has redeemed us from the bondage of sin. Consequently, in view of obeying that apostolic precept, in the Name of Jesus let every knee be bent; we wish that at the Holy Sacrifice, everyone would bow his head in token that interiorly he bends the knee of his heart." Quoted from: <http://www.willingshepherds.net/Dominican%20Confraternities.html>

general history refers to St Joseph as a carpenter and kinsman (but not the betrothed or husband) of Mary (Mir-khvand (d.1498), Rawzat-as-safa, Gardens of Purity).

Devotion to the Holy Name was promoted in late-mediaeval Lithuania by the Bernardines; other Christological devotions can be glimpsed occasionally in ecclesiastical endowments – such as the ordering of regular masses *de quinque vulneribus, de passione Christi* at Zelva, Dory and Vilnius cathedral in 1508, 1511 and 1505¹⁶. Most visible and longest-lasting is the cult of Our Lord as the Man of Sorrows¹⁷.

What interests Casimir's court is the divinity and humanity of Jesus Christ. This in itself is a key to the anti-Trinitarian views alleged to have been rampant in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, leading to the Judaizing Heresy in Novgorod, whose origins are attributed by tradition to the Lithuanian prince of that city, Mikhail Olelkovich (to whom we shall return later)¹⁸. The mystery of the Sacred Name is discussed in the Czartoryski manuscript by Bishop Jan Lubrański (of Poznań)¹⁹ with two Jews, or perhaps one Jew and one Converso. Lubrański offers the traditional Christian interpretation of Psalm 109 verse 1, *dixit Dominus Domino meo*, whereby The L*RD (Jahweh) speaks to Our Lord (Adonai, understood here to mean Jesus Christ). The Jew Ezechiel finds it difficult to discuss this verse because of the prohibition on speaking the L*RD's

¹⁶ Alicja Szulc, *Homo religiosus późnego średniowiecza. Bernardyński model religijności masowej*, Poznań: Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza: Wydział Teologiczny, 2007; Rūta Janonienė, *Bernardinų bažnyčia ir konventas Vilniuje. Pranciškoniškojo dvasingumo atspindžiai ansamblio įrangoje ir puošyboje*, Vilnius: Aidai, 2010.

¹⁷ Grażyna Jurkowlaniec, *Chrystus Umęczony. Ikonografia w Polsce od XIII do XVI wieku*, Warsaw: Wydawn. DiG, 2001; Gabija Surdokaitė, "Rūpintojėlio kultas Lietuvoje", in: *LDK sakralinė dailė: Atodangos ir naujieji kontekstai*, (ser. *Acta academiae artium Vilnensis*, vol. 51), Vilnius, 2008, pp. 155–65. The image is desecrated by modern Lithuanians as a topos of folk art and used in alcohol advertisements.

¹⁸ John L. I. Fennell, *Ivan the Great of Moscow*, London: Macmillan, 1961, pp. 324–25, 329.

¹⁹ Zbigniew Zyglewski, "Jan Lubrański biskup płocki, 1497–1498", in: *Nasza Przeszłość*, 1994, vol. 82, pp. 97–112; *Kronika miasta Poznania*, vol. 2: *Jan Lubrański i jego dzieło*, Poznań, 1999. Lubrański was probably bishop of Poznań (1498) when this text was written rather than when the events took place. He served Casimir from 1489 and took part in various missions.

Name, while another announces to the Cardinal of Santa Croce di Gerusalemme (probably the Spanish archbishop Bernardino Lopez de Carvajal) that the Sacred Name (Iesus, understood by Christians to signify “salus Jahveh”), which is not obvious from the Hebrew text of the psalm of course, has been misunderstood here. In the mid-sixteenth century Isaac ben Abraham of Trakai refers to a dispute over this text in the fortieth chapter of the First Part of *Hizzuq ’emunah*, where he cites the Anti-Trinitarian Simon Budny in support of the Jewish interpretation of the text as a reference to King David²⁰.

The fifteenth-century sermons published by Karl Heinrich Meyer in 1931 refer to Polish Catholics who are Sabbatarian and fear accusations of Judaizing²¹. We might imagine that there was a certain amount of dialogue between Jews and Gentiles. However, this “curiosity” is listed alongside such other grievous errors as refusing to wash one’s hair or bathe on a Friday out of respect for Christ’s suffering. Could such devotional sensitivities be the result of the growing interest in private religious practice encouraged in the fifteenth century as part of the so-called *devotio moderna*?

There is further evidence of direct or indirect influence by Jews on Christian Lithuanians, both Catholic and Orthodox, from mid-fifteenth-century Kiev. These have been discussed in great detail by the Israeli scholar Moshe Taube and the Lithuanian, Dr Sergey Temchin²².

²⁰ Izaak ben Abraomas Trakiškis, *Tikėjimo sutvirtinimas*, pp. 194–197.

²¹ *Sermones polonici saeculi decimi quinti* in *Fontes historiae religionis slavicae*, ed. K. H. Meyer, Berlin, 1931, p. 74.

²² Sergey Temchin, “Skharia i Skorina: ob istochnikakh vilenskogo vetkhozavetnogo svoda (f 19-262)”, in: *Senoji Lietuvos Literatūra*, 2006, vol. 21, pp. 289–314; Sergejus Temčinas, “Bažnytinės knygos rusėnų kalba ir religiniai identitetai slaviškose Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštijos žemėse XIV–XVIIIa. Stačiatikių tradicija”, in: *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštijos tradicija ir paveldo „dalybos“*, ed. Alfredas Bumblauskas et al., Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos institutas, 2008, pp. 149–155; Sergey Temchin, “Kirillicheskie rukopisnye uchebnye drevneevreiskogo iazyka (XVI v.) i vilenskii vetkhozavednyi svod”, in: *Knygotyra*, 2011, vol. 57, pp. 86–99; Moshe Taube, “The fifteenth-century Ruthenian translations from Hebrew and the Heresy of the Judaizers. Is there a connection?”, in: *Speculum Slaviae orientalis: Muscovy, Ruthenia and Lithuania in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. Vyacheslav V. Ivanov, Julia Verkholtantsev, Moscow: Novoe izdatel’stvo, 2005, pp. 185–208.

It seems to be agreed that the author of the fifteenth-century translations of books of the Old Testament (Job, Ruth, Song of Songs, Proverbs, Daniel, Ecclesiasticus, Jeremiah, Esther) from Hebrew into Ruthenian was a Kievan Jew named Zacharias ben Aaron ha-Cohen, associated with the Orthodox Lithuanian prince of Kiev, Mikhail Olelkovich. He also translated astrological and philosophical texts by John of Holywood, Maimonides, and Al-Ghazali. These translations appeared from 1454 onwards. In 1470 Zacharias may have travelled to Novgorod with Olelkovich, who had been invited by the citizens to become their military defender. According to accepted tradition, Olelkovich's arrival in the city coincided with the spread of the Unitarian Judaizing (*zhidovstvuyushchie*) heresy. Dr Taube considers the translation work to have been intended from the beginning to convert Muscovy to Judaism before the end of the world – in AM 7000 for millenarian-minded Rus'ians, 5525 for Jews (prophesied by another Kievan exile rabbi, Moses ben Jacob II, as the year of the Messiah), or AD 1492 for the rest of us. It seems highly unlikely that a Jewish scholar (or anyone else for that matter) in 1454 would have known that Olelkovich would become prince of Novgorod in 1470, or perhaps he made the most of his chance to start a Rus'ian heresy, when it arose. It is particularly strange that he would translate his conversion texts into a language, Ruthenian, spoken in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, but barely understood in north-eastern Rus' and that he would choose Muscovy of all places as the focus of the end of the world – why not try to convert the inhabitants of Lithuania and Poland instead? Muscovy was on the make in European politics in the last quarter of the fifteenth century, but it was insignificant in comparison with the Jagiellonian realms. If the Judaizers are to be understood as closet Jews (new Jewish arrivals from Lithuania allegedly warned them not to become circumcised, lest they be detected), why are they also accused of anti-Semitism? It would surely make more sense (not that sense must necessarily have anything to do with the matter) to view Zacharias as a servant of Olelkovich, who sought to help his master deepen his Christian faith and cultural prestige with a vernacular Bible (like his kinswoman, Dowager Grand Duchess – Queen Sofia Alšėniškė [Sofia Holszańska]) and popular astronomical

and philosophical treatises (John of Holywood's *De Sphaera*, which was taught to students at Kraków as in other universities, Pseudo-Aristotle (the *Secreta Secretorum*) and Maimonides (Logical Vocabulary). It is logical to accept Dr Temčin's suggestion that Olelkovich was the patron of Zacharias' work. A similar range of books was owned by the Lithuanian statesman and palatine of Vilnius Albertas Goštautas in the early sixteenth century (although they were not translations from the Hebrew)²³. However, whether the translator intended it or not, Zacharias' Old Testament texts did come to be used by Christians – in Orthodox Muscovy and Lithuania: *habent sua fata libelli*. They survive in a manuscript from the Orthodox monastery in Supraśl, now held in the Library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences in Vilnius, dated between 1517 and 1532. The first part of the manuscript contains Franciscus Skorina's introduction to his printed edition of the Psalms (Vilnius, 1525) and the eight Zacharias' translations along with Old Church Slavonic translations of the Psalms and part of the Book of Proverbs done not from the Hebrew²⁴. Part two of the manuscript is an anti-Judaic (and anti-Muslim) tract, the biblical compilation known as *Tolkovaia Paleia*. The use of Ruthenian in Lithuania was not restricted to the grand ducal chancery or Orthodox Christians. It was used in the Catholic Church, where convenient, for recording endowments (as in the official record, the Lithuanian Metrica), fraternity financial business and even texts of the Mass could be recorded in joined-up Latin in Cyrillic transcription²⁵.

²³ Kęstutis Gudmantas, "Alberto Goštauto biblioteka ir Lietuvos metraščiai", in: *Knygotyra*, 2003, vol. 41, pp. 1–16.

²⁴ Sergejus Temčinas, "Bažnytinės knygos"; Sergejus Temčinas, "Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystijos rusėniškoji literatūra kaip kultūrinės integracijos modelis", in: *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštijos tradicija ir tautiniai naratyvai*, ed. Alfredas Bumblauskas, Grigorijus Potašenko, Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2009, pp. 53–85.

²⁵ Catholic documents in Ruthenian e. g. the sale of land at Alsėdžiai to Bishop Martin III (II) of Medininkai in 1510 by Vitko Stankovič, in: *Codex Mednicensis seu Samogithiae Dioecesis, Pars I (1416.II.13–1609.IV.2)*, ed. Paulius Jatulis, Rome: Academia Lituana Catholica Scientiarum, 1984, no. 120, pp. 188–89 (under false date of 1515); on Latin Liturgical texts in Cyrillic script, see e. g.: Julia Verkholantseva,

In conclusion, we may assert that there seems to be some, albeit not entirely unambiguous evidence that in the second half of the fifteenth century and the early sixteenth century the various Christian communities of the Grand Duchy were capable of debating theological issues with non-Christians or making use of the learning of Jews to improve their religious and secular education and that the language of this written cultural communication was Ruthenian into which the work of Latin, Jewish and Arabic authors was translated. Be that as it may, it would be mistaken to regard the Grand Duchy as a generally tolerant state in modern terms. Jews could be regarded with suspicion (as we saw in the appearance of a theoretical Jew in the Vilnius Consistory Court's record of the Lithuanian Host-seller-cum-desecrator) and Jews were expelled from the Grand Duchy for a short period by Grand Duke Alexander between 1495 and 1503. Fifteenth-century western European anti-Judaic incunabula survive in Lithuanian collections but their provenance is almost completely unknown, as is the date of their accession by readers in the Grand Duchy (inscriptions often point to owners no earlier than the post-Reformation period)²⁶. In 1499 the Karaite convert, Stanislav Ozheiko of Trakai, was ennobled by King John Albert of Poland at the request of his brother, Grand Duke Alexander of Lithuania. On this occasion the new Christian was adopted by the family of Bishop Martin III of Medininkai (who was descended from German merchants in Vilnius) and given the bishop's family crest, Merawa, a coat of arms which was not of local origin. The man, like the bishop, seems to have been rewarded for his services to the monarch but left still as *not quite* U²⁷. In 1503 the royal decree was annulled.

“Kirillicheskaia zapis' latinskikh molitv I otryvka china Messy iz rukopisi Sinodal'nogo sobrania GIM No. 558”, in: *Drevniaia Rus'. Voprosy medievistiki*, 2010, vol. 2, pp. 74–90.

²⁶ Nojus Feigelmanas, *Lietuvos inkunabulai*, Vilnius: Vaga, 1975, p. 77; Alexander de Nevo, *Consilia contra Judaeos foenerantes*, Venice: Franciscus Renner, de Heilbronn, 1482; *Pharetra fidei Catholicae contra Judaeos*, Leipzig: Arnold von Köln, 1494, no. 358, p. 258, no. 385, p. 273; Rabi Samuel, *Epistola contra Judaeorum errores*, Cologne: Heinrich Quentell, 1499 (1497?).

²⁷ Jerzy Michta, “Nobilitacje Żydów litewskich w XV–XVIII wieku”, in: *Miasta, ludzie, instytucje, znaki: Księga jubileuszowa ofiarowana Profesor Bożnie Wyrozumskiej*

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries anti-Muslim tracts were published in Vilnius such as the *Alfurkan* of Piotr Czyżewicz. This duplicitous treatment of the ideological Other is reflected in Catholic relations with the Orthodox. On the one hand, Orthodox Christians in Vilnius adopted Catholic trappings (compare the late Gothic architecture of Bernardine friary church with that of the nearby Orthodox Church of the Most Pure Mother of God which contained chantry altars founded by the building's patron Konstantin Ostrogsky) and institutions (such as parish fraternities), while local Catholics came to venerate icons (at Aušros Vartai or Our Lady of Trakai); schismatic kin were expected to protect the ecclesiastical foundations of childless Catholic benefactors and Catholic landowners could build or endow both Catholic and Orthodox churches side by side in Lithuanian towns (such as Anykščiai or Drohiczyn). Even so, to prove his ideological zeal Bishop Tabor commissioned an anti-Ruthenian treatise from his university idol, Jan Sakran, while theoretically encouraging the Unionist community in the Grand Duchy. The duality is illustrated best perhaps by a dispute in 1512 between Stanislovas Kiška (Stanisław Kiszka), lord lieutenant of Hrodna, and the starosta of Žemaitija, Stanislovas Kešgaila (Stanisław Kieżgajlo) over the right of advowson to the parish church at Deltuva. During the appeal case, heard before the Gniezno metropolitan consistory court, lawyers on both sides agreed to send a messenger back to Vilnius to bring materials from the Vilnius consistory court. When Frederick (hardly an Orthodox name!) of Betygala returned to Gniezno with the sealed documents, the papers were acknowledged as genuine and submitted to the court. However, when the unsealed evidence ran contrary to the arguments of Kiška's case, his lawyer demanded the material be dismissed, since the messenger was a Ruthenian and therefore (sic!) excommunicate. The court authorities responded that whether the messenger were a Ruthenian or any other pagan, the seals on the documents had been recognised by both sides as genuine, and so remained admissible²⁸.

w 75. *Rocznicę urodzin*, ed. Zenon Piech, Kraków: Tow. Nauk. Societas Vistulana: Instytut Historii Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2008, pp. 380, 387–389.

²⁸ *Archiwum Archidiecezjalne w Gnieźnie, Acta Consistorii A (Acta Acticantium)*, 78, ff. 140v, 147, 155, 165, 169, 172, 173, 174. *Ibid.*, *Acta Consistorii A (Acta Acticantium)*,

Relations between Christians and the Non-Christian Other in late-mediaeval and early-modern Lithuania may be summed up as an openness to learn useful knowledge from Others who were safely boxed into their categories and traditions so long as these boundaries were accepted by both sides. Breaking the boundaries, even legally (when a Jew gave in to compulsion and converted to escape banishment and was ennobled as a result, or an Orthodox Christian accepted the jurisdiction of the Pope and the decrees of the Council of Ferrara-Florence and became a Unionist), was not socially acceptable.

APPENDIX

1

Anecdote containing a discussion between Christians, Jews and a Tatar at the court of King Casimir (Jagiellończyk) concerning the Divine and Human Nature of Jesus Christ

A: Ms Biblioteka Czartoryskich, Kraków, Ms 1399, p. 8;

E: S. C. Rowell, "Fifteenth-century Poland-Lithuania in the light of an anonymous Kraków notebook", in: *Quaestiones medii aevi novae* vol. 8, 2003, p. 322.

Et Zub erat Judeus sapiens, quem rex Kazimirus prosequitur favoribus. Item eciam erat Tartarus nomine Tymyrza, scilicet sapiens valde. Iste Tymyrza coram rege stans dedit alapam Judeo Zub, quia Cristo, dixit, 'o filius erat carpentarij'.

Rex commotus, "cur fecisti?", "O rex", dixit ille Tartarus, "si sederet ad latus tuum ego ei facerem, quia hoc habemus in nostra lege, si quis blasphemaverit Christum Ihesum non debemus pati.

Quod canonicus dominus Stanislaus incepit ridere. Rex "cur rides?" Iste, "quod errat et facit tale etc." Ille Tartarus dixit: "Quare dicit, quod

79, fol. 3: "Jeremias procurator Grodnensis patroni et collatoris parrochialis ecclesie in Dziewolthowa ... allegans illa omnia non valere neque illis fidem adhiberi quia idem Fredericus mentita fide existens Rutenus et propter hoc excommunicates... Andreas [lawyer for Stanislovas of Žemaitija] respondit generaliter nec obstat quod allegat procurator exadverso, quam Rutenus vel alter paganus sit portitor literarum, cum ipse rotulus sit sigillatus et clauses, quem habuit pro recognito Jeremias". [Date of session 1513-01-14].

errarem?”. “Tot et tot anni sunt, a ducentis annis et plus agitur ista questio inter sapientissimos doctores nostros et Judeos et Christianos et tu cum perumto capite velis cito concludere. Hoc nil facis.”

2

A dispute between Bishop Jan Lubrański and Jewish scholars over the interpretation of Psalm 109:1.

A: Ms Biblioteka Czartoryskich, Kraków, Ms 1399, p. 17;

E: Rowell, “Fifteenth-century Poland-Lithuania”, pp. 325–26.

Iste interfuit dominus episcopus Poznaniensis dominus Johannes Lubransky omnibus²⁹, idem dominus episcopus locutus est cum uno Judeo doctissimo nomine Ezechielis, qui dixit “nos habemus nomen ineffabile, hic in isto versu ‘dixit Dominus Domino meo’. Vero vos dicitis dominus illic nos habemus Iehus, vos dicitis Ihus, et hic silemus propter reverenciam, Illius nomen non audemus proferre”.

Item alter Judeus ad gardinalem sancte crucis ikoma³⁰ Christiana doctissimus, sed iam cristianus, qui dixit quod Sanctus Iesus aculeatus non bene interpretatus est etc

²⁹ *Omnibus* seems to refer back to the dispute on p. 8 of the manuscript.

³⁰ This word is uncertain; it may be *iconisma*, ‘icon’, and refer to sacred images, but this is unclear.

PAWEŁ KRAS

AN OVERVIEW: THE CONVERSION OF PAGANS
AND CONCEPT OF *IUS GENTIUM* IN THE
WRITINGS OF CRACOW PROFESSORS IN THE
FIRST HALF OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

On 18 April 1413 Andrzej Łaskarzyc, Cracow professor of decrees and diplomat in the service of Polish King Ladislaus II Jagiełło (Jogaila, 1386–1434), presented Benedict Makrai, commissary of King Sigismund of Luxembourg, with a memorandum, in which he comments on the sixteen documents presented earlier by the Teutonic Knights to support their claims to the castle of Veliuona. In that document Łaskarzyc made a full-scale attack on the Teutonic Knights, challenging the crusading ideology of the Teutonic Order and undermining the *raison d'état* of their further existence in Prussia¹. As a well-trained and experienced lawyer, he first questions the validity of papal documents of Clement IV, Alexander IV and Innocent IV, which had authorized the operations of the Teutonic Knights against pagans. Actually, Łaskarzyc argues that all such documents are invalid, because the Teutonic Knights provided the popes with false information and intentionally hid some important details. For example, they falsely claimed that they had been fighting for the Catholic faith and converted numerous pagan Lithuanians to Christianity. In actual fact, they had converted no one, as they were simple laymen who did not know the Holy Writ and lacked basic skills of literacy:

¹ The historical context of Makrai's mission is discussed by: Zenon Hubert Nowak, *Międzynarodowe procesy polubowne jako narzędzie polityki Zygmunta Luksemburskiego w północnej i środkowowschodniej Europie (1412–1424)*, Toruń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 1981, pp. 31–33; see also: Marian Biskup, Gerard Labuda, *Dzieje Zakony krzyżackiego w Prusach: Gospodarka – społeczeństwo – państwo – ideologia*, Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Morskie 1986, pp. 369–370.

quia sunt puri et simplices layci et non solum sacre Scripture, ymmo et gramatice ignari, et semper pro conversione infidelium sed pro occupatione bonorum ipsorum aliquas partes infidelium invaserunt, bona ipsorumque occuparunt et eos possederunt et possident ipsis infidelibus in sua perfidia sub eorum potestate et regimine stantibus”.²

Demonstrating the lies of the Teutonic Order, the Polish diplomat made his comments on the missions conducted among pagan Lithuanians by Franciscans and Dominicans, who were preaching the Gospel without any problems and no one tried to expel them. Furthermore, Łaskarzyc stresses the fact that Lithuanians never conquered any territories of Latin Christians, but they lived instead within their fatherland:

Tacuerunt eciam veritatem, quod in huiusmodi terris tunc infidelium, scilicet Lithwani, Samagitarum etc. semper Christiani et viri religiosi, videlicet fratres Minores, Predicatores et alii semper moram traxerunt et fidem catholicam predicarunt, quam ipsi Lithwani et alii protunc infideles predicare non prohibuerunt, nec ipsos Christianos et religiosos expulerunt nec in aliquo molestarunt, sed quiete et pacifice stare permiserunt, nec ipsi Lithwani umquam aliquam terram Christianorum occuparunt, sed in suis paternis semper morabantur, nec ipsos Christianos et terras eorum invaserunt, nisi se et sua defendendo.³

If so, in his opinion, there can be no doubts that the Teutonic Knights intentionally lied to the pope and obscured true objectives of their military operations in Lithuania. Łaskarzyc makes it clear that their activities were inspired by greed, as primarily they wished to conquer new lands and did not care at all for the conversion of indigenous pagans. Contrary to the Teutonic Knights' claims to having been so long involved in the Christianizing missions, they did very little to bring pagans to the Catholic faith. In fact, their Christianizing efforts turn out to be a complete failure and no one has been converted to the Christian faith. Once again, Łaskarzyc refers to promising results achieved by the Franciscan and Dominican missionaries, who were welcomed by

² *Lites ac res gestae inter Polonos ordinemque cruciferorum. Spory i sprawy między Polakami a Zakonem Krzyżackim*, ed. Ignacy Zakrzewski, vol. 2, Poznań: Biblioteka Kórnicka, 1982, no. 32, p. 295 (henceforward quoted as *Lites*).

³ *Ibid.*

Lithuanian dukes and allowed to preach God's word among pagans. The Teutonic raids into the Lithuanian territories compromised those missionary efforts and dramatically changed the attitude of the pagans towards Roman Christianity. The memorandum openly blames the Teutonic Knights for the aborted missions of mendicant preachers who had to leave the Lithuanian people. The Teutonic encroachments into the Lithuanian territory made Lithuanians hostile to Christian missionaries and reluctant to accept the Catholic faith. For Lithuanians, the struggle against the Teutonic Knights became a war for sovereignty, in which national feelings rose high. Following arguments by Pope Innocent IV and St Thomas Aquinas, Łaskarzyc accepts the rights of pagans to own land and property. Furthermore, he argues that Christians will violate God's law and commit robbery if they take steps to seize pagan lands without any legitimate cause:

Cum enim dominia et possessiones bonorum inducte sunt iure gentium et naturali, quia occupanti conceduntur et preoccupantem sine justa causa eis spoliare non licet iure divino prohibente nomine furti omnem rapinam et usurpacionem rei aliene etc.⁴

If so, no one, neither the pope nor the emperor, could claim any power over pagan territories. Nor could they authorize anyone to conquer the areas populated by infidels, as that would be an act of hostility which is contrary to Christ's commandment of "love of thy neighbor". If popes or Christian emperors authorized such acts of violence as those perpetrated by the Teutonic Knights in Lithuania, they would violate God's law and commit sin. Developing his arguments along these lines, Łaskarzyc arrived at the concept of religious tolerance and rejected the idea of converting pagans by force. In his opinion, no one should be coerced into accepting the Christian faith, as this would be against God's will and Christ's teaching. The conversion of pagans should be achieved only by spiritual weapons, such as preaching of God's word. Since the Teutonic Knights were "illiterate laymen" (*layci illiterati*), they lacked basic abilities to successfully accomplish any Christianizing mission. Concluding his memorandum, Andrzej

⁴ *Ibid.*

Łaskarzyc questions the legitimacy of all papal and imperial privileges for the Teutonic Knights, which had granted them pagan territories and authorized their crusading operations in Lithuania. His arguments rest upon *auctoritates* from canon law, including the opinions of Pope Innocent IV and St Thomas Aquinas, who define infidels as neighbours who share, by natural law, the same rights as Christians (“Constat enim de iure, quod infidelis fidei Christiane non minus est proximus noster asserendus”). Furthermore, Łaskarzyc discusses the concept of *proximus*, extending it to all men, even to infidels. Here he makes a reference to the canon on charity from the *Decretum Gratiani* (“Non illi tantum proximi nostri credenda sunt quos nobis gradus sanguinis iungit: sed proximi nostri credenda sunt omnes homines naturae nostrae”)⁵. All those legal arguments and supporting *auctoritates* are applied to refute the crusading ideology, which has laid foundations to military orders in general and fuelled the growth of the Teutonic state in Prussia in particular.

At the end of the memorandum from 1413, Łaskarzyc discusses one more canon law argument which allows him to expose negligible Christianizing successes achieved by the Teutonic Knights in Lithuania. An application of the legal principle of *cessante causa, cessare debet effectus ipsarum* makes it clear that the baptism of Duke Jagiełło and his brothers, boyars and all pagan people has removed the main reason for any Christianizing activities of the Teutonic Knights in Lithuania. If so, there can be no legitimate cause of further military operations under the banner of Christianization in the territory. Moreover, in the opinion of the Polish procurator, no longer can the Teutonic Order justify their raids into Lithuania, as Christian Lithuanians cannot be the target of conversion. Consequently, all papal and imperial documents for the Teutonic Knights have lost validity, as they were produced in a completely different historical and legal context. Concluding his memorandum, Łaskarzyc argues that further military operations against

⁵ *Ibid*, pp. 295–296; see comments by Leszek Winowski, *Innowiercy w poglądach uczonych zachodniego chrześcijaństwa XIII–XIV wieku*, Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1985, pp. 41–45; see also: Krzysztof Ozóg, *Uczeni w monarchii Jadwigi Andegaweńskiej i Władysława Jagiełły (1384–1434)*, Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 2004, pp. 196–197.

Lithuanians will result only in shedding Christian blood and committing atrocities against the innocent population. At the same time they will clearly demonstrate greed and rapacity of the Knights who have little respect for laws divine and human.

The above-mentioned arguments well reflected the opinions of Cracow University professors who cooperated with King Ladislaus Jagiełło in his diplomatic struggle against the Teutonic Knights. A number of Cracow intellectuals, who had received degrees in law and theology in Prague or at the Italian universities of Bologna and Padua, took a leading role in various activities against the Teutonic Knights. In the first quarter of the fifteenth century, diplomatic and legal operations undertaken by Polish diplomats on a wide European forum were intensified and well-concerted. For the first time, so many well-trained Polish scholars actively participated in the international debate over the Teutonic Order and its military operations against Lithuania, offering their legal expertise and experience in the service of the Polish King⁶.

Andrzej Łaskarzyc (1362–1426) was just one among them, but his diplomatic activities in the second decade of the fifteenth century made him a leading figure in the legal dispute between the Polish Kingdom and the Teutonic Knights. He was a doctor of decrees and a renowned scholar at the University of Cracow. At the same time, Łaskarzyc became a busy diplomat and a high-ranking churchman. In 1379 he started studying at the University of Prague and by 1392 he had earned a bachelor's degree of decrees. In 1402 he went to Padua and in 1405 became a doctor of decrees. During his short stay in Poland in 1397, he became the chancellor of Queen Jadwiga of Anjou and later, after her death in 1399, was employed by King Jagiełło. Since 1411 Andrzej Łaskarzyc acted as Procurator of the Polish King in the trial against the

⁶ The detailed study of Andrzej Łaskarzyc' involvement in the Polish-Teutonic negotiations is offered by Krzysztof Ożóg, "Udział Andrzeja Łaskarzyca w sprawach i sporach polsko-krzyżackich do soboru w Konstancji", in: *Polska i jej sąsiedzi w późnym średniowieczu*, eds. Krzysztof Ożóg and Stanisław Szczur, Kraków: Societas Vistulana, 2000, pp. 159–186; and see also recent study by Wojciech Świeboda, *Innowiercy w opiniach prawnych uczonych polskich XV wieku. Paganie, Żydzi, muzułmanie*, Kraków: Societas Vistulana, Kraków 2013, pp. 162–167.

Teutonic Knights, visiting various European courts and presenting Polish grievances against the Order. After January 1413, as the plenipotentiary of King Jagiełło, Łaskarzyc accompanied Benedict Makrai, executor of the Buda treaty, in the negotiations over border delimitations between Poland and the Teutonic State. In 1414–1418 he took part in the Council of Constance as a member of the Polish delegation. In reward for his services, King Jagiełło promoted Łaskarzyc to the bishopric of Poznań and secured his successful election in 1414. At the Council of Constance, as the Bishop elect of Poznań, Łaskarzyc participated in debates over the Polish-Teutonic controversy and cooperated with Paulus Vladimiri, at that time the main exponent of Polish interests⁷.

The purpose of my paper is to present the origins of the principle of *ius gentium* in the writings of Cracow professors in the first half of the fifteenth century. Furthermore, it is aimed at reexamining how the concept was used to challenge the policy of converting pagans by force and to promote instead the idea of toleration and respect towards infidels. Those problems, as presented above, are not new and they entered the scholarly debate in the first decades after World War II. In the 1950s and 1960s a number of critical editions of sources related to the political debate between Poland and the Teutonic Knights were published and made available to a wider international audience. Among them, the selected works of Paulus Vladimiri in the Latin, Polish and English editions attracted much scholarly attention⁸. At the same time, new extensive studies devoted to the concept of *ius gentium* and the idea of just war were produced. It suffices to mention here the seminal works by Stanislaus Belch⁹ and Ludwik Ehrlich¹⁰. Thanks to their gigantic

⁷ Karol Piotrowicz, “Andrzej Łaskarz”, in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, vol. 1, Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1935, pp. 103–106; Marian Frontczyk, “Andrzej Łaskarz z Gosławic, biskup poznański”, in: *Nasza Przeszłość*, Kraków, 1969, vol. 30, pp. 125–170.

⁸ *Pisma wybrane Pawła Włodkowica: Works of Paul Vladimiri (a selection)*, ed. Ludwik Ehrlich, 3 vols, Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy PAX, 1968.

⁹ Stanislaus Belch, *Paulus Vladimiri and his doctrine concerning the international law and politics*, 2 vols, London, Hague, Paris: Mouton & Co, 1965.

¹⁰ Ludwik Ehrlich, *Paweł Włodkowic i Stanisław ze Skarbimierza*, Warszawa:

effort, new light has been cast on the production and circulation of theological and political writings of the Cracow professors, who, in the first half of the fifteenth century, became key players in the international debate on the Christian attitude towards infidels. In recent years, the involvement of Cracow intellectuals in the dispute over the rights of pagans and the means of their conversion to Christianity has been intensively studied by Polish and international scholars. Important contributions to that research came from Krzysztof Ozóg¹¹, Mieczysław Markowski¹², Zofia Włodek¹³, Thomas Wünsch¹⁴ and Paul Knoll¹⁵. It is

Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1954; Ludwik Ehrlich, *Polski wykład prawa wojny w XV wieku. Kazanie Stanisława ze Skarbimierza 'De bellis iustis'*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Prawnicze, 1955; Ludwik Ehrlich, *Rektor Paweł Włodkowicz rzecznik obrony przeciw Krzyżakom*, Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 1963.

¹¹ Krzysztof Ozóg, *Uczeni*; Krzysztof Ozóg, *The Role of Poland in the Intellectual Development of Europe in the Middle Ages*, Kraków: Societas Vistulana, 2009 (unfortunately, this high quality academic study is mutilated by a poor English translation); and a number of articles by the same author listed in the bibliographies attached to the above-mentioned works and recorded by *International Medieval Bibliography* and *Bibliografia historii Polski*.

¹² Mieczysław Markowski, *Dzieje Wydziału Teologii Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego w latach 1397–1526*, Kraków: Papieska Akademia Teologiczna w Krakowie, 1996; Mieczysław Markowski, “Uniwersytet Krakowski a sobory pierwszej połowy XV wieku”, in: *Acta Mediaevalia*, Lublin, 1999, vol. 12, pp. 177–213.

¹³ Zofia Włodek, “Eklezjologia krakowska w pierwszej połowie XV wieku”, in: *Jubileusz sześćsetlecia Wydziału Teologicznego w Krakowie 20 X 1996 – 20 X 1997*, Kraków: Papieska Akademia Teologiczna w Krakowie, 1998, pp. 247–282; Zofia Włodek, “Tendencje doktrynalne na Wydziale Teologicznym Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego w XV wieku”, in: *Literatura i kultura późnego średniowiecza w Polsce*, ed. Teresa Michałowska, Warszawa: Instytut Badań Literackich PAN, 1993, pp. 17–27.

¹⁴ Thomas Wünsch, *Konziliarismus und Polen: Personen, Politik und Programme aus Polen zur Verfassung der Kirche in der Zeit der mittelalterlichen Reformkonzilien*, Paderborn, München, Wien, Zürich: F. Schöningh, 1998.

¹⁵ Paul W. Knoll, “The University of Cracow and the Conciliar Movement”, in: *Rebirth, Reform and Resilience: Universities in Transition 1300–1700*, eds. James M. Kittelson and Pamela J. Transue, Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1984, pp. 190–212; Paul W. Knoll, “Literary Production at the University of Cracow in the fifteenth century”, in: *The development of literate mentalities in East Central Europe*, eds. Anna Adamska and Marco Mostert, Turnhout: Brepols, 2004, pp. 217–246.

also worth mentioning that in 2010 a young Cracow scholar, Wojciech Świeboda, presented a doctoral dissertation devoted to the opinions of Cracow intellectuals on infidels in the fifteenth century, based both on published and handwritten materials¹⁶. My overview is much indebted to those older and recent studies which examined the conflict between the Polish Kingdom and the Teutonic Order from various perspectives, stressing the significant role played by Cracow scholars, their writings and diplomatic activities.

THE POLISH-TEUTONIC CONFLICT: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

In the late Middle Ages the Kingdom of Poland became a political and military power in East Central Europe. Demographic and economic growth of the Kingdom resulted from skilful policies of the two last Piast monarchs who reintegrated and consolidated most of the Polish territory into a single kingdom. Their successes paved the way for the golden age of Polish politics and military in the fifteenth century¹⁷. After the death of the last Piast King Casimir the Great, the Polish throne was succeeded by King Louis Anjou of Hungary and, after his death in 1382, inherited by his younger daughter Jadwiga. The unique status of Jadwiga, who was the crowned monarch of Poland with the right of succession, provided favourable opportunities for the first political alliance between Poland and Lithuania. The so-called Union of Krewa, signed in 1385, made it possible for Grand Duke Jagiełło to be crowned King of Poland, following his baptism and marriage with Jadwiga. The new dynasty established in Poland by Jagiełło was to rule the Polish Kingdom and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania for almost two centuries, stimulating fast political

¹⁶ As quoted in note 6.

¹⁷ In English the best overview of the problem is still offered by: Paul W. Knoll, *The Rise of the Polish Monarchy: Piast Poland in East Central Europe, 1320–1370*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1972. The reexamination of various historical processes related to the growth of Poland under the two last Piasts is provided by: Janusz Kurtyka, *Odrodzone Królestwo: Monarchia Władysława Łokietka i Kazimierza Wielkiego w świetle nowszych badań*, Kraków: Societas Vistulana, 2001.

and economic advancement in the two countries. Under the reign of Jagiełło, Poland took an important role in debates on crucial problems of Latin Christendom such as Church reforms, Great Schism of Western Christianity, the invasion of Turks in the Balkans, the outbreak of the Hussite movement in Bohemia and relations with Eastern Christians. Gigantic diplomatic and military efforts were, however, focused on the Teutonic Order, which threatened the territorial integrity of Lithuania and blocked the economic development of Poland by its hold of Gdańsk Pomerania¹⁸.

To achieve the long-term goals of Polish politics, it was not enough to defeat the Teutonic Knights at the battlefield of Grunwald in 1410. For King Ladislaus Jagiełło and his entourage, the same priority was to be given to the legal and diplomatic campaign against the Teutonic Order on a wide European forum. Before and immediately after the battle of Grunwald, Polish diplomats and experts in law launched a series of diplomatic and judicial manoeuvres to counterbalance the Teutonic propaganda and to justify Polish military operations against the Order. To give a fatal blow to the high reputation that the Teutonic Order enjoyed in most European countries, it was necessary to present Polish grievances and reveal the gruesome nature of the Order's operations against Poland and Lithuania. That is why King Jagiełło employed a number of Cracow scholars, mostly doctors of law, who represented the Polish interests in the legal proceedings against the Teutonic Order at the courts of the pope and various international arbiters, as well as at the general council of Constance. Roughly, almost 100 scholars of Cracow University served at his court, either in the royal chancery or as legal experts to represent the King in the judicial proceedings against the Teutonic Order.

On the other hand, the Teutonic Knights also developed a wide-scale campaign across Europe to demonstrate that their military operations were in fact well-grounded. They argued that the Order had

¹⁸ For recent overview of those complex problems see a collection of studies with an extensive bibliography: *Państwo zakonu krzyżackiego w Prusach: Władza i społeczeństwo*, eds. Marian Biskup and Roman Czaja, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 2009.

been established a long time ago to protect Christians against infidels and to promote Christianity in pagan territories. Such objectives were to be achieved by all means necessary. First, the Teutonic Knights spread Christianity to the heathen Prussians, the people living along the Baltic coast, between Gdańsk Pomerania and Lithuania. Within less than half a century, the Teutonic Knights had successfully conquered all Prussian territories and converted local population by force. The Teutonic state, which accompanied the conquest of Prussia, was founded by merciless terror, brutally crushing any form of resistance. By the end of the thirteenth century, the Teutonic Knights had built a highly centralized and militarized state in Prussia, which became the platform for their further expansion along the Baltic coast. After securing their conquest of Prussia, their Christianizing efforts were directed towards Lithuania and Samogitia.

The military operations of the Teutonic Knights followed directly from the idea of Holy War, which had been first invoked in the eleventh century, at the time of the first crusade to the Holy Land, and was later extended to all forms of conflict between Christians and non-Christians. In general, the concept of Holy War was imbedded in the structure of medieval Christendom. As soon as Latin Christendom was defined as a separate and integral civilization ruled by its own system of religious and moral values, its enemies were clearly identified and their suppression authorized. In political theology, Roman Christianity was the only true religion and was to be defended by all means and actively promoted to non-Christian peoples. From the perspective of most medieval popes and the Roman clergy, converting pagans to Christianity was not only a recommended option, but a necessity to be apprehended and enforced by all Christians. Military orders which formed in the Holy Land were the extreme product of that ideology. Their members were regarded as Christ's knights (*milites Christi*), who combined monastic discipline with military skill to fight for the Christian faith. Their operations against infidels were not only morally legitimized, but recommended as an ideal service for Christian knights. The treatise *De laude novae militiae*, produced by St Bernard of Clairvaux for the Templars, well reflected the amazing mixture of spiritual and military ideas that legitimized and

promoted the growth of military orders in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries¹⁹.

The Teutonic Knights, who came into being in that climate of crusading fervor, were profoundly inspired by the ideology of Holy War and the concept of *miles Christi*. The Teutonic Order of the Hospital of St Mary in Jerusalem, known in Poland as the Teutonic Knights, was established in 1189 in the Holy Land by a group of German knights to protect pilgrims and to fight against enemies of Christianity²⁰. Their ideological program was based upon the doctrine of St Augustine, who developed the concept of two opposing societies, *civitas Dei* and *civitas dyaboli*, that were in a permanent conflict. The idea of Christian universalism and its enforcement by all means across the world became *raison d'être* of the Order's activities both in the Holy Land and later in Eastern Europe²¹. For the Teutonic Knights, human life was worthless unless completely subjugated to God's will. Some medieval scholars argued that life in primeval sin and rejection of Christ made human soul and body dead. In consequence, pagans who refused to accept the Christian faith were predestined to death. The Teutonic Knights were reluctant to convert pagans because they believed that pagans simply lacked divine grace which was necessary for their successful conversion to Christianity. In their approach to infidels, the Knights applied the doctrine of Duns Scotus who considered one's love for God and neighbour the supreme

¹⁹ The international literature on that topic is extensive; good recent overviews are presented by Jonathan Riley-Smith, *Krucjaty: Historia*, translated into Polish by Janusz Ruskowski, Poznań: W drodze, 2008 (English edition: *The Crusades: a History*), pp. 33–56; Georges Minois, *Kościół i wojna: Od czasów Biblii do ery atomowej*, translated into Polish by Adam Szymanowski, Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza Volumena & Domw Wydawniczy Bellona, 1998 (French edition: *L'Église et la guerre*), pp. 125–164.

²⁰ Janusz Trupinda, *Ideologia krucjatowa w Kronice Piotra z Dusburga*, Gdańsk, Oficyna Ferberiana, 1999, *passim*.

²¹ Marian Dygo, "Ideologia panowania zakonu niemieckiego w Prusach", in: *Państwo zakonu krzyżackiego w Prusach*, pp. 357–369, here pp. 357–360; Marian Dygo, "Die heiligen Deutschordensritter. Didaktik und Herrschaftsideologie im Deutschen Orden in Preußen um 1300", in: *Die Spiritualität der Ritterorden im Mittelalter*, ed. Zenon Hubert Nowak, (ser. *Ordines Militares. Colloquia Torunensia Historica*, 7), Toruń: Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika w Toruniu, 1993, pp. 165–176.

and absolute virtue, and therefore a justification of bringing faith by force. Furthermore, they identified the natural law (*lex naturalis*) with the divine order which ruled the world and which all creatures had to obey. Lack of faith was considered a sin which destroyed that order and threatened social stability. If so, Christians were encouraged to restore the order, either by converting pagans or by fighting them²².

A good insight into the ideology of the Teutonic Order is provided by the Chronicle of Peter of Dusburg, which was produced in 1330s and was continued until 1434. Its author was a canon of Sambia, and later deputy judge and dean of Königsberg. The main purpose of his work was to give praise to the glorious deeds of the Teutonic Knights in their struggle against pagan Prussians. The Teutonic Order was presented as an institution which had been inspired by God to combat pagans in His name. In the opinion of Peter of Dusburg, the crusade conducted by the Knights in the Holy Land was later continued in Prussia. The aims and methods of the crusade thus remained the same. The conversion of Prussians was to be achieved by force. First, the Teutonic Knight crushed any military resistance of the local population and later Christianity was imposed by the victorious conquerors. Peter of Dusburg had no doubt that the military power of the Teutonic Order demonstrated the superiority of Christian God over pagan deities. In numerous fragments of his Chronicle, he justifies wars waged by the Teutonic Knights and provides moral legitimization of their brutal methods of conquest. Furthermore, he argues that peace can be granted only to those who love Christ. As pagans do not love Christ, even hate Him, they do not deserve to be offered peace and should be subjugated to the rule of Christians. It is worth noting that the Prussians are described as wild and cruel creatures, stubborn and stupid, wicked by nature, who could be brought to Christian faith by force²³.

²² Stefan Kwiatkowski, *Zakon Niemiecki w Prusach a umysłowość średniowiecza. Scholastyczne rozumienie prawa natury a etyczna i religijna świadomość krzyżaków do około 1420 roku*, Toruń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 1998, pp. 43–51.

²³ *Piotra z Dusburga Kronika ziemi pruskiej*, eds. Jarosław Wenta and Sławomir Wyszomirski, (ser. *Pomniki Dziejowe Polski*, seria II, t. XIII), Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 2007, pp. 31–45; see comments by: Jarosław Wenta, *Kronika Piotra*

When the Teutonic Knights were relocated from the Holy Land to Prussia, they adhered to the same ideals and concepts they had adopted while serving in Palestine. In the ideology of the Teutonic Order, there was not that much difference between fighting against Muslim Saracens and against pagan Prussians or Lithuanians. The target of their operations remained the same: enemies of Christ and His Church who should be either converted or exterminated. Pagans were treated as inferior human beings, savage, brutal and illiterate people who had no knowledge of the true faith and lacked intellectual abilities to understand its superiority. Therefore, the only successful method to convert them from pagan superstitions to the Christian religion was the use of force. As warrior monks, the Teutonic Knights were neither priests nor missionaries. Of course, there were some clergymen in their ranks, who first of all had to provide pastoral care for the knights, but the Order was neither intended nor trained to undertake Christianizing missions among pagans. The Order was founded to protect and spread Christianity by force, extirpating pagan cult sites and crushing all resistance to Christian missionaries. That was the key principle of its operations in the Holy Land and Prussia, its *raison d'être*.

It is worth noting that various popes and emperors claimed their rights to territories populated by pagans. The popes of the eleventh and twelfth century even used a forged charter of Constantine's Donation to demonstrate their dominion over infidels and their territories. It was widely acknowledged that pagans had no right to dominion and property, which were reserved exclusively to Christians. Pagans were inferior to Christians and as such their claims to property were denied. If so, it was legitimate according to divine and human law to wage war against pagans and deprive them of their territories and property²⁴.

z *Dusburga. Szkic źródłoznawczy*, Toruń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 2003, pp. 22–25.

²⁴ Horst Fuhrmann, "Konstantinische Schenkung und abendländisches Kaisertum. Ein Beitrag zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Constitutum Constantini", in: *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 1966, vol. 22, pp. 123–142; Paweł Kras, "Donacja Konstantyna – legenda w służbie polityki papieskiej", in: *Studia Mediaevalia Bohemica*, Praha, 2011, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 7–32, here pp. 8–11.

The Teutonic Knights adopted those concepts and applied them to legitimize their military operations against the Prussians, Lithuanians and Samogitians.

For a very long time, from the Order's foundation in 1189 to its secularization in 1525, the Teutonic Knights enjoyed popes' and emperors' protection. The two highest leaders of Latin Christendom, either cooperating with each other or openly in conflict, granted generous privileges to the Knights and political and financial support to their military operations. For the popes, the Teutonic Order was an instrument of expanding Catholic Christianity to new territories in Eastern Europe. Their operations in Prussia and later in Lithuania were considered legitimate as directly related to the protection of Christians and the conversion of pagans. The Teutonic Knights developed amazing diplomatic abilities to demonstrate how much they served the Catholic Church at the Eastern peripheries of Latin civilization. In the thirteenth and fourteenth century they exerted great efforts to promote the image of the Order as the avant-garde of Latin Christendom. Their military ideals gained much popularity in Western Europe, in particular the German-speaking countries, attracting a number of noble offspring to join the Order and dedicate their lives to the service of *militia Christi* "in the East". As early as the first decades of the thirteenth century, Grand Masters of the Teutonic Knights, starting with Hermann von Salza, became prominent figures who were always welcome guests and sought-after advisors at various European courts. That is why dozens of European monarchs, counts and princes made long journeys to the Prussian or Lithuanian forests to participate in the campaigns organized by the Order.

This short overview of the Order's ideology and its significant position within Latin Christendom should allow to better understand the challenges Cracow intellectuals had to face while promoting the concept of *ius gentium* and the idea of just war. When the first generation of Cracow masters working in the service of Polish King Ladislaus Jagiełło started developing political and moral reflections on law, government and Christian-pagan relations, they discovered a coherent system of ideas which had been well-grounded in the European theology

and philosophy. Looking from the academic perspective of the twenty-first century, we may admire their courage and determination to raise issues which were innovatory and even revolutionary. The concept of *ius gentium*, which originated from the natural law and became a cornerstone of European political philosophy in the seventeenth century, at the beginning of the fifteenth century looked absolutely bold and, in a way, rebellious. That concept of *ius gentium* undermined the dominant idea of Christians' superiority over non-Christians and promoted equality of all people, based on natural law and divine law. Moreover, it brought further consequences. If all people are equal, infidels share with Christians the same rights to live, own property, run their own states and preserve their traditions. Furthermore, in their writings Cracow professors argued that it was against God and nature to persecute non-Christians, enforce new faith, invade their territories, kill them, burn their settlements and destroy their states. Those were the methods used by the Teutonic Knights to conquer new territories and convert pagans to Christianity. Applying scholastic methods to political and judicial debates, Polish intellectuals demonstrated that the military operations of the Teutonic Knights violated divine and natural law and as such should be condemned and abandoned.

After the end of military campaigns in 1410 and signing the truce of Toruń in 1411, the Polish King continued the diplomatic struggle against the Teutonic Knights, rallying international allies all around Europe. In the summer of 1411 an official Polish delegation chaired by Andrzej Łaskarzyc, doctor of decrees, came to Rome to pay homage to Pope John XXIII. During the official audience Łaskarzyc made an important speech related to the Teutonic Knights and their conflict with the Polish Kingdom. The first part of the speech focused on the Polish King who was presented as the most Christian of monarchs, new David, graced by God with wisdom, justice and gentleness. In the second part Łaskarzyc sketched out the circumstances of the Polish-Teutonic conflict and focused on the recent war. He listed various attempts by King Jagiełło to peacefully settle the conflict with the Teutonic Knights. In particular, he stressed the Christianizing achievements of the Polish King and Duke Vytautas in Lithuania, who were portrayed as ideal monarchs and shields

of Christianity. They were contrasted with the Teutonic Knights, sons of the devil, who were accused of destroying churches in Lithuania, spilling Christian blood and a number of atrocities. The war waged against them by the Polish King and the Lithuanian Grand Duke was just, as it served to punish the Order which betrayed Christ's teaching and Christian ideals. Furthermore, he argued that it was against God and nature to kill people, burn their houses and seize their property. Such atrocities committed by the Teutonic Order could not be explained and excused by their Christianizing efforts²⁵.

Diplomatic activities of Andrzej Łaskarzyc should be analyzed in a much wider context. The arguments he used to refute Teutonic opinions on the conversion of pagans were widely discussed at the University of Cracow and presented in various academic texts. The concept of *ius gentium* or the idea of just war can be easily found in a number of writings produced by Cracow scholars in the first two decades of the fifteenth century. Below I will present only two of Cracow intellectuals who made significant contribution to the debate.

THE IDEA OF JUSTICE AND COMMON WELFARE
BY STANISŁAW OF SKARBIMIERZ

Stanisław of Skarbimierz (*circa* 1365 – 1431-01-09) is one of the prominent Polish intellectuals under the reign of King Ladislaus Jagiełło. He was born to a merchant family of Skarbimierz in Little Poland; his father Jan was a Skarbimierz citizen and his brother Jan was a *scultetus* in Siemiechów near Tarnów. Thanks to his natural abilities and hard work, he made an extraordinary academic and ecclesiastical career. He was one of the leading Polish theologians in the fifteenth century and a highly popular preacher. In the years 1380–1396 he studied at Prague, achieving academic distinction in the faculty of arts and later in the faculty of law. In 1382 he became a bachelor and, three years later,

²⁵ Maria Kowalczyk, "Mowa obediencyjna do antypapieża Jana XXIII", in: *Biuletyn Biblioteki Jagiellońskiej*, Kraków, 1996, vol. 46, pp. 19–24; see also comments by: Krzysztof Ożóg, *Uczeni*, pp. 186–188.

master of arts. Conrad of Worms, who supervised his early career in Prague, exerted much influence on his intellectual formation. In 1389 he started studying law, earning a doctor's degree in 1396. In 1397 he returned to Cracow and joined a group of intellectuals that played the leading role in reopening Cracow University. Probably it was his involvement in Cracow University that granted him access to the royal court, where he became the confessor of Queen Jadwiga of Anjou. In 1400 he was elected the first rector of the new *studium generale* in Cracow and until his death in 1431 he was one of the busiest and best-known Cracow professors. He also became an important churchman, receiving canonry of Cracow cathedral in 1402. At the same time Stanisław was appointed cathedral preacher and performed his preaching duties until 1423. Since 1419 he acted as vicar general *in spiritualibus* for the bishop of Cracow²⁶. However, he never took any position in the royal administration. Stanisław was very active in the political life of the Polish Kingdom. His interests were focused on the Polish-Teutonic conflict and in his writings and sermons he made comments about the issue. In 1422, as the substitute royal procurator (*procurator substitutus*), he took part in the Polish-Teutonic trial presided by papal legate Antonio Zeno. His reputation as a great preacher ran high in his own time. He left more than 600 pieces of writing, including more than 500 sermons, which remain one of the best sources for the study of theological, moral and legal problems discussed in Cracow in the first half of the fifteenth century²⁷.

As a theologian, moralist and lawyer, Stanisław was sensitive to moral shortcomings of human nature. That is why he readily accepted the application of ascetic discipline and repressions to correct the sinfulness of human nature. He highly valued the system of codified law, but at

²⁶ Roman Maria Zawadzki, "Stanisław ze Skarbimierza", in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, t. XLII, Kraków and Warszawa: Polska Akademia Umiejętności and Polska Akademia Nauk, 2003–2004, pp. 76–80; on his career and teaching at the University of Cracow see also Mieczysław Markowski, *Dzieje Wydziału Teologii*.

²⁷ Roman Maria Zawadzki, "Stanisław ze Skarbimierza", p. 78. His literary legacy was extensively presented in: Roman Maria Zawadzki, *Spuścizna pisarska Stanisława ze Skarbimierza. Studium źródłoznawcze*, Kraków: Polskie Towarzystwo Teologiczne, 1979.

the same time he believed that such a system must rely upon the highest virtues of truth, love for one's neighbour, justice and equality. In his opinion, each state, regardless of its size and population, is ruled by laws which are indispensable to secure peace and welfare of its inhabitants. People need laws like horses need harness. He argues that there are no ideal states which are governed like the city of God. Stanislaw used to quote St Augustine's well-known comment that "if justice is removed from kingdoms, they will become nothing but bands of thieves". Stanislaw's theory of just war and his approach to pagan-Christian relations are well-reflected in the collection of *Sermones sapientiales*. Of particular interest is the sermon on *De bello iusto et iniusto*, numbered XXX²⁸. Actually, it is a lecture on the principles of justice in general, and on military cooperation of Christians and pagans in particular. The sermon was written in the first half of 1410 and is related to the military campaign which ended at the battlefield of Grunwald. The public impact of that sermon is still under discussion, as it was never separately copied and circulated. At the same time the sermon was well-known to Bishop Wojciech Jastrzębiec, a close collaborator of King Ladislaus Jagiełło, who produced and distributed several letters related to the Grunwald victory. Arguments used by Jastrzębiec to legitimize the war against the Teutonic Knights in 1410 originated directly from those presented by Stanislaw in his sermon *De bello iusto et iniusto*. It looks like the production of Stanislaw's sermon was not incidental and it should be analyzed as an integral element of a much wider action launched by Cracow intellectuals to promote the idea of just war against the Teutonic Order.

Stanislaw's reflections on the relations between the state and the people are focused on the problem of what is efficient and what is licit, what is pragmatic and what is moral. The central place in the system of government is given to the king. Following Plato's concept, Stanislaw

²⁸ The first critical Latin-Polish edition was published by Ludwik Ehrlich in: *Polski wykład prawa wojny*, pp. 91–145; from that edition the Latin-Polish text was reprinted in a selection of Skarbimierz's sermons on the Book of Wisdom: Stanislaus de Skarbimieria, *Sermones de sapientia selectae*, ed. Mirosław Korolko, Cracoviae: Officina Arcana, 1997, no. 5 (XXX), pp. 84–109.

argues that an ideal king should combine features of an efficient ruler and a wise man. A good king should always support the growth of wisdom and listen to wise men. Among king's virtues the highest position is given to prudence, which is defined as one's reasonable ability to draw conclusions from the past to achieve good results in the future. That ability, if well learnt and consequently applied, should make all king's activities successful and allow him to avoid failures. Stanisław of Skarbimierz raises here another important problem, trying to define what the common welfare of people is. On the one hand, he turns his attention to the Bible, which provides guidelines to how Christians should act to achieve the highest good, i.e. eternal life with Jesus Christ. The Bible is a Holy Writ given by God to humans as an instrument of religious and moral instruction. At the same time the Bible is the code of divine law which provides guidelines for how to live according to God's commandments²⁹.

On the other hand, Stanisław's political and moral concepts are much indebted to the idea of natural law. Stanisław of Skarbimierz argues that, along with God's commandments, natural law is necessary to define the common good and to adopt due measures to achieve it. God and nature are thus presented as the highest values of the whole moral system, something common to all people. Even ancient pagans respected and implemented natural law. That is why, out of love for their fatherland, they practiced the virtue of selflessness to achieve the common good, even sacrificing their lives. If so, Christians, who are given divine law, should do even more than pagans. These moral and political principles let Stanisław develop his idea of just war. His arguments on war are embedded in the contemporary political situation of the Polish Kingdom and respond directly to the military conflict between Poland and the Teutonic Knights. The central problem of Stanisław's writings, but at the same time a key issue in the political debate at European universities and royal courts, was to establish which party was right.

²⁹ For a detailed analysis of the ideal king in the writings of Cracow professors see: Krzysztof Ożóg, "Król w refleksji uczonych polskich XV wieku", in: *Król w Polsce XIV i XV wieku*, eds. Andrzej Marzec and Maciej Wilamowski, Kraków: Societas Vistulana, 2006, pp. 7–37.

Stanisław's treatment of pagans is much influenced by his concept of divine and natural law. Nevertheless, his general ideas on political and moral issues remain universal and might be applied to various cases of European politics in his own times. Furthermore, Stanisław's treatment of pagans is much influenced by his concept of divine and natural law. In his opinion, pagans have the same rights as Christians to property and government. Referring to the decree of Pope Innocent IV, he claims that no one can seize pagan lands or property without sin³⁰. Furthermore, Stanisław argues that pagans possess a universal system of virtues, which originates from natural law and as such should be respected. If so, they might be called to defend moral virtues such as justice and magnanimity and which are common to Christians and pagans³¹.

Stanisław proposes five main conditions of just war. First, such war is waged only by laymen; second, war serves either to retrieve territories seized by force by another country or to defend those territories; third, war is aimed at restoring peace and war itself is only the means to achieve it; four, only noble reasons can legitimize war, war cannot result from anger or greed, but it should rest on God's love and justice; five, just war should be endorsed by the authority of the Church, in particular if it is waged in the service of faith³². If war is just under those five conditions, what about military alliances with pagans? Stanisław raises

³⁰ "... *dominia et possessiones et iurisdictiones licite sine peccato possunt apud infideles secundum Innocentium, eo quod, ut ipse dicit, non tantum pro fidelibus, sed pro omni rationali creatura facta sunt... non licet papae vel fidelibus auferre dominia sive iurisdictiones infidelibus, quia sine peccato ea possident et de iure*" (*ibid.*, p. 106).

³¹ "... *sicut in actibus virtutum moralium potest quis communicare pagano, et, maxime nititur, ipsum ducere ad salutem (cum iustitia et magnanimitas sint virtutes cardinales communes fidelibus et infidelibus), in actibus ipsarum christianus et paganus convenire possunt, quod esse potest in iusto bello*" (*ibid.*, p. 102).

³² "*Iustum autem bellum, quis esse intelligat, [1] si est persona saecularis non ecclesiastica, cui prohibitum est humanum sanguinem effundere... [2] si fiat pro rebus repetendis vel pro defensione patriae; [3] si causa sit legitima, ut scilicet propter necessitatem, pugnetur, quatenus per pugnam pax turbata recuperetur aut acquiratur..., [4] si non fiat propter odium aut ultionem vel cupiditatem, sed propter zelum legis divinae, propter caritatem, iustitiam et obedientiam..., [5] si fiat auctoritate ecclesiae, presertim cum pugnatur pro fide aut auctoritate principis...*" (Stanislaus de Scarbimiria, *Sermones de sapientia selectae*, no. 5 (XXX), p. 86).

that issue and discusses circumstances when Christians are allowed to cooperate with pagans. In his opinion, if war is just under those five conditions, various means and techniques might be used to defeat the enemy. Even pagans might be legitimately called into action to achieve the main objective of just war. This is the implementation of the ancient principle that “the end justifies the means”³³. What does matter is the final result: the triumph of justice which should be achieved by all means. That is why alliance with pagans is justified if it serves to restore justice³⁴. The Cracow professor argues that for the implementation of justice it does not matter whether someone fights by means of ambush or in an open field; it does not make a difference whether the Christian king uses exclusively Christian knights or if he cooperates with pagan forces as well. Stanisław of Skarbimierz supports his statements with arguments related to the natural law (*ius naturale*), which justifies the use of any military technique to defeat the enemy, and to the law of nations (*ius gentium*), which legitimizes cooperation between Christians and pagans³⁵.

Thus the arguments of Stanisław might be used to justify the war of Poland with the Teutonic Knights. The war was waged by King Jagiełło in alliance with Lithuania, whose population at that time still remained partly heathen. Poland waged just war, and if so, it was legitimate for the Catholic king to cooperate with pagans, because such alliance was justified by the rules of war and by natural law as well. During the war

³³ “*Nec est differentia in ratione flagelli, an christianus delinquens per alium christianum vel infidelem puniatur. Et sic si pagani per se inscrutabili Dei iudicio ad puniendum christianos delinquentes quandoque moveantur, et ei bellando, interficiendo et peccatores de terra delendo servire dicuntur, cum etiam in bello iusto christianis iustam partem habentibus coniuncti, contra alios christianos malos pugnantes, Deo servire non dicantur*” (*ibid.*, p. 100).

³⁴ “*...quantum ad iustitiam nihil refert, an per christianos tantum vel christianos iunctis paganis quasi quibusdam insidiis, christiani principes uti possunt*” (*ibid.*, p. 102).

³⁵ “*Item ius naturale idem est apud omnes; sed principes vim vi repellentes ius naturale tuentur, in quo cum paganis convenient, igitur quantum ad hoc ipsis uti possunt. Item bella sunt de iure gentium, quae quantum consonant iustitiae, ab ecclesia amplectentur, ergo nihil obviat, quin christiani, ut fiat satis iustitiae, quae praeclarissima est virtutum, paganorum adiutorium, si aliunde non habent, invocare possint*” (*ibid.*, p. 102).

of 1410, justice was done to the Teutonic Knights, and if so, it was of secondary significance whether pagans made a contribution to that military success.

PAULUS VLADIMIRI'S CONCEPT OF *IUS GENTIUM*

Paweł Włodkowic of Brudzewo (*circa* 1370–1435), known in the international literature as Paulus Vladimiri, was 15 years younger than Stanisław of Skarbimierz. He was a distinguished scholar, jurist and rector of Cracow University (1414–1415). Like Stanisław of Skarbimierz, he was a doctor of decrees and graduate of Prague University. After his studies at Prague, where he received his master degree in arts, he moved to Padua, where he studied canon law under the supervision of famous lawyer and conciliarist Francesco Zabarella. At forty Paulus Vladimiri returned to Poland and took position at the Faculty of Law in Cracow. In 1413 he became a royal diplomat and the most prominent Polish advocate in the legal disputes with the Teutonic Knights. As the rector of Cracow University, Paweł Włodkowic represented Poland at the Council of Constance, where he delivered a thesis about the power of the Pope and the Emperor, the *Tractatus de potestate papae et imperatoris respectu infidelium* (*Treatise on the power of the pope and the emperor in regard to the infidels*). As Stanisław Bełch has rightly argued, Vladimiri's treatise "is the first work to deal critically and systematically with the extent of the authority of the spiritual and secular powers, i.e. the papacy and the empire, in relation to non-Christian states". Furthermore, "it is the first elaborate system of doctrine concerning the rights of infidel independent nations vis-à-vis Christian kingdoms and powers, particularly the papacy and the empire"³⁶. In his *Tractatus Vladimiri* argues that pagan and Christian nations can coexist in peace and criticizes the Teutonic Order for its wars of conquest of native non-Christian peoples in Prussia and Lithuania. Vladimiri's arguments are extensively supported by a collection of *auctoritates* from the Bible,

³⁶ Stanisław Bełch, *Paulus Vladimiri and his doctrine*, vol. 2, pp. 780–789, here p. 780.

theological and political writings, as well as from codification of Canon law. All supporting documents are well-arranged and bound together by Vladimiri's comments. There is no doubt that the *Tractatus* is a work of gigantic effort and demonstrates both Vladimiri's intellectual abilities and his expertise in theology and law. His activities at the council of Constance, which are well-recorded by his literary production, made him a leading Polish expert on international law and an important representative of the Polish king in the subsequent diplomatic struggle against the Teutonic Knights. It was thanks to his busy diplomatic activities that in 1421 Pope Martin V entrusted his legate Antonio Zeno with the investigation of the conflict between Poland and the Teutonic Order. The literary production of Włodkowiec includes a rich variety of texts: academic treatises as well as official statements related to the legal or diplomatic actions of the Polish King against the Teutonic Knights. Almost all of those texts are pieces of high-quality legal writing, formatted for court debate and supplied with due arguments³⁷.

Paulus Vladimiri adopted the concept of just war elaborated by Stanisław of Skarbimierz and applied it to the Polish-Teutonic relations. In contrast to universal treatment of political and moral issues by Stanisław, Paulus is much more concrete and almost always either discusses a particular problem of the Polish-Teutonic agenda or applies to it his conclusions. If analyzed together, his opinions on the activities of the Teutonic Knights and his treatment of pagans' rights aptly have been called a doctrine of religious toleration. That doctrine has made Włodkowiec famous in the history of European religious ideas and gave him the position of a pioneer of religious toleration. Actually, his religious opinions are deeply embedded in the medieval political and theological concepts, and are articulated in the scholastic language of academic discourse. His doctrine of religious toleration matured in Padua and was much impressed by the teachings of Zabarella. He used widely thirteenth-century canonistic opinions formulated by Pope Innocent IV and Thomas Aquinas. What makes his doctrine original is, first of all, his amazing ability to combine legal and historical arguments.

³⁷ *Works of Paul Vladimiri (a selection)*, vol. 1, pp. x–xiv.

Stanislaw Bełch, in his extensive study on the political doctrine of Paulus Vladimiri, made important comments on the origins of *ius gentium* and discussed the original contribution of Paulus to the European debate on the natural rights of infidels. In Bełch's opinion, "the problem with which Vladimiri was mainly occupied was that of the rights of politically organized nations viewed in the light of the papal and imperial universal authority. In connection with this, he also dealt with the question of conversion by force. Of war aimed at the political subjection of infidel nations to the empire. Of the guilt and punishment for the guilt of the infidels, the distinction between peaceful and non-peaceful infidels, and of many other questions related to missionary as well as international law"³⁸. Furthermore, it is worth stressing that Paulus Vladimiri's concept of *ius gentium* and his rejection of conversion by force originated both from the New Testament and from the writings of Church fathers, in particular St Augustine and St Gregory the Great. In Christ's command to the Apostles, who were dispatched to the world to preach the Gospel (Mk 16,15), the conversion was treated as reasonable act of any human being resulting from free will. Following those instructions, St Augustine and St Gregory the Great argued that no one should be enforced to accept Christian faith and that pagan customs needed to be respected. That attitude towards peaceful conversion of infidels was endorsed by medieval collections of canon law³⁹. The teaching of Church Fathers was included in the *Decretum* by Yves of Chartres (circa 1091–1094), and later repeated in the *Decretum Gratiani* and *Decretales* of Gregory IX⁴⁰. Thus the principles of *ius gentium* and the concept of conversion by persuasion were deeply rooted in the theological tradition of ancient and medieval Christianity. As late as in the Carolingian period, the presence of that peaceful attitude towards pagans was paralleled by the growth of an opposing view, which legitimized the use of force as a means of Christianizing infidels. During the reign of Charlemagne, it became widely accepted that pagans should be first defeated and

³⁸ Stanislaus Bełch, *Paulus Vladimiri and his doctrine*, vol. 1, pp. 57–58.

³⁹ *ibid.*, pp. 58–59.

⁴⁰ Wojciech Świeboda, *Innowiercy*, pp. 69–74.

later pacified and Christianized. Such a model of Christianization was brutally adopted in Charlemagne's policy towards heathen Saxons⁴¹.

To get a better understanding of Paulus Vladimiri's international doctrine and his concept of *ius gentium*, it is worth discussing his two major works: *Tractatus de potestate papae et imperatoris respectu infidelium*, also known as *Saevientibus olim Pruthenis*⁴², and *Causa inter reges Poloniae et Cruciferos*, entitled also *Ad aperiendam*. The two were produced at the council of Constance and closely related to the Polish-Teutonic conflict, which was discussed at one of the council commissions. *Ad Aperiendam* was written at the turn of 1415 and 1416, and published a year later⁴³. The text was produced in consultation with the Cracow professors and accepted by the whole Polish delegation at Constance. In the first part of the treatise, Paulus Vladimiri criticizes legal and ideological foundations of the Teutonic Order, calling it the cruelest sect ever recorded in the Church history. In his opinion, the Order is even more dangerous because it corrupts Christian souls and bodies by means of scandals, murders and robberies. In 156 articles Paulus Vladimiri presents legal and historical arguments to support his thesis. After demonstrating that the Teutonic Knights are heretics, he calls for a fast and final extermination of that dangerous heresy. In conclusion, he argues that the Teutonic Knights cannot claim legitimate rights to

⁴¹ Stanislaus Belch, *Paulus Vladimiri and his doctrine*, vol. 1, pp. 59–60: “The occasional necessity of defending Christian states against aggressive infidels grew into the settled practice of defending the Church by force of arms against pagan enemies. This in turn gave rise to the conviction that the best way of pacifying and effecting the conversion of infidel barbarians was to defeat them in battle. The vanquished Saxons adopted Christianity and were incorporated into the empire. The armed conflicts and contacts with Islam were not without influence in this matter of taking to the sword in order to make converts and win territories from the infidels. From this attitude it was only a step to the notion of fighting the heathen *because* they were infidel; this resulted in wars of conquest and colonization which sometimes meant the extermination of heathen populations.”

⁴² *Works by Paulus Vladimiri*, ed. Stanislaus Belch, in: Stanislaus Belch, *Paulus Vladimiri and his doctrine*, vol. 2, pp. 779–844.

⁴³ Paweł Włodkovic, *Pisma wybrane*, vol. 1, ed. Ludwik Ehrlich, Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy PAX, 1968, pp. 144–259.

any of the lands they conquered and the general council should enforce their resettlement to some other area:

quia falsitas litterarum istarum falsam causam eis prestitit occupandi tum quia ea detinent nomine hospitalis quod in rerum natura nullum est notorie, tum quia optinent ea per rapinam notoriam.⁴⁴

His second anti-Teutonic treatise *Saevientibus olim Pruthenis* was produced in the first half of 1416⁴⁵. In that piece of writing he extensively uses arguments of Andrzej Łaskarzyc against the Teutonic obstruction of Christianization process in Lithuania, and those of Stanisław of Skarbimierz on just war and the cooperation between Christians and pagans. Following the concepts of *ius gentium* and *ius naturale*, Paulus Vladimiri argues that pagans living in peace have the right to property and their own states. At the same time he challenges the right of pope and emperor to declare war on pagans without any justified cause. Neither popes nor emperors can claim their power over territories populated by pagans. Consequently, papal and imperial documents which granted pagan territories in Prussia or Lithuania to the Teutonic Knights are invalid, as they violate natural law and divine law alike. Furthermore, Paweł considered all wars against pagans waged by the Teutonic Order unjust. Fighting against pagan Prussians and Lithuanians, they violate divine, natural, canon and civil laws. Their possession of territories in Prussia is illegal. Their claims to spreading Christianity are false as the conversion of pagans by force is against natural law, *ius gentium* and Christ's commandments. Sketching the history of the long conflict between Poland and the Teutonic Order, the Cracow scholar demonstrates that just war was waged only by Polish kings, while the Teutonic Knights

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p 259: „Cum igitur evidenter constat ex predictis ad predictos Cruciferos nichil iuris pertinere de omnibus prefatis bonis, terris, et dominiis, per eos occupatis ut dictum est, tum quia falsitas litterarum istarum falsam causam eis prestitit occupandi, tum quia ea detinent nomine hospitalis quod in rerum natura nullum est notorie, tum quia optinent ea per rapinam notoriam: igitur constat notorie de non iure ipsorum. Et per consequens constat nullum eis pro dictis dominiis comptere accionem nec eciam excepcionem, sed simpliciter per hanc sacram synodum fore realiter compellendos cum effectu ad eorum dimissionem.”

⁴⁵ Dated by the editor to 1415; Paweł Włodkovic, *Saevientibus*, in: Paweł Włodkovic, *Pisma wybrane*, vol. 1, pp. 2–112.

acted against the Christian doctrine. His treatise concludes with an appeal to the council to condemn the Order as heretic and abolish it⁴⁶.

Employing legal and logical *auctoritates*, Paulus Vladimiri promotes the concept of religious toleration, which openly rejects any use of force in the matters of religion. All men are equal and each man possesses unlimited religious freedom. Only God as the supreme being and the principle of all beings has the absolute power over all men. Free will is part of human nature and makes all men different from animals. If so, it should be respected and protected as a key human right. Free will offers each person the right to decide what he or she wants to do. That is why it is against divine and natural law to enforce any choice on a person. In particular, free will should be respected in relation to matters of faith. The choice of faith should result from free will and no force should be used to infringe freedom of that act. Paulus Vladimiri does not deny that Christianity has a missionary character and that the teaching of Jesus Christ should be disseminated by Christians among pagans. Actually, he acknowledges the role of Christians to be active in spreading the Gospels to all people who have not learnt them yet. Tracing back the history of Christianity, he realizes that mass conversion of pagans often followed the baptism of their ruler. It seems that Paulus Vladimiri does not criticize such conversions of pagans, respecting the leading role of their rulers. At the same time he does not reject the crusade ideology as long as crusades serve to restore Christianity among the peoples who were once baptized and later abandoned the Christian faith. His reflections on the conversion of pagans are closely associated with his concept of political government within Christendom. Interestingly, Paulus Vladimiri argues that the highest and universal power belongs only to the pope. As the vicar of Christ, the pope is the highest authority in spiritual matters, and as such is superior to the emperor.

These two problems discussed above are important as the foundation

⁴⁶ Ludwik Ehrlich, *Paweł Włodkowiec*, pp. 67–71, Hartmut Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg, der Deutsche Orden und die polnische Politik. Untersuchungen zur politischen Theorie des späteren Mittelalter*, (ser. *Veröffentlichungen des Max Planck-Instituts für Geschichte*, 45), Göttingen: Max Planck-Institut für Geschichte, 1975, pp. 230–234; Krzysztof Ozóg, *Uczeni*, pp. 213–214.

of Paulus Vladimiri's theory of toleration. It is worth noting that the whole argument related to the conversion of pagans in *De potestate papae* is presented in a dozen of verses, but its intellectual potential is outstanding and theological consequences explosive. Discussing the crusades against pagan Lithuanians, Paulus Vladimiri argues that Lithuania was never a Christian country and as such should not be the target of crusades. The situation of Lithuania is juxtaposed to that of the Holy Land, where Jesus Christ was born, lived and sacrificed His life. If so, the pope has the right to declare war on Saracens and to organize crusades to restore Christian control over the Holy Land. In the eyes of Paulus Vladimiri, in every territorial dispute legal arguments should come first and be decisive. In the case of Lithuania, the principle of religious freedom does not contradict the above-mentioned principle of restitution, but it does not in itself protect the Lithuanian sovereignty. It is interesting to see how Paulus Vladimiri attempts to explain his two different approaches to the crusades against Saracens and against pagan Lithuanians. His preliminary thesis raises the question whether Christian monarchs can legitimately expel Saracens and Jews from their kingdoms and confiscate their property. Additionally, he poses another question the circumstances under which the pope has the right to punish infidels. In his arguments, Włodkowiec accepts the following presumptions:

1. If infidels want to live in peace among Christians, they should not be repressed and their property confiscated. Neither any ruler nor the pope might repress them if they respect religious and social order of Christendom.
2. The pope has the power over infidels living outside the Christian world even if they are outside his jurisdiction. The pope as the vicar of Christ has the power over all human beings. So he could punish infidels if they act against natural law and commit idolatry.

The idea of religious toleration promoted by Paulus Vladimiri is thus limited and can be granted only conditionally. As idolatry is against natural law (it is natural to venerate only one God the Creator of all universe), it should be punished by the pope. Only Muslims and Jews as monotheists are excluded from those repressions.

In international literature Paulus Vladimiri is rightly considered a forerunner of modern theories of human rights, as in his writings and public proclamations he did pioneer the concept of peaceful coexistence among nations, regardless of their ethnicities or religions. With great zeal and determination, he argued that the world should be guided by the principles of peace and mutual respect among nations. In his opinion, pagans have their place in the world created by God and ruled by the principle of natural law, they are God's creatures and possess the same rights as Christians. If so, they have a right to peace and to ownership of their lands, and no one is allowed to attack them and seize their property without sin.

IUS GENTIUM AND THE CONVERSION OF PAGANS
AT THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE (1414–1418)

Polish activities against the Teutonic Knights reached its climax at the Council of Constance, which became the biggest international forum where the Polish-Teutonic conflict was presented and a move towards resolution was attempted. On the one hand, the Teutonic Order, represented by its procurator Peter of Ornetá, took steps to demonstrate that the Polish King had cooperated with pagans to the detriment of Christianity and waged war to destroy a Christian institution, the Teutonic Knights. On the other hand, the Polish delegation, headed by Mikołaj Trąba, archbishop of Gniezno and former chancellor, launched an active campaign to counterbalance the Teutonic offensive and prove that the struggle against the Teutonic Order was just war. Among the members of the Polish delegation there were three outstanding and experienced lawyers: Jakub of Kurdwanów, Andrzej Łaskarzyc and Paweł Włodkowic. All of them were doctors of decrees who had studied at the University of Padua and kept friendly contacts with leading Italian professors of Roman and canon law. At the same time they were highly experienced diplomats who had spent a long time in the service of the Polish King and were responsible for legal proceedings against the Teutonic Knights. Their knowledge of law, diplomatic experience and friendship with European intellectuals made them perfectly able advocates of the Polish King at the Council of

Constance. Undoubtedly, Paulus Vladimiri and Andrzej Łaskarzyc were behind the appointment of Simon of Teramo, professor of law at the University of Padua, as the procurator of the Polish King in the trial with the Teutonic Knights. All activities of Polish delegates were supported by Italian lawyers such as Casper of Perugia and Augustine of Pisa. It is worth mentioning two other representatives of Cracow University: Piotr Wolfram, licentiate of canon law, and Andrzej of Kokorzyn, bachelor of theology, who acted as intermediaries between the Polish King and his delegates at Constance⁴⁷.

Activities of Polish delegates at Constance took various forms. On 13 February 1416, at the suggestion of King Jagiełło, representatives of Samogitia, 60 baptised Samogitians, arrived in Constance and made a formal complaint against the Teutonic Order, called *Proposicio Samaytarum*. They complained about a number of atrocities perpetrated by the Teutonic Knights in their lands. At the same time they requested that the council of Constance appoint King Jagiełło and Grand Duke Vytautas to be protectors of Samogitia's Christianization and entrust Christianizing mission to the archbishop of Lviv and the bishop of Vilnius. That Samogitian action was supported by members of the Polish delegation. Their *Propositio Polonorum* was publicly presented at the same session by Cracow professors Piotr Wolfram and Italian scholar Augustine of Pisa⁴⁸. The authors of that text are unknown, but it seems that the draft was first prepared in the chancery of the Polish King and its final version was produced at Constance by Paul Vladimiri, Andrzej Łaskarzyc and Mikołaj Trąba. In the *Propositio* Polish delegates presented a list of charges against the Teutonic Knights, describing in detail injuries committed by them in Lithuania after its conversion to Christianity. The *Propositio Polonorum* focused on the hostility of the Teutonic Order towards the Polish King and Poland in general. But it discussed two opposing approaches to the Christianization of Lithuanians as well. On the one hand, the Polish delegates presented the progress of Christianizing missions in Lithuania, extolling the

⁴⁷ Krzysztof Ożóg, *Uczeni*, pp. 206–207.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 210–211.

role of Jagiełło and Vytautas in the construction of new churches and promoting Catholic clergy. On the other hand, they stressed that the progress of Christianization was obstructed by the Teutonic Order, which continued to invade Lithuania as it was still a pagan country. The message conveyed by the *Propositio* was clear: the Teutonic Knights interrupted the spread of Christianity and waged unjust war against Christians. In doing so, they compromised their own mission and deserved to be punished for that. The *Propositio* was concluded with two proposals: that the Order be quickly reformed and that it be transferred from Prussia to the outskirts of Christendom, to the borderlands of Turks and Tartars (*in metis Tartharorum et Turcorum*)⁴⁹.

CONCLUSIONS

In the first decades of the fifteenth century Cracow scholars adopted the concept of *ius gentium* stemming directly from *ius naturale* and *ius divinum*. It served to demonstrate that natural rights were granted to all human beings and included religious freedom and the right to own property. Employed by the Polish King, Cracow professors used those concepts to undermine the idea of Holy War and conversion by force promoted by the Teutonic Order. Krzysztof Ożóg and Wojciech Świeboda have recently reexamined the role played by Cracow intellectuals such as Stanisław of Skarbimierz, Andrzej Łaskarzyc or Paweł Włodkowic in the diplomatic dispute with the Teutonic Order. Their international actions intensified a few years before the battle of Grunwald and culminated at the Council of Constance in 1415–1418. Thanks to their writings and public activities, the concept of converting pagans by force was successfully challenged and the Teutonic military operations against Lithuania exposed to wider criticism. At the same time, their pioneering reflections on *ius gentium* and *bellum iustum* questioned the medieval idea of Holy War and stimulated new approaches to infidels.

⁴⁹ *Codex epistolaris Vitoldi magni ducis Lithuaniae 1376–1430*, ed. Antoni Prochaska, (ser. *Monumenta mediae aevi historica res gestas Poloniae illustrantia*, 6), Cracoviae: Akademia Umiejętności, 1882, pp. 1001–1008; see comments by: Hartmut Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg*, pp. 206–208, 219–222.

YVES KRUMENACKER

CAN WE GIVE THE GOSPEL TO THOSE WHO HAVE
NOT HEARD OF IT? REFORMED THEOLOGICAL
DISCOURSES ABOUT THE SALVATION OF PAGANS
IN THE EARLY MODERN ERA

The Protestant Reformation happened almost at the same time as the great voyages around Africa and towards Asia, as well as the discovery of America. Thus, when a new Christian denomination arose, there emerged unprecedented opportunities for evangelizing new peoples. However, all historians agree that, in the 16th and 17th centuries, it was almost exclusively the Catholic Church that took up the challenge. Such weakness in Protestant missionary expansion has been accounted for in various ways. It has been suggested that the new Church had other priorities (reforming Christianity, strengthening an alternative doctrine to Roman theology, etc.); that 16-century Protestant nations were none too familiar with distant overseas lands; that the removal of religious orders led to a shortage of missionary personnel, etc¹. Our

¹ Gustav Warneck, *Abriss einer Geschichte des protestantischen Missionen*, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1882; Gustav Plitt, Otto Hardeland, *Geschichte der lutherischen Mission*, vol. 2, Berlin: A. Deichert, 1894–1895; Gustav Kawerau, *Warum fehlte des deutschen evangelischen Kirche des 16 und 17 Jahrhunderts das volle Verständnis für die Missionsgedanken der heiligen Schrift?*, Breslau: Korn, 1896; *Les Précurseurs de l'idée missionnaire en France aux XVIe et XVIIe siècles*, Paris: Société des Missions Évangéliques, 1923; François Rousseau, "Les Protestants aux XVIe et XVIIe siècles et la théorie de l'idée de mission", in: *Revue d'Histoire de l'Eglise de France*, 1926, vol. 12, pp. 443–459; Walter Holsten, "Reformation and Mission", in: *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 1953, vol. 44, pp. 1–32; Hans-Werner Gensichen, "Were the Reformers indifferent to Missions?", in: *History's Lessons for Tomorrow's Mission*, Genève: WSCF, 1960, pp. 119–127; William Hogg, "The Rise of Protestant Missionary Concern", in: Gerald H. Anderson, *Theology of Christian Mission, 1517–1914*, London: SCM Press, 1961,

contribution to this debate will examine theological texts dedicated to the evangelization of pagans in order to determine whether leaders of the New Churches did actually strive to boost that effort. We shall limit ourselves to the Calvinist literature tradition, not to embrace too vast a subject.

WHAT EVANGELIZERS?

In the Roman Catholic Church, missions used to be, overwhelmingly, performed by members of religious orders. Though there were a few somewhat adventurous secular priests, seeking fortune and limiting their ministries to their fellow-countrymen before expanding it to other populations, such as Las Casas in its infancy², the first modern-era missionaries belonged mainly to long-standing religious orders, including the mendicant ones (Augustinians, Carmelites, Mercedarians, Franciscans and Dominicans), and later to new orders such as the Jesuits and the Recollects, the Vincentians (Lazarists), the Sulpicians, the Paris Foreign Missions priests, etc. However, Protestantism removed the old orders and did not create new ones. Who, then, could evangelize pagans?

Ecclesiology has a very important place in Calvin's theology. The matter of the organization of the Early Church and Church ministries at his time is dealt with extensively in Book IV (the 1559–1560 edition) of the *Institution de la Religion Chrétienne*. This point was little developed

pp. 95–111; Yves Krumenacker, “Le protestantisme et les découvertes au XVIe siècle”, in: *Découvertes et explorateurs*, Bordeaux: Histoire au Présent/L'Harmattan, 1994, pp. 239–251; Yves Krumenacker, “La conversion interdite? Lectures de l'évangélisation primitive par le protestantisme de l'époque moderne”, in: *Convertir/Se convertir: Regards croisés sur l'histoire des missions chrétiennes*, eds. Jan Borm, Bernard Cottret, Jean-François Zorn, Paris: Nolin, 2006, pp. 55–67; Andrew Buckler, *Jean Calvin et la mission de l'Eglise*, Lyon: Olivetan, 2008.

² Manuel Giménez Fernández, “Fray Bartolomé de Las Casas: A Biographical Sketch”, in: *Bartolomé de las Casas in History: Toward an Understanding of the Man and his Work*, eds. Juan Friede, Benjamin Keen, DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1971, pp. 67–126; *The Life and Writings of Bartolomé de Las Casas*, eds. Henry Raup Wagner, Helen Rand Parish, Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1967, pp. 5–6.

in the early editions of the book and not until 1543, not only from Scripture but not from the Fathers of the Church either³. The clearest classification of ministries can be found in Chapter III of Book IV. Calvin believed the early Church had five ministries: apostles, to preach the Gospel to all; prophets, who have special revelations; evangelists, whose “ministries are next in importance to the Apostles’, though they are inferior in dignity”; doctors, who are in charge of explaining Scripture; pastors, who are responsible for “discipline”, [...] to administer Sacraments, [...] for exhorting and remonstrating, [...] and for explaining Scripture”. The first three ministries are not to be perpetual but subject “to the time it was necessary to establish churches where there were none,” a time that, Calvin believed, was gone, though God could still, exceptionally, generate apostles or evangelists. Only pastors are left for the ordinary Church; these are close to apostles, except for one thing: “What Apostles do around the whole world, each Pastor is required to do in his own Church, which he is a representative of.” Every pastor is indeed linked to a particular Church⁴. As can be seen, no ministry was designed to evangelize pagans in Calvin’s times.

This organization is reflected in the various Reformed Churches. For example, the *Discipline des Églises réformées de France* from 1559 reserves the term “minister” for pastors, and it attributed to the offices of deacon and elder the same tasks as in Geneva⁵; ministers, elected by a consistory, are not allowed to preach elsewhere without prior consent of the minister or the consistory they visit – which means they can rarely do so in non-Christian lands⁶. Later versions of the *Discipline*,

³ Alexandre Ganoczy, *Calvin théologien de l’Église et du ministère*, Paris: Cerf, 1964; about Calvin in general see: Yves Krumenacker, *Calvin au-delà des légendes*, Paris: Bayard, 2009.

⁴ Jean Calvin, *Institution de la Religion Chrétienne*, ed. Jean-Daniel Benoit, Paris: Vrin, 1957–1963, IV, III, § 4–9; for the most part, the writing of these paragraphs goes back to 1545.

⁵ *L’Organisation et l’action des églises réformées de France (1557–1563): Synodes provinciaux et autres documents*, eds. Philip Benedict, Nicolas Fornerod, Genève: Droz, 2012, pp. lii–liii.

⁶ Bernard Roussel, “La *Discipline des Églises réformées de France* en 1559: un

until 1659, greatly increased the requirements regarding ministers, but they were again not expected to evangelize outside their own Churches; quite the contrary, actually: “Ministers will not be elected without assigning them a particular herd, and they shall be suited to the herds they have been assigned.”⁷ Calvin, for his part, was much more discreet than Luther on the notion of universal priesthood and did not seem to consider that any faithful can evangelize: according to the Genevan reformer, God can be known only through pastors: “He [God] elects among men those he will make his ambassadors, whose task it is to enlighten the world about His will.”⁸

Of course, Calvin also stressed in many sermons (especially in sermons on Deuteronomy, preached from 1555 to 1556) the need to “draw all men on earth to God”, so as to grow and multiply the kingdom of Christ; note however, that he preached to Geneva citizens who would never have the opportunity to evangelize pagans: hence, his exhortations were only rhetorical. Nowhere does he tell them to leave their city to make the Word of God available to distant peoples. When he speaks of the whole earth, it is to explain that it is God himself who spreads his doctrine, without us knowing what instruments he might have used: “Suffice it that God spreads the doctrine of salvation throughout the world, that there are small herds assembled here and there [...] It [the doctrine of the gospel] must resound throughout the earth, and let our Lord plant Churches everywhere, and be worshiped among barbarous people”¹⁰.

royaume sans clergé?”, in: *De l'Humanisme aux Lumières, Bayle et le protestantisme*, eds. Michelle Magdelaine, Maria-Cristina Pitassi, Ruth Whelan, Antony McKenna, Paris: Universitas, Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1996, pp. 169–191.

⁷ Isaac D'Huisseau, *La Discipline des Eglises réformées de France*, Genève et Saumur, ed. Isaac Desbordes, 1667, p. 61.

⁸ Jean Calvin, *Institution de la Religion Chrétienne* (Book IV, Chapter III, § 1), Marne-la-Vallée: Farel, 1978, p. 54.

⁹ Sermon on Deuteronomy, 33, 18–19, quoted by Andrew Buckler, *op. cit.*, p. 91. In this book, Buckler mentions numerous quotations from Calvin, mainly drawn from his Commentaries of Scripture and from his sermons, supporting the advancement of Christ's Kingdom.

¹⁰ Sermon on Isaiah 26, 15, quoted by Andrew Buckler, *op. cit.*, pp. 97–98.

PRIMITIVE EVANGELIZATION
AND THE DAMNATION OF PAGANS

A second obstacle to the evangelization of pagans is the belief that this work has already been done in apostolic times. That idea was already found in Luther's work, who had taken up the patristic and medieval tradition. It was taken up again, with some nuances, in the Calvinist tradition. Calvin himself was aware, however, that some people had never been evangelized. He knew, since he had followed Admiral Nicolas Durand de Villegagnon's expedition to Brazil quite closely, that the Topinambous Indians had no knowledge of God¹¹ and, in the *Institution de la Religion Chrétienne*, he wondered "how is it that cognizance of the pure heavenly truth has never been made known to so many people, and that others have hardly had any opportunity to get a taste of only some rudiments of it?"¹² The answer, he said, commenting on the first letter to Timothy, was that God never said that all men and women were to know the truth, but that it was the sole privilege of all states and all conditions; and when Matthew mentioned that the Good News was to be spread throughout the world, he only meant it would simply be found in "the most distant neighborhoods of the world"¹³. Augustin Marlorat (1506–1562), a pastor in Rouen, also explained that "all men" actually means "all states and conditions"¹⁴. Calvin himself did not seem to set great store by the actual realization of primitive evangelization because, while he would take a more relative view of it in some passages, he bore it out in others: in his commentaries on the Gospels, he explained that the

¹¹ Olivier Reverdin, *Quatorze calvinistes chez les Topinambous. Histoire d'une mission genevoise au Brésil (1556–1558)*, Genève: Droz, 1957.

¹² Jean Calvin, *Institution de la Religion Chrétienne* (Book III, Chapter 24, §15), *op. cit.*, p. 453.

¹³ Jean Calvin, *Commentaires [...] sur toutes les epistres de l'apostre saint Paul*, Genève: Etienne Anastase, 1560 (about 1 Tim 2. 4); Jean Calvin, *Concordance qu'on appelle harmonie*, Genève: C. Badius, 1555 (about Mt 24. 14).

¹⁴ Augustin Marlorat, *Le Nouveau Testament*, Genève: Jean Bonne-Foy, 1563 (about 1 Tim 2. 4).

doctrine had spread throughout the world after the apostles' departure from Galilee, which fulfilled the prophecy in Isaiah 49. 6¹⁵.

After Calvin, Théodore de Bèze expressed the same conviction that the apostles' preaching had reached the other side of the world or the New world in their times, because, as St. Paul wrote, at least a taste of the Gospel had penetrated there¹⁶. In the Netherlands, Hugo Grotius was also convinced that the Gospel had reached across the ocean in Pope Clement's time¹⁷. However, Adrian Saravia, professor at Leiden until 1588 (then in exile in England), found that the Gospel had not yet reached all peoples¹⁸. As we shall see, many Dutch theologians, rather than questioning the reality of primitive evangelization, insisted on the need to bring the Good News to pagans. In contrast, Lutheran theologians almost universally agreed that this work had already been accomplished in apostolic times: Lossius, Nicolai, Gesner, Gerhard, Johannes Müller, and many others, had no doubt about it either¹⁹.

Equally interesting is the conclusion that most of these theologians derive from the existence of a primitive evangelization. Again, Calvin's ideas were broadly shared. To his mind, pagans had no extenuating circumstances: God "has imprinted some marks of his glory in all his works, and even in such a clear and significant way, that no allowance for ignorance can be allowed to the harshest and least sophisticated peoples in the world"²⁰. The Geneva reformer added in his commentary

¹⁵ *Commentaires de Jehan Calvin sur le Nouveau Testament*, Genève: Conrad Badius, 1561 (about Mc 16. 15 and Mt 28. 19).

¹⁶ Théodore de Bèze, *Jesu Christi Domini Nostri Novum Testamentum...*, Genève: H. Estienne, 1565 (about Col 1. 23).

¹⁷ *Annotata ad ss. Evangelia... Sive Criticorum sacrorum*, t. 4, Francfort: Balthasar Wust, 1696 (Grotius, about Mt 24. 14).

¹⁸ Adrian Saravia, *De ministrorum evangelii diversis gradibus liber...*, London: G. Bishop & R. Newberie, 1590.

¹⁹ Yves Krumenacker, "La conversion interdite?..."; a great number of texts are quoted by *Mission in Quellentexten: Von der Reformation bis zur Weltmissionskonferenz 1910*, ed. Werner Raupp, Erlangen: Verlag der Evang.-Luth. Mission, Bad Liebenzell: Verlag der Liebenzeller Mission, 1990.

²⁰ Jean Calvin, *Institution de la Religion Chrétienne* (Book I, Chapter 5, § 1), *op. cit.*, p. 17.

on Psalm 19 that “the glory of God is not written in cryptic and small letters, but richly engraved in nice big letters for everyone to read, and easily, too”²¹. For him, pagans have had some knowledge of the truth: “We see that among pagans there had always remained a residue of truth; we will see, from some of the statements pagans have formulated, that it is impossible for natural man to think up by themselves any of those they have brought there. Why then? It is God who has brought them there, for their conviction to be all the greater, so that on the last day it will all be taken into account?”²². We can better understand why the matter of primitive evangelization was of little importance in Calvin’s eyes: even though the Word of God had not been announced to them, they should have known the truth by contemplating creation; and if they remained ignorant, it was because God had doomed them. Predestination does actually extend to particular persons: it is each and every man that God saves or otherwise dooms to damnation²³. It is easy to deduce that trying to convert pagans who had turned away from God could only be a transgression of God’s eternal purposes.

Obviously, his successors shared similar views. Marlorat thought knowledge of God through creation “does not come before removing any excuse from men; and is quite different from what is alluded to in John 17, 3; which leads to salvation”²⁴. Bèze seemed of the same opinion, and hardly considered sending missionaries to the peoples deprived of Revelation because, under predestination, they were just excluded from salvation²⁵. Much later, an echo of this teaching can be found in Charles Drelincourt’s works, though he was a supporter of sending missionaries

²¹ *Commentaires de Jehan Calvin sur le livre des Pseaumes*, Paris: Ch. Meyrueis, 1859 (about Ps 19. 4).

²² Sermon 176 about Dt 31, quoted by Louis Caperan, *Le Problème du Salut des Infidèles*, Paris: Beauchesne, 1912, p. 233.

²³ Jean Calvin, *Institution de la Religion Chrétienne* (Book III, Chapter 21, § 7), *op. cit.*, pp. 402–404.

²⁴ Augustin Marlorat, *Le Nouveau Testament* (about Rm 1. 20).

²⁵ Michel Delval, “La doctrine du Salut dans l’œuvre homilétique de Théodore de Bèze”, in: *Mémoire de la Ve section de l’École Pratique des Hautes Études*, 1982.

to pagans and was sure the whole world had not been evangelized at the time of the apostles²⁶.

The question looks like an open and closed case, then: the belief, a widely shared one, that primitive evangelization has indeed taken place, the assurance that outside the knowledge of Jesus Christ there can be no salvation, and the strength of the doctrine of predestination acted as a powerful restriction to the missionary enterprise of spreading the Word of God. Moreover, it is even more so in the Lutheran world. Georg Möbius went, against all evidence, to the extent of writing, in 1685, that the apostles could only have managed to go to America on foot, in order to accomplish the divine will of offering salvation to all²⁷! Lucas Lossius better represented the majority opinion regarding the damnation of all pagans and thinking it could only be a consequence of their sins²⁸. Their common teaching was to be found in *Loci Theologici* by Johann Gerhard who taught that preaching the Gospel throughout the earth belonged to the apostles and that this duty had not been passed on to the Church; therefore the Gentiles could only be damned²⁹. This was the basis of the Lutheran teaching for decades. One final example could be a submission written in 1651 by the Faculty of Theology at Wittenberg claiming that God had legitimately removed salvation from the peoples who were still in darkness, on account of their carelessness and ingratitude³⁰.

²⁶ Charles Drelincourt, *Les Visites charitables, ou les consolations chrétiennes, pour toutes sortes de personnes affligées*, Amsterdam: Pierre Mortier, 1731, 52nd visit, pp. 410–468 (1st edition 1667).

²⁷ Georg Möbius, *Tractatus Philologico-Theologicus de Oraculorum origine, propagatione, & duratione*, Lipsæ: Justin Brand, 1685.

²⁸ *Annotationum scholasticarum Lucae Lossii Luneburgensis in Novum Testamentum Iesu Christi Nazareni, promissi à Deo per Moysen & prophetas ... Tomus quintus, in quo continetur ad Romanos Epistola Diui Pauli Apostoli ...*, Francfort: Chr. Egen, 1562.

²⁹ Johann Gerhard, *Loci theologici*, 1610–1625 (numerous editions), volume 6, locus 23, Chapter V, § 210–225.

³⁰ A dissertation presented to Count Erhardt Truchsess zu Wetzhausen in 1651 by the Wittenberg Theological Faculty, in: *Mission in Quellentexten*, pp. 70–71.

OPENINGS FOR MISSION

Yet there were openings for mission, especially in the Calvinist world, and indeed, though Protestant missions were very rare in the 16th century, they became slightly more numerous in the next one. Calvin, the first among others, did not close the door on any attempt at evangelization in his time. But can we indeed say, as do the advocates of the view that Calvin had a missionary vision, that all his actions, the reform of Geneva, the will to bring the powerful to the true faith, sending books and pastors to France and elsewhere, were done out of missionary intent³¹? This would be consistent with the ancient usage of the word, meaning that God manifests Himself, makes Himself present in this world, as a mission, even though Calvin never used the word “mission” to describe his reformation work. Hold on, are we not going too far when we equate preaching within the Christian world and proclaiming the Gospel to those who do not know Christ? Calvin thought the main objective was to reform the Church, to bring it back to true piety, to surrender all its glory to God, but only among peoples who knew him already, even though their faith was deeply clouded. Never ever did he contemplate starting a new Church, unlike, for example, the Anabaptists. On the other hand, he was convinced that it is always God who leads men. “Missionary activism”, like the one that could be found within the Catholic Church, was therefore out of the question. Commenting on the episode when Paul came to Troas to preach the Gospel, but failed to meet Titus and went on his way to Macedonia instead, where he felt called by God, Calvin declared that “an opportunity had then presented itself to advance the Gospel. For, just as we can enter when the door is open, the Lord’s servants also make advancements when the means prove to be available to them. The door is closed when there is no hope of ever making the most of it”³².

³¹ Philip Hugues, “John Calvin, Director of Missions”, in: *The Heritage of John Calvin*, ed. John H. Bratt, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1973, pp. 40–54; Andrew Buckler, *Jean Calvin et la mission de l’Église*, Lyon: Olivétan, 2008.

³² *Commentaires sur toutes les épistres de l’apostre saint Paul*, Genève: Estienne Anastase, 1560 (about 2 Cor 2, 12).

When, in 1556, an expedition in Brazil, led by Admiral de Villegagnon, requested pastors, Geneva sent two, but probably more as European explorers. Nevertheless, one of the members of the expedition, Jean de Léry, began to try and convert the Topinambous Indians who, he thought, had been evangelized by St. Matthew himself. Twenty years later, he had become a pastor and interpreted his failed attempt as a sign that God had not included the Topinambous among his elect³³. An opportunity had presented itself to preach the Gospel, he had been bound to seize it, but he need not have persisted when conversion did not happen, because it was evidence that such was not God's will. Yet, it was the main and one of the few attempts at evangelization by France or Geneva during the 16th and 17th centuries.

However, some records have been found of Huguenots lamenting the scarcity of Protestants on the mission field. The great size of Catholic literature on missions has undoubtedly played a great role. Reports and letters the Jesuits would send to report on their missions to their congregations were often published, as early on as the famous one written by Francis Xavier in 1545; as of 1583, extracts from annual letters were communicated to pupils in Jesuit grammar schools (and we know today

³³ About that famous expedition, see: Franck Lestringant, "Calvinistes et cannibales. Les Écrits protestants sur le Brésil Français (1555–1560)", in: *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français*, 1980, vol. 126, pp. 9–26, 167–192; Franck Lestringant, "Tristes Tropicistes: du Brésil à la France, une controverse coloniale à l'aube des guerres de Religion", in: *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 1985, vol. CCII, no. 3, pp. 267–294; Franck Lestringant, *Le Huguenot et le sauvage*, Paris: Klincksieck, 1990; Franck Lestringant, *Une sainte horreur ou le voyage en Eucharistie, XVIIe–XVIIIe siècle*, Paris: PUF, 1996; Franck Lestringant, "Le huguenot et le sauvage: nouvelles hypothèses, nouveaux documents", in: *La France-Amérique (16th – 17th centuries)*, ed. Franck Lestringant, Paris: Honoré Champion, pp. 131–142 (and, in the same collection, the article by B. Conconi); Franck Lestringant, *Jean de Léry ou l'invention du sauvage: essai sur l'Histoire d'un voyage fait en la terre du Brésil*, Paris: Honoré Champion, 1999; Franck Lestringant, *D'encre de Brésil: de Léry écrivain*, Orléans: Paradigme, 1999; Yves Krumenacker, "Le protestantisme et les découvertes au XVIe siècle"; Yves Krumenacker, "La conversion interdite? ..."; Thierry Wanegffelen, "Rio ou la vraie Réforme", in: *Aux temps modernes: naissance du Brésil*, Paris: PUPS, 1998, pp. 161–175; Mauricio A. Abreu, "La France Antarctique, colonie protestante ou catholique?", in: *Les Huguenots et l'Atlantique* eds. Mickaël Augeron, Didier Poton, Bertrand Van Ruymbeke, Paris: PUPS, 2009, pp. 125–134.

that, despite censorship by consistories and synods, many Protestants would send their children there) and to the general public. In the 17th century, the *Relations*, whose most famous ones were the *Relations de la Nouvelle France* (41 volumes, 1632–1673), were a great success. Moreover, missionaries published stories of evangelization, which enjoyed great readership, such as *L'Histoire générale des choses de la Nouvelle Espagne* by Bernardino de Sahagun; *L'Histoire naturelle et morale des Indes* by José de Acosta, *L'Histoire de l'expédition chrétienne au Royaume de la Chine* by Nicolas Trigault, or *L'Histoire des Indes orientales et occidentales* by Giovanni Pietro Maffei³⁴. To which must be added a whole series of Protestant “black literature”; these writings were meant to give Catholic missions a bad name – but at the same time, they made them more widely known as well – such as the translation by Urbain Chauveton of the *Historia del Mondo Nuovo* by Girolamo Benzoni, *De Rebus Gestis* by Jeronimo Osorio and translated by Simon Goulart³⁵, or then again Las Casas’ translation of *Brevissima Relación de la destruccion de las Indias*³⁶. Though quite a few Protestants were sensitive to the exposure of the cruelties practiced by missionaries and the hypocrisy of Catholic states – arguably more responsive to economic wealth than to the salvation of pagans – or denounced the refusal to accept God’s judgment irremediably condemning those who had not known Christ, others took a keen interest in these remote regions and lamented that Protestants took no part in this evangelistic effort.

We have some examples in France, like the one of Beaulieu Heves who, in 1646, wanted to bring the Gospel to the peoples who had never heard of it³⁷; or of a lawyer at the Paris Parliament, Henry Mouche, *Sieur*

³⁴ Jean Comby, *Deux mille ans d'évangélisation*, Paris: Desclée, 1992.

³⁵ Marcel Bataillon, “L’Amiral et les ‘nouveaux horizons’ français”, proceedings of the conference, *L’Amiral de Coligny et son temps (1972)*, *Bulletin de la Société d’Histoire du Protestantisme Français*, 1974, vol. 120, no. 5, pp. 42–50, 81–82.

³⁶ André Saint-Lu, “Les premières traductions françaises de la ‘Brevissima Relación de la destruccion de las Indias’ de Las Casas”, in: *Revue de Littérature comparée*, 1978, vol. 206–207–208, pp. 438–449.

³⁷ “Lettre inédite de Beaulieu-Heves à Ph. Vincent ministre de La Rochelle. 1646.”, in: *Bulletin de la Société d’Histoire du Protestantisme Français*, 1852, vol. 1, pp. 416–418.

de la Colombière, who sent huge amounts of money in the 1660s and 1670s to British companies with a view to spreading the faith³⁸. Similarly, the faithful person staged in Drelincourt's *Visites charitables* complains that there are no Protestants preaching the Gospel to pagans³⁹. In the Lutheran world, Philipp Nicolai deemed that the Jesuits were Christians doing Christian work by announcing the fall, damnation and salvation through Christ, and that Roman Catholic Churches, be they Ethiopian or Muscovite, were instruments of salvation because they kept planting the Gospel worldwide; Johannes Müller wrote that, when the papists converted pagans to the apostles' faith, it concerned the Church of God, even though the Roman Church was not the true Church⁴⁰.

Another route was explored by Adrian Saravia. Born in 1531 in Artois, he was first a Franciscan monk before converting to the Reformation in 1557. After a short stay in Geneva (1558), he went to England where many Dutch Protestants were fleeing Spanish repression. He married during his singular return to the continent and was then appointed curate of Threadneedle Street French Reformed Church, London. He returned to Antwerp in 1562, as a minister of the Walloon Church, and worked to spread the Reformation in the Netherlands. But he had to flee in 1563 and took refuge in Guernsey. He then reached Southampton in 1569, where he was headmaster of a school. The development of the Dutch Revolt allowed him to return to Ghent in 1580 and he became professor of theology (1584) and Dean (1585) of the University of Leiden. But he kept links with Britain and sought British intervention against Spain. Hence, he was suspected of conspiracy and was able to leave Leiden before being stripped of his post and sentenced to death. He fled to England where he became Dean of Tatenhill. This is where he wrote his *De ministrorum evangelii diversis gradibus liber* in 1590, which was refuted by Bèze and Gerhard among others. He questioned the traditional Calvinist ecclesiology, arguing

³⁸ *Livre des Actes des Eglises Wallonnes aux Pays-Bas, 1601–1697*, eds. Guillaume H. M. Posthumus Meyjes, Hans Bots, La Haye: Instituut voor Nederlandse Geschiedenis, 2005, pp. 804–805, 818–821, 832–835, 839–840, 844–848.

³⁹ Charles Drelincourt, *Les Visites charitables*.

⁴⁰ Texts quoted in: Werner Raupp, *op. cit.*

that the evangelizing mission was not peculiar to the apostles, but was transmitted to their successors, the bishops; since the Church was holding the key to power, it had to send missionaries to unbelieving people. He maintained his position in his response to Bèze, the *Defensio tractationis of diversis ministrorum Evangelii gradibus* in 1594. He subsequently had a successful career in England, until his death as Dean of Westminster in 1613⁴¹. In his works, he defended Episcopalian ecclesiology, which can obviously be related to its links with England and its integration in the latter part of his life in the Anglican Church. But his word was apparently hardly taken up by Calvinist theologians, perhaps precisely because of its Episcopalian leaning.

Another opening for missions took place in Holland, thanks to the development of the colonial empire. Indeed, as of 1595, ships had won their fight against the Portuguese monopoly over trade with the Malayan archipelago. In 1602, various commercial companies were merged into the Dutch *Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie* (VOC), founded in 1602, which had the monopoly of trade with the East, but also the opportunity to take possession of territories such as Java, the Moluccas or Ceylon, which put Dutch merchants in contact with non-Christian populations. The VOC statutes provided for the promotion and defence of the Dutch Reformed Church and, therefore, pastors accompanied expeditions and stayed in the colonies. A great number of them were much more concerned about settlers than natives, or baptized the latter only after very superficial evangelization. The experience, however, stirred true missionary zeal among some. Thus, Antoine Waleus founded, in Leiden in 1622, a *Seminarium Indicum* for VOC pastors, which, however, remained open for only eleven years. He was assisted in his efforts by Justus Heurnius, the author in 1618 of *De Legatione evangelica ad Indos capessenda Admonitio*, and he himself settled in the

⁴¹ Willem Nijenhuis, *Adrianus Saravia (c. 1532–1613)*, Leyde: Brill, 1980. The main works on the controversy have been written by Saravia, *De ministrorum evangelii diversis gradibus liber...*, London: G. Bishop & R. Newberie, 1590; and *Defensio tractationis de diversis ministrorum Evangelii gradibus*, London: reg. Typog., 1594; and by Théodore de Bèze, *Ad Tractationem de ministrorum evangelii gradibus, ab Hadriano Saravia Belga editam*, Genève: J. Le Preux, 1592.

Dutch East Indies from 1624 to 1639. The great Utrecht theologian, Gisbertus Voetius, defended the idea of missions to unbelievers, but under the authority of the synod and not of states or companies. His pupil, Johannes Hoornbeek, also a professor at Utrecht, then Leiden, wrote an important treatise, *De conversione Indorum ac gentilium* (posthumous, 1669), where he stressed the responsibility of the Dutch government for advancing the kingdom of Christ⁴². In total, over two centuries, the Dutch Reformed Church sent eight hundred pastors and thousands of deacons and teachers to Indonesia, and it is thought that the number of Indonesians baptized between 1708 and 1771 reached 43,748⁴³.

How are we to explain this evolution? An essential element is undoubtedly that one came into contact with reality. Writings that were most hostile to the evangelization of pagans often emanated from theologians who had not left Europe nor, oftentimes, even their countries. It dealt with theoretical reflections based on abstract dogmas, which could only spark disputes during the meeting, or through actual readings, with real pagans. One of the first to illustrate this was Jean de Lery: while in contact with the Topinambous, he preached the Gospel to them; it was not until much later, after studying theology, that he had explained why they had been excluded from salvation. Similarly, it was probably the encounter with the Malayan archipelago populations that brought theologians as strictly tied to Calvinism as Waleus – who played an important role at the Synod of Dort – or Voetius, one of the main representatives of the purest Reformed orthodoxy, to defend the idea of mission-work. Theologically, they could rely on the principle that every person, according to Calvin, must proclaim their faith around them; pastors surrounded by pagans enjoyed total legitimacy to announce the Gospel to them. On the other hand, the fact that these territories

⁴² Biographies of these characters can be found on the site of the Boston University School of Theology, History of Missiology, in: <http://www.bu.edu/missiology/about/>

⁴³ *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, vol. 6, 16, Berlin: De Gruyter, 1987, pp. 135–136.

were annexed by the Dutch authorities gave latter the obligation to evangelize their new subjects: it was no longer, strictly speaking, a matter of sending missionaries overseas, but of communicating the Gospel to the inhabitants of a territory of Reformed persuasion. Nevertheless, the Dutch decided to leave their province to serve in very remote areas where Christianity was almost unheard of. This was when they came very close to the Catholic missionary paradigm.

It should also be noted that similar efforts were undertaken, in America, by Puritans like Whitaker Mayhew or John Eliot, because of their eschatological ideas: they considered themselves chosen by God to spread His reign by converting the Indians before the advent of end times. Similarly, the protagonists of the Great Awakening in the 18th century were often millenarians, like Presbyterian Jonathan Edwards. It was the same with Pietists, who had millenarian ideas too and who wanted to spread the Gospel all over the world. This is probably another reason behind the way the Reformed missionary thought evolved.

HARTMUT LEHMANN

MARTIN LUTHER AND THE TURKS

Ever since the National Socialists drew on Luther's writings against the Jews in their propaganda to justify their racial policy of extermination, this topic has captured the attention of Reformation scholars and the wider public. By contrast, Luther's no less controversial writings on the Turks have not garnered the same level of scrutiny. It is only a few years ago that the first extensive studies on this topic were published¹. As we now know, Luther had a keen interest in the political and religious role of the Turks for most of his life. He referred to what he called the Turkish threat time and again. At no point was he more occupied with this topic than in the late 1520s, however, when the army of Sultan Suleiman threatened to conquer Vienna and the danger of the Turkish army invading Central Europe loomed large².

In 1529 and 1530 Luther published two treatises in which he sought to tell his followers how they should see the Turkish danger: first, in 1529, the treatise "On War Against the Turks" (*Vom Krieg wider die*

¹ Johannes Ehmann, *Luther, Türken und Islam: Eine Untersuchung zum Türken und Islambild Martin Luthers (1515–1546)*, Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2008; see also: Hartmut Bobzin, *Der Koran im Zeitalter der Reformation: Studien zur Frühgeschichte der Arabistik und Islamkunde in Europa*, Stuttgart: Steiner, 1995; Thomas Kaufmann, "Türckenbüchlein": *Zur christlichen Wahrnehmung 'türkischer Religion' in Spätmittelalter und Reformation*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008; Rudolf Mau, "Luthers Stellung zu den Türken", in: *Helmar Junghans, ed., Leben und Werk Martin Luthers von 1526–1546: Festgabe zu seinem 500 Geburtstag*, 2 vols., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983, pp. 647–662.

² For the context see: Martin Brecht, *Martin Luther*, vol. 2: *Ordnung und Abgrenzung der Reformation*, Calw: Calwer Verlagsverein, 1986, pp. 350–355; Heinz Schilling, *Martin Luther: Rebell in einer Zeit des Umbruchs: Eine Biographie*, München: C. H. Beck, 2012, pp. 544–550.

Türken)³ and then, in 1530, the “Sermon to Soldiers Fighting the Turk” (*Heerpredigt wider die Türken*)⁴. Already in 1518 Luther had explained that God would use the Turks as a rod to punish sinful Christians. They should accept this punishment and repent their sins and pray to God for mercy. Some of Luther’s adversaries sharply criticized his position as a sign of defeatism. In 1529, therefore, Luther clearly stated that Christian Europe had the right to defend itself against the armies of the Ottoman Empire. The Holy Roman Emperor, Charles V, should take the lead and use the sword, if necessary, for, as Luther explained, this was a power struggle in which military considerations prevailed. In full accordance with his teaching of the two realms, or regiments, Luther warned, however, that the fight against the Turks was not a struggle of one religion against another and was not a fight in which the Church should be directly involved, nor a kind of crusade. Rather, as he had done many times before, Luther admonished his readers that the Christian position toward this conflict should be remorse and prayer. Defending one’s homeland was only justified if one repented one’s sins and strove to be worthy of God’s mercy and grace.

In the second part of his treatise “On War against the Turks”, Luther took a closer look at the religious aspects of the controversy. In his view, Islam represented a highly dangerous belief system, deeply corrupted by demonic powers. Muslims were agents of the devil, he averred, and in particular their prophet, Muhammad, was the devil incarnate. This explained, according to Luther, why the Turks set out to destroy the livelihood of Christians. For Luther, therefore, the Turks were similar in many ways to the papacy and to witches. Like the papacy, they held wrong beliefs but claimed to govern the lives of people; like witches, they had concluded a pact with the devil and set out to do harm in his name. In this situation, Luther argued, Christians should learn a simple lesson. Just as true children of God should be vigilant and shield themselves against the papal influence, they should not believe any rumors that the Sultan was a benign ruler; and just as they should

³ WA [Weimarer Ausgabe] 30/II, pp. 10–148.

⁴ WA 30/II, pp. 160–197.

defend their houses and their property against all sorts of *maleficia* perpetrated by witches, they should do the same if the Turks continued to march beyond Vienna. The real task of devout Christians was not a new crusade, Luther concluded, but armed defense. All members of the empire should support the emperor in defending the empire as best they could.

In addition, Luther continued, adherents of Islam posed a particular menace for Christians as they threatened marriage and thus the very foundation of a Christian way of life. In this context, Luther sharply criticized polygamy and, as he bluntly said, women being bought and sold by Muslims like cattle. Four years earlier, in 1525, Luther had himself gotten married. In taking this step, he had wanted to demonstrate to his supporters that marriage was a gift sent by God. This may explain why he objected to polygamy so vehemently.

In his “Sermon to Soldiers fighting the Turks”, published in 1530, in the same year when the Augsburg Confession was issued, Luther offered yet another interpretation. In this treatise he attempted to explain what the Turkish threat meant in the context of salvation history. He pointed out that the Roman Empire was the last of the four empires prophesied by Daniel. Furthermore, he explained that the Holy Roman Empire was the last extension of the Roman Empire. The destruction of this empire would be immediately followed by the Second Coming and the Last Judgment. Therefore, Luther expected the battles with the Turks to be the battles between Christ and Gog and Magog, i.e., the two nations led by Satan in the decisive battle at Armageddon against the Kingdom of God. Within this apocalyptic scenario, Luther contended, attacks by the Turks were an essential next step, representing danger for Christians but also hope as divine redemption was near. The Turks were only able to claim temporal victories, Luther added, but could never conquer God’s realm. In the end, they were doomed. For Luther, Christians who died in these battles were martyrs because they had given their lives for a just cause.

Neither in 1529 nor 1530 were the Turks able to conquer Vienna, nor were they able to advance further north. Among Luther’s followers, and certainly for Luther himself, however, the fear persisted that the Turks might do so in the near future. In fact, during the last several years of his life, in the early 1540s, Luther was obsessed by fear that

the reform movement he had initiated and lent his name to, would fail because powers opposed to his aims, including the Turks, would take over Central Europe. In ever-stronger words, he now attacked those whom he considered his main enemies, namely, the papacy, the Jews and the Turks. These were the years when he wrote his tracts against the Jews, insisting that the Jews should be expelled and their synagogues destroyed. His pleas against the Turks, written in the same period, were also dictated by anger and equally full of similar phantasies of destruction and extermination.

Even at that time, however, Luther's main concern was the sinfulness of the Christian society. For example, in his "Admonition to Prayer Against the Turks" (*Vermahnung zum Gebet wider den Türken*)⁵, his main focus was on manifest sins of people in all walks of life. From Luther's point of view, his contemporaries were asking for punishment, and they should not be surprised if God used the Turks to do precisely that. Again, he repeatedly referred to the well-known theme of repentance and prayer. Therefore, when defending themselves against the Turks, his countrymen should always remember that they were fighting against a large army of devils because, as he continued, the Turkish army was in fact the devil's army.

At about the same time, sitting at the table with family and friends, Luther remarked that he was not interested in the personal life of Muhammad⁶. But Christians should nonetheless fight against Muhammad's teachings, that is, in his view, against the lies of the devil. This is why in 1542 Luther also published a German translation of a late medieval refutation of the Quran⁷. According to Luther, people should be able to read themselves how corrupt and dangerous the Koran was. Until his death, Luther never revised his earlier opinion that Christ's realm was a realm of mercy, while Muhammad's realm was one of revenge and rage⁸.

⁵ WA 51, pp. 585–625.

⁶ WATR (Table Talk) vol. 5, no. 5536 (winter 1542/43).

⁷ WA 53, pp. 272–396 (originally written by the Dominican brother Richard).

⁸ WATR, vol. 2, no. 1516 (May 1532).

Let me sum up with a question: How should we deal with this part of Luther's legacy as we approach the year 2017, when Lutherans from around the world prepare to celebrate the beginning of the Reformation? In the second decade of the twenty-first century, Turks form the biggest minority both in Protestant and Catholic parts of Germany. Until now, representatives of Turkish clubs and societies have not taken note of Luther's vitriolic attacks against the religion of Islam in general and against Muhammad in particular which, in my opinion, are no less insulting than the Danish caricatures of Muhammad that have caused so much trouble and confusion around the world in the past few years. Should the Protestant churches simply hope that the Turks in Germany, and Muslims in other countries, will not take much interest in Luther's writings, not even in 2017 when Protestants commemorate the beginning of the Reformation and Luther's historic achievements? Or should Protestants address this issue head-on? But how should they do it? Should they distance themselves from these particular writings of Luther? Should they argue that religious pluralism and religious tolerance were not part of the teachings of Luther and his disciples but that, over the years, Protestantism has moved beyond Luther's views and now respects other faiths and religions? Should they try to explain how strongly Luther feared the power of the devil and how he saw the evil doings of God's eternal adversary at work in various groups and movements, from rebellious peasants of 1525 and the papacy to the Jews as well as the Turks? It is not my intention to offer advice or provide answers to the questions that I have raised. But I am convinced that those who are preparing for the Luther jubilee of 2017 have yet to overcome many obstacles and conceive new ways forward and around difficult issues. Foremost among these will be a new and convincing interpretation of Luther's infamous writings against the Turks.

VAIDA KAMUNTAVIČIENĖ

CATHOLICS AND JEWS IN THE DIOCESE OF
VILNIUS IN THE 17TH CENTURY ACCORDING TO
THE CATHOLIC CHURCH VISITATIONS

The Diocese of Vilnius was the largest diocese in the 17th-century Europe in terms of area it covered. In 1669, according to the Synod of the Diocese of Vilnius, it contained 26 decanates and 410 churches¹. One of the Council of Trent decrees stated that all dioceses must be visited once a year. But the sheer size of the Diocese of Vilnius made this impossible. Materials of the 17th-century Diocese of Vilnius visitations have been discussed in the articles of Polish historian Waldemar Franciszek Wilczewski². There are only a handful of fragments of the 17th-century Diocese of Vilnius visitations, which cover only several decanates, surviving in Lithuanian and Polish archives. The most valuable of these include the visitation of Hrodna decanate for the years 1660–1662, conducted by the Dean of Hrodna

¹ *Acta synodi diaecesis Vilnensis praesidente Illustrissimo ac Reverendissimo Domino D. Alexandro in Macieiov Sapieha Dei et Apostolicae Sedis gratia Episcopo Vilnensi*, Vilnae: Typis Academicis, 1669.

² Waldemar Franciszek Wilczewski, “Wizytacja diecezji wileńskiej przeprowadzona przez biskupa Mikołaja Słupskiego: czas trwania i zasięg”, in: *Tarp istorijos ir būtovės: Studijos prof. Edvardo Gudavičiaus 70-mečiui*, eds. Alfredas Bumblauskas and Rimvydas Petrauskas, Vilnius: Aidai, 1999; Waldemar Franciszek Wilczewski, “Fragment księgi wizytacji dekanatu lidzkiego i nowogródzkiego z roku 1669 w zbiorach Biblioteki Czartoryskich w Krakowie”, in: *Archiva temporum testes. Źródła historyczne jako podstawa pracy badacza dziejów: Księga pamiątkowa ofiarowana Profesorowi Stanisławowi Olczakowi*, eds. ks. Grzegorz Bujak, Tomasz Nowicki, ks. Piotr Sawicki, Lublin: Towarzystwo naukowe KUL, 2008, pp. 628–635; Waldemar Franciszek Wilczewski, “Wizytacje generalne diecezji wileńskiej w XVII–XVIII w.: Ewolucja problematyki”, in: *Soter*, Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, 2010, no. 35 (63), pp. 99–110.

Jonas Kazimieras Vaišnoravičius³; the visitation of Kaunas, Simnas and Alvitas decanates for the years 1668–1669, conducted by the canon of Vilnius cathedral chapter, parish priest of Kaunas Parish Benediktas Žuchorskis⁴; and the visitation of Vaūkavysk, Ruzhany and Slonim decanates for the years 1668–1669, conducted by the scholastic of Vilnius cathedral chapter, kings' secretary and the regent of the grand chancellery of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania Aleksandras Kotovičius⁵. Visitation materials of these seven decanates were the main sources of this research. In this paper, I discuss only the territory of these seven decanates of the Diocese of Vilnius, namely Hrodna, Kaunas, Simnas, Alvitas, Ruzhany, Vaūkavysk and Slonim. Some additional sources, in particular inventories from certain parishes, mostly from the 1670s⁶, will contribute to this research as well. The official position of the Catholic Church towards the Jews was expressed in the Councils of the Diocese of Vilnius for the years 1669 and 1685⁷.

In the 17th century, these decanates lay on the borderland between the Polish Kingdom and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, while today this area spans across Lithuania, Belarus and Poland. In the 17th century, this territory was largely rural and covered with forests, while the largest towns were Kaunas and Hrodna.

According to the decrees of the Vilnius Diocesan Synod of 1669, the largest decanate among these was Hrodna⁸, which had 20 parish

³ Visitation of Hrodna decanate, 1660–1662, in: *Lithuanian State Historical Archive* (henceforth – *LVIA*), f. 694-1-3969.

⁴ Visitation of Kaunas, Simnas and Alvitas decanates, 1668–1669, in: *Manuscript Department of the Wróblewski Library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences* (henceforth – *LMAVB*), f. 318-28550.

⁵ Visitation of Ruzhany, Vaūkavysk and Slonim decanates, 1668–1669, in: *Manuscript Department of Vilnius University Library* (henceforth – *VUB*), f. 57-B53-41.

⁶ Most of the inventories compiled in 1670s are held in the file: Inventories of parishes of Vilnius diocese, Second half of the 17th century, in: *LVIA*, f. 694-1-3970.

⁷ *Acta synodi diaecesis Vilmensis; Acta, constitutiones et decreta synodi diaecesis Vilmensis praesidente Illustrissimo ac Reverendissimo Domino Domino Alexandro Michaele Kotowicz Dei et Apostolicae Sedis gratia Episcopo Vilmensi*, Vilnae: Typis Academicis, 1685.

⁸ *Acta synodi diaecesis Vilmensis*; Parishes of Hrodna decanate were: *Hrodna, Przewalka, Oża, Jeziora filia Grodnensis Eccl., Kwasowka, Ejsmonty, Brzostowica Mała,*

churches and one filial church, 21 Catholic churches in total. Kaunas decanate was the second-largest, it contained 19 Catholic churches, 2 of them were filial churches and 17 parochial churches⁹. The number of Catholic churches in other decanates ranged between 12 and 14: in the decanate of Slonim¹⁰, 14, Simnas¹¹ and Ruzhany¹² decanates had 13 parish churches each, Alvitas¹³ decanate had 12 parish churches and one filial church, decanate of Vaūkavysk¹⁴ had 12 parishes.

Seventeen churches were visited in Hrodna decanate in 1660–1662, while some churches, including Eysmanty, Malaya Bierastavitsa, Pryvalki and Różanystok, were not visited. It must be emphasized that this particular visitation was conducted right after the end of a war with Russia and is particularly revealing in terms of the effects this war brought on the Diocese of Vilnius. During the visitation in Ruzhany decanate in 1668–1669, Lahishyn and Ivanava churches were not visited. Veisiejai church belonged to Simnas decanate, but it was visited along with the churches of Kaunas decanate. At the same time, all churches in Kaunas, Alvitas, Vaūkavysk and Slonim decanates were visited.

Krynki, Sudziałowo, Odelsk, Indura, Kuźnica, Kondźyn, Sokołka, Sokolany, Dąbrowka, Zalesie, Nowydwor et Altaria, Krasnobor, Lipsk, Rożanystok.

⁹ *Ibid.*; Parishes of Kaunas decanate were: *Kowno, probostwo S. Krzyża, Jezno, Stokliszki, Wysokidwor, Sumiliszki, Zyżmory, Zosle, Poporcie, Kormiałowo, Łopie, Giegużym, Skorule, Wadziogoła, Rumszyszki, Uzugoście filia eccl. Stokliscensis, Dorsuniszki, Preny, Bersztany filia Prenen.*

¹⁰ *Ibid.*; Parishes of Slonim decanate were: *Slonim, Darewo, Połonca, Mysz, Lachowicze, Stwołowicze, Zadźwieie, Gorodyszczce, Jelna, Wśielub, Zdździeciół, Dworzec, Rohotna, Mołczadź.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*; Parishes of Simnas decanate were: *Urdomina, Łozdzieie, Siemno, Balwierzyszki, Udryia, Metele, Sereie, Swieteieżioro, Leypuny, Wiewsieie, Berźniki, Seyny, Puńsk.*

¹² *Ibid.*; Parishes of Ruzhany decanate were: *Rożana, Łukonica, Łyszkwow, Porozow, Strubnica, Zehwia, Masty, Dereczyn, Miedźirzyc, Kossow, Olszewo, Łahiszyn, Janow alias Castrum Cassinum.*

¹³ *Ibid.*; Parishes of Alvitas decanate were: *Olwita alias Poszyrwinty, Grazyszki, Wizayny, Łankieliszki, Poiewonie filia Olitensis Eccl., Bartniki, Przerosl, Filipow, Bakalarzow, Raczki, Janowka, Witkowiszki.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*; Parishes of Valkavysk decanate were: *Wołkowisk, Gniezno, Świsłocz, Jałówka, Brzostowica Wielka, Szydłowicze, Repla, Wołpa, Łunna, Roś, Krzemienica.*

People of various confessions lived in the territory of the Diocese of Vilnius in the 17th century. Materials from visitations and inventories have recorded Catholics, Orthodox Christians, Uniates, Lutherans, Calvinists, Jews, Muslims and even pagans¹⁵ living in this area. This multiconfessionality had evolved through the ages and had been influenced by cultural customs of local, historical traditions as well as the political life of the state and the evolution of European states. After Jews had been expelled from Western Europe in the Middle Ages, a populous Jewish community had settled in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Jews enjoyed privileges that guaranteed them their legal and social status in the Lithuanian society. Interconfessional relations in the 17th-century Grand Duchy of Lithuania were also influenced by the reforms of the Council of Trent and Counter Reformation. After the reforms of the Council of Trent, the Catholic Church established itself as the state religion and enjoyed exceptional conditions for its activities.

The multiculturalism of the Diocese of Vilnius has been noted by various historians and described in their works, but nobody has used these Catholic Church visitations as a source to investigate Catholics' attitudes towards others. Visitors were obliged to visit all the parishes and write a so-called *status animarum*, i.e., to analyze the make-up of parish populations, to describe their faith. Of course, not all visitors were diligent in describing *status animarum* of the parishes, but from the information which was recorded in their reports we can understand some aspects of the relations between Catholics and Jews in the 17th century. It must be emphasized that sources used in this paper present only one side, the position of the Catholic Church, and it would be worthwhile to compare it to other sources.

One of the biggest towns in the area in question was Hrodna which can also be labeled as one of the older centers and historically densely

¹⁵ About pagans see more: Vaida Kamuntavičienė, "Jelnios parapijos gyventojai XVII a. (*Stara Litwa*, arba jorvingių pėdsakais Vilniaus vyskupijoje)", in: *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis*, 2011, no. 2, Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos institutas, 2012, pp. 21–30.

populated by Jews¹⁶. Hrodna was a royal town and all Lithuanian rulers since the times of Vytautas were favorable to Jews issuing privileges that guaranteed their livelihood and relations with the state and society. Unlike Hrodna, Kaunas was not so much inhabited by Jews, though a big Jewish community lived on the other bank of the river Neris, just opposite Kaunas, in the territory named Sloboda or Vilijampolė.

It is impossible to specify the size of the Jewish community that lived in the area in question in the 17th century, because visitation materials do not contain such data. The least information about the Jews was recorded in Kaunas decanate, whereas the most informative are the records from Hrodna decanate. This investigation does not give the entire picture of the life of Jews among Christians in the Diocese of Vilnius, but it does present the most significant aspects of the situation of the Jewish community in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

The first problem we have encountered while researching the parishes in question was the identification of the area where the Jews were allowed to reside. According to contemporary regulations, it was prohibited for them to disturb Christians. In Hrodna, for example, the Jews were forbidden to live closer than 300 meters from Catholic temples¹⁷ in order to show proper respect to the Catholic Church and to avoid unnecessary confrontation. Jews had to respect Catholic holidays and to act accordingly during them¹⁸. Jurgita Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė has presented data which shows a custom in Hrodna to insult Jews who refused to get out of the way during Catholic feast processions¹⁹. It is probable that the separation of areas inhabited by Jews and Catholics was meant to guarantee the safety of both communities.

In certain locations, even sterner measures were in place. On 11 February 1662, a decree was issued in Sokółka, requiring Jews to

¹⁶ Jurgita Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė, *Žydai Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės visuomenėje: Sambūvio aspektai*, Vilnius: Žara, 2009, pp. 42, 69.

¹⁷ Visitation of Hrodna decanate, p. 29.

¹⁸ Jan Kurczewski, Summary of the visitation of the years 1674–1676, conducted by the bishop Mikalojus Slupskis, *LMAVB*, f. 318-26479, p. 53.

¹⁹ Jurgita Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė, *op. cit.*, p. 248.

move out of Sokółka estate. They were only allowed to visit Sokółka during market and fair days, but for no longer periods than three days. Jews were forbidden to acquire houses and landholdings and if a Jew already owned one, it would be confiscated by the Church. It was even forbidden to rent residential housing to Jews; infraction of the ban carried a fine of 10 sexagens of Lithuanian coins (*groszy*) for the benefit of Sokółka church²⁰. In a similar fashion, Jews in Puńsk were ordered to leave the church foundation landholdings within four weeks in order to avoid a scandal²¹.

The decree against the Jews was announced during Vilnius Diocesan Synod in 1669, which was summoned by the Bishop of Vilnius Aleksandras Sapiega. In this decree, it was stated that all contracts with Jews had to be called null and void and they were forbidden from renting church properties. The requirement was based on the idea that Christian peasants ought not to be placed under the authority of Jews²². A similar decree regarding Christians working for Jews was issued during another Vilnius Diocesan Synod, called by the Bishop of Vilnius Aleksandras Kotovičius in 1685²³.

According to traditional customs, the landlord was not only the employer, but also had to take care of the religious life of his subordinates and to make sure so that they attended the mass on holy days. Naturally, Jews did not care for religious life of their Christian tenants. On the contrary, they could cause obstructions by forcing their Christian dependents to work on Sundays and other Christian holidays. On the other hand, a Christian who was too lazy to attend the mass on Sunday could put the blame on his Jewish superior. Therefore Jewish landlords who employed Christian peasants were uncomfortable in dealing with local parish priests. For example, the parish priest of Indura

²⁰ Decree of the canon of Kraków, royal commissioner Małachowski, Sokółka, 1662-02-11, Visitation of Hrodna decanate, ff. 48–48v.

²¹ Visitation of Kaunas, Simnas and Alvidas decanates, 1669, in: *LMAVB*, f. 318-28550, p. 128.

²² “Bona ecclesiastica iudaeis non arendentur”, in: *Acta synodi diaecesis Vilnensis*.

²³ “De iudaeis familia christiana abutentibus”, in: *Acta, constitutiones et decreta synodi diaecesis Vilnensis*, p. 34.

in Hrodna decanate once tried to ensure that nineteen Christians who were employed by Jews were able to attend services on Sundays²⁴. The visitor to Balbieriškis parish in Simnas decanate was concerned that Jews were forcing Catholics to work on Sundays and holidays and demanded the parish priest to focus more of his attention on pastoral care of parishioners who were working for Jews, to conduct more frequent visits to villages for catechesis in order to teach religion to peasants who were Jewish servants²⁵. It seems that these attempts were not always successful. For example, in Masty parish of Ruzhany decanate, a Jew was living with a Christian woman and had children, something that was considered scandalous²⁶. During the Vilnius Diocesan Synod of 1685, it was pointed out that Christian governesses to Jewish children were susceptible to Judaization, since they were prone to forgetting Christian holidays and the sacramental life²⁷.

Whenever Jews wanted to build a synagogue, they had to get a permission from the bishop of Vilnius. On the basis of materials that we have analyzed, it can be seen that the Jews of Indura rebuilt their local synagogue in the early 17th century, after receiving a permission from the local bishop²⁸. The Jews in Balbieriškis flocked to a synagogue that was considered “new”. It was built on land owned by Duchess Czartoryska and served local Jews as well as those from neighboring villages and landholdings of other noblemen²⁹. The life of Jews and Christians was regulated by edicts. On 17 June 1616, the Bishop of Vilnius Eustachijus Valavičius issued a privilege to the Jews of Novy Dvo, stating that the Jews of Novy Dvor had to provide the Church with two sexagens of Lithuanian coins, two pounds of pepper, a pound

²⁴ Inventory of Indura church, 1705, in: *VUB*, f. 57-B53-471.

²⁵ Visitation of Kaunas, Simnas and Alvitās decanates, fol. 98v.

²⁶ Visitation of Ruzhany, Vaūkavysk and Slonim decanates, p. 8.

²⁷ “De judaeis familia christiana abutentibus”, in: *Acta, constitutiones et decreta synodi diaecesis Vilmensis*, p. 34; Andrzej Kakareko, “Synod biskupa Aleksandra Kotowicza z 1685 r.”, in: *Rocznik teologii katolickiej*, Białystok: Uniwersytet w Białystoku, 2004, vol. 3, p. 143.

²⁸ Inventory of Indura church, 1705, in: *VUB*, f. 57-B53-471.

²⁹ Visitation of Kaunas, Simnas and Alvitās decanates, fol. 98v.

of ginger, a quarter of a pound of saffron every Easter and a pound of ginger and a pound of pepper for every Christmas. At the same time, they were exempt from all other taxes³⁰.

Christians recognized Jews as capable financiers and willingly used their services. Bannerman (*chorąży*) of Slonim Andzej Przeclawski and his wife Anna Krzycka endowed the Church of Kosava with 250 coins, which were given to the Jews of Kosava, who in turn pledged to provide the local church with 20 coins annually³¹. In 1705, Teresa Winska Morzyna gave 500 Polish coins for the sanctuary lamp of the Blessed Sacrament at Indura Church. But since she did not trust the capability of the local parish priest to handle finances and in order to protect the endowment, she entrusted the money to the Jews of Indura qahal, who in turn had to provide the Church with six stone of tallow: three stone of tallow had to be delivered on 2 February (Candelmas, the Feast of the Presentation of Christ in the Temple) and the remaining three, on 29 September (St. Michael's day)³².

But these idyllic relations could go sour very easily. In the middle of the 17th century, the discussed parishes were badly ravaged during a disastrous war with Russia, they suffered under the occupation of the Muscovites for several years and almost all churches were plundered and a majority of them burned. For example, the church of Indura suffered this fate. Its inventory notes that the rectory of the church was burnt down by the Muscovites, while the church itself was set on fire by a Jew from Hrodna, a son of Jacob³³. On this occasion, a Jew was compared to an enemy who had ravaged the country.

Another interesting aspect of Jewish-Christian relations is recorded in the inventories of parochial peasants. In Ražiai village (Kaunas parish), there lived peasants with surnames Jew (*Žydąs*) and Little Jew (*Žydėlis*): *Nicolaus Zidelis* ir *Matthiasz Żydowicz*³⁴. It is not known whether these

³⁰ Visitation of Hrodna decanate, fol. 36v.

³¹ Visitation of Ruzhany, Vaūkavysk and Slonim decanates, p. 24.

³² Collection of Church documents of Indura church, in: *VUB*, f. 57-B53-475, pp. 63–72.

³³ Visitation of Hrodna decanate, fol. 55.

³⁴ Visitation of Kaunas, Simnas and Alvitavas decanates, fol. 8.

people were of Jewish origin. Most probably, they were Catholic and had been nicknamed thus because of specific character or physical traits, the nicknames having gradually turned into their surnames. Without any doubt, there existed specific image of the Jew in the Diocese of Vilnius in the 17th century, but we do not have any specific details about it.

In conclusion, it can be stated that the Jews were a very important part of the society of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and occupied a specific niche in its everyday life. From the point of view of the Catholic Church, Jews were a threat to Catholics. Consequently, Jewish settlements were separated and located at a distance from Christian temples and Jews were only allowed to reside in specified areas. Without the consent of the bishop, Jews were not allowed to build synagogues. There was a very big problem related to Catholics who served in Jewish households because it was seen as a direct threat to their religiosity and an impediment to properly adhering to Catholic customs. From the economic point of view, Jews were extremely useful for Catholics. Their prowess as financiers was highly valued. In spite of mutual benefits, in the times of extreme hardship, Jews were the first ones to be blamed and persecuted. Jews could freely live in the area of the Diocese of Vilnius under conditions imposed by the Catholic Church, which were generally were fairly favorable to them.

WIOLETTA PAWLIKOWSKA-BUTTERWICK

THE VILNIUS CATHEDRAL CHAPTER AND THE
JEWS IN THE SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH
CENTURIES: CASES FROM THE ACTS OF THE
CATHEDRAL CHAPTER

Many scholars have been drawn to study relations between the Jewish population and the Catholic clergy in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth¹. However, the coverage of these complicated questions remains uneven. Doubtlessly, among the most prominent issues are conflicts related to confessional differences. It was from the position of religious alterity that the Catholic side most often acted against those who kept the Old Covenant. Such attacks were also the ones that had the most far-reaching effects, at least according to most of the historiography. However, mutual relations between the Catholic clergy and the Jews were by no means restricted to such conflicts. There can be no doubt that contacts of economic nature were among the principal ways the two groups interacted. Sometimes these religious and economic factors overlapped.

Throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Catholic clergy, although it constituted a single social and legal (although not

¹ See, e. g., Antony Polonsky, *The Jews in Poland and Russia: 1350 to 1881*, vol. 1, Oxford: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2010; Zenon Guldon, “Żydzi wśród chrześcijan w miastach małopolskich w XVI–XVIII wieku”, in: *Nasza Przeszłość*, 1992, vol. 78, pp. 187–222; Stefan Gąsiorowski, *Chrześcijananie i Żydzi w Żółkwi w XVII i XVIII wieku*, Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 2001; Barbara Wizimirska, “Chrześcijananie i Żydzi w Rzeszowie w XVII i XVIII wieku”, in: *Prace Historyczno-Archiwalne*, 1993, vol. 1, pp. 75–90; Waldemar Kowalski, “Ludność żydowska a duchowieństwo archidiakonatu sandomierskiego w XVII–XVIII wieku”, in: *Studia Judaica*, 1998, vol. 1, pp. 177–99.

a parliamentary) estate, was not a monolith. Nor, of course, were the Jews. Therefore relations between a parish priest or his assistant and local Jews in a small town or village would have differed considerably from those between the Jews and the higher clergy – that is, prelates, canons and bishops – associated with cathedral cities such as Vilnius (Wilno in Polish, Vilne in Yiddish, Вильня in Belarusian). Similarly, official relations could differ considerably from private contacts.

In this paper, I will discuss relations between the Vilnius Cathedral chapter and Jews (both those who had converted to Christianity and those who remained in the Judaic religion) in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, mainly in the light of the protocols of the sessions of the Vilnius chapter. The choice of this kind of material as the principal source requires a brief commentary. These protocols are not a faithful reflection of past reality; they do, however, present a record of certain issues and problems that preoccupied the canons and prelates of Vilnius at the time. In general, “spicier” situations were recorded, whereas those that would have seemed rather common to the clergymen in question were not. So it is in such records that we should look for various exceptional situations, novelties and revelations. Moreover, the one-sidedness – the Roman Catholic view of the given problem – which is characteristic of this kind of sources may prompt us to question the reliability of information contained therein. Especially suspect may be information concerning “others”, that is, people in opposing and usually lower social, confessional or legal positions. These doubts are, however, mitigated by the fact that the book of protocols was maintained by a capitular notary under an oath to record the sessions faithfully. The sessions were held in secrecy, and members of the chapter who were present were obliged to maintain secrecy or else face ecclesiastical penalties. Above all, the protocols were kept chiefly for internal use of the corporation. They were not intended as Judeophobic propaganda, nor were they court records². They were not written in order to persuade their readers, but simply for ease of reference. Therefore, as sources go, they are not

² References to disputes between inhabitants of the capitular *jurydyki* were, however sporadically, entered into the acts.

particularly biased. My research to date on these protocols has revealed that they can cast much new light on the everyday life of the city of Vilnius and its diverse inhabitants. The documents also contain valuable information on capitular estates that were dispersed over vast areas of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania³. The picture that emerges from these sources is, in its own way, reliable; but, given their limitations, it is certainly not a full picture. Nevertheless, it may serve as a good point of departure for further research.

From the second half of the sixteenth century, if not earlier, cities and small towns of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania became urban centres that attracted increasing numbers of Jews to settle and trade. The trend is usually explained by favourable privileges granted to them by the Grand Dukes, in order to stimulate economic life⁴. Unique in Europe was the partial right granted to Lithuanian Jews to own and trade in land. According to Jurgita Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė, this possibly testifies to “a new quality in the way in which they could function in society”⁵. Certainly, Jews played an important role in urbanization processes within the towns of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

During the seventeenth century, a conviction began to take root that Jews were necessary in order to create, maintain or restore the trading character of a settlement. For example, one leaseholder of the Vilnan capitular estates informed the chapter that “to maintain marketplaces in Karpilówka (Карпилаўка), it is necessary to permit the Jews to settle there, and to provide them with a synagogue and a *kirkut*”. The chapter accepted the proposal and decided “to give 30 Jews a site for a synagogue and a *kirkut* just outside the town”.⁶

³ Wioletta Pawlikowska, *Wileńska kapituła katedralna w drugiej połowie XVI wieku*, doctoral dissertation, Poznań, 2011, pp. 13–14.

⁴ Jurgita Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė, “Žydai”, in: *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštijos kultūra: tyrinėjimai ir vaizdai*, ed. Vytautas Ališauskas [et. al.], Vilnius: Aidai, 2001, p. 796 (Polish translation: Jurgita Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė, “Żydzi”, in: *Kultura Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego. Analizy i obrazy*, Kraków: Universitas, 2006, p. 886).

⁵ Jurgita Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė, “Žydai”, p. 801; Jurgita Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė, “Żydzi”, p. 892.

⁶ Józef Maroszek, “Żydzi wiejscy na Podlasiu w XVII i XVIII wieku w świetle

The Jews' legal status was regulated, although not exclusively, by privileges granted by the Grand Dukes of Lithuania. The privilege granted by Vytautas legalized two kinds of activity – lending at an interest (pejoratively called usury) and trade – in which less wealthy Jews were most frequently engaged. Those Jews who succeeded in amassing greater fortunes sought leases on taverns and other properties and businesses, especially those that were monopolies, such as distilling and selling alcohol (*propinacija*). By the same token, they became the chief competitors for Christian burghers, especially artisans.

Perhaps paradoxically, the very success achieved by Jews in the economic sphere contributed to the rise of negative images and stereotypes, and thus also became one of the motives for assaults and accusations directed at them. Jewish communities sought to defend themselves in various ways. One strategy was to appeal to Christian authorities, such as the king and the grand duke, the Lithuanian Tribunal, municipalities⁷ and even the Vilnius chapter⁸ or the bishop, in order to defend Jewish lives, livelihoods and property. The second strategy was to take the case to institutions of Jewish communal life – local qahals or the general council of Lithuanian Jewish communities – the *Va'ad*⁹.

Vytautas's privilege regulated social as well as economic aspects of Jewish life. It permitted the Jews to perform their funeral rites, to take their oaths by the doors of a synagogue, to maintain synagogues and cemeteries, and also forbade Christians to disturb their Sabbath (protecting them from attacks by their neighbours)¹⁰.

przemian struktury rynku wewnętrznego”, in: *Studia Podlaskie*, 1989, vol. 2, p. 64. He cites *Kościół zamkowy czyli katedra wileńska w jej dziejowym, liturgicznym, architektonicznym i ekonomicznym rozwoju*, vol. 2: *Źródła historyczne na podstawie aktów kapitulnych i dokumentów historycznych*, ed. Jan Kurczewski, Wilno, 1910, pp. 94–102, but unfortunately these quotations are not to be found there.

⁷ Cf. David Frick, “Jews and Others in Seventeenth-Century Wilno: Life in the neighborhood”, in: *Jewish Studies Quarterly*, 2005, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 9.

⁸ *Biržų dvaro teismo knygos, 1620–1745*, eds. Vytautas Raudeliūnas and Romualdas Firkovičius, Vilnius: Mintis, 1982, p. 91.

⁹ David Frick, “Jews and Others”, p. 9.

¹⁰ Jurgita Šiaučiuonaitė-Verbickienė, “Žydai”, p. 799, Jurgita Šiaučiuonaitė-

Although Jews never became town citizens or burghers, they remained an established group in towns of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Some historians have even called them the “second urban estate”¹¹. The Jews of Vilnius were particularly privileged in comparison to their brethren in Kraków or Warsaw, or the Tatars who lived in the Vilnan suburb of Lukiškės (Łukiszki)¹², in that they could settle in the city centre, which meant that they lived among Christians (Catholics of both rites, Orthodox Christians and various Protestants). The privilege granted by Sigismund III on 1 June 1593 guaranteed Jews the right “to acquire and purchase dwellings with the nobility (*szlachta*), especially since, at the time of our accession to these domains, the Polish Crown and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, we found [Jews] living [here]”¹³.

Jewish houses and tenements in Vilnius, according to the findings of Jerzy Ochmański¹⁴, Józef Maroszek¹⁵, Mindaugas Paknys¹⁶ and David Frick¹⁷, were generally located in the area defined by three streets, named respectively after the Germans (Niemiecka / Vokiečių), the Jews (Żydowska / Żydų / Yidishe), and meat shops (Jatkowa / Mėsinių / Yatkever)¹⁸. Despite plans made and efforts undertaken in the

Verbickienė, “Żydzi”, p. 890; Jurgita Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė, “The Social and Legal Status of Jews in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and its Influence on the Status of Tatars and Karaites”, in: *Central Europe*, 2010, vol. 8, no. 2, p. 71.

¹¹ See most recently Andrzej B. Zakrzewski, *Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie (XVI–XVIII w.). Prawo – ustroj – społeczeństwo*, Warsaw: Campidoglio, 2013, p. 81.

¹² Jan Tyszkiewicz, *Tatarzy na Litwie i w Polsce. Studia z dziejów XIII–XVIII w.*, Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1989, p. 228.

¹³ Quoted after David Frick, “Jews and Others”, p. 13.

¹⁴ Jerzy Ochmański, *Dawna Litwa*, Olsztyn: Pojezierze, 1982, p. 90.

¹⁵ Józef Maroszek, “Ulice Wilna w XIV–XVIII wieku”, in: *Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej*, 1999, vol. 47, no. 1–2, p. 168.

¹⁶ Mindaugas Paknys, “Wilno roku 1636 według ‘Rewizji gospód’”, in: *Lituanoslavica Posnaniensia. Studia Historica*, 2007, vol. 12, pp. 103n; see also Mindaugas Paknys, *Vilniaus miestas ir miestiečiai 1636 m.: Namai, gyventojai, svečiai*, Vilnius: Vilniaus dailės akademijos leidykla, 2006.

¹⁷ Quoted after David Frick, “Jews and Others”, p. 16.

¹⁸ See the plan of the city reconstructed by Maria Łowmiańska on the basis of the 1648 plan of the city’s fortifications by Friedrich Getkant (1614–1666) and other

seventeenth century, there was no distinctly Jewish district isolated from the rest of the city. Jewish tenements were, however, in most respects excluded from the jurisdiction of the city courts, and could almost be considered a separate Jewish *jurydyka*, albeit without the land¹⁹.

Over the two centuries in question, several dozen issues with a Jewish element appear in the Vilnan capitular acts. Many were of religious or confessional nature, others were economic, although the categories can overlap. One of the earliest cases of the former kind may be linked to accusations that Jews participated in “profanation of the Host”²⁰. Under the date of 25 December 1525, it was noted that during the administering of communion in the parish church of St John in Vilnius, “a common Lithuanian man, who did not even know Our Father” (*simplex homo lituanus, nesciens Pater noster*), took the Holiest Sacrament of the Eucharist without having first confessed his sins. Having exited the church, he retrieved the Host from his mouth with his hand and placed it in a pouch (*marsupium*). He was, however, caught in the sacrilegious act by a passing woman. During interrogation, he testified that he had been paid by Jews, from whom he had received 20 Lithuanian *grosze* in advance, and expected to receive the same sum upon delivery²¹. Unfortunately, the acts do not inform us of the outcome of this case. Further research will be hindered by the absence of any names.

Ecclesiastical legislation, following the principle of restricting contacts between Christians and Jews, forbade mixed marriages and Jews holding public office²². The decrees of the Third Lateran Council of

sources, Maria Łowmiańska, *Wilno przed najazdem moskiewskim 1655 roku*, Wilno: Wydawn. Magistratu m. Wilna, 1929. See also *Vilniaus namai archyvų fonduose*, vol. 1–13, ed. Vladas Drėma, Vilnius: Savastis, 1995–2007.

¹⁹ Józef Maroszek, “Ulice Wilna”, p. 171.

²⁰ On this question, see most recently (for a slightly later period): Magda Teter, *Sinners on Trial: Jews and Sacrilege after the Reformation*, Cambridge Harvard University Press, 2011, pp. 89n.

²¹ [Mamert Herburt], Wypisy z aktów czyli dziejów kapituły katedry wileńskiej z siedmiu pierwszych tomów od 1501 – do 1600 r., in: *Czartoryski library*, MS 3516 (hereafter – Herburt), § 212, 213, fol. 36.

²² David Knowles, Dimitri Obolensky, *Historia Kościoła*, vol. 2, Warsaw, 1988,

1179 prohibited Jews from employing Christian servants, and forbade Christians to live together with Jews. These regulations were extended at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. At the same time, while Jews were permitted to engage in supplying credit, charging excessive interest rates was condemned as usury. The Fourth Lateran Council also commanded that Jews wear distinctive clothing in order to alert others about their presence. The aim of the conciliar legislation was therefore maximally to restrict contacts between Jews and Christians and, by the same token, to minimize the influence of Jews on Christians – an influence considered highly negative. This medieval legislation was confirmed in its essential points by the Council of Trent (1545–1563)²³. However, the legal situation of Jews was also regulated by, alongside the grand ducal privileges, the Lithuanian Statutes. Bans contained in all three statutes (1529, 1566, 1588) on Jews holding public office or employing Christian servants, especially wet-nurses²⁴, were based on canon law²⁵. This question is all the more interesting in that some senior clergymen–prelates and canons with benefices in Vilnius – were members of the commission which drafted the statutes²⁶. Provisions of the civil law were supplemented and defined more precisely in the statutes of provincial and diocesan synods and in the pastoral letters issued by bishops²⁷.

p. 290; Jacek Krochmal, *Krzyż i menora: Żydzi i chrześcijanie w Przemysłu w latach 1559–1772*, Przemysł: Wydawnictwo Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk w Przemysłu, 1996, pp. 141n.

²³ Wojciech Góralski, *Reforma trydencka w diecezji i prowincji kościelnej mediolańskiej w świetle pierwszych synodów kard. Karola Boromeusza*, Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 1988, pp. 309–11.

²⁴ Andrzej B. Zakrzewski, “Ograniczenia ludności żydowskiej w Nieświeżu XVII–XVIII wieku: Dwa przyczynki”, in: *Praeities Pēdsakais: skiriama profesoriaus daktaro Zigmanto Kiaupos 65-mečiui*, eds. Egidijus Aleksandravičius, Artūras Dubonis, Elmantas Meilus, Rimantas Miknys, Edmundas Rimša, Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos institutas, 2007, pp. 381–82; Andrzej B. Zakrzewski, *Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie*, p. 81.

²⁵ Leszek Winowski, *Innowiercy w poglądach uczonych zachodniego chrześcijaństwa*, Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1985, pp. 134–63.

²⁶ Grzegorz Błaszczyk, *Diecezja żmudzka od XV wieku do początku XVII wieku. Ustrój*, Poznań: Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu, 1993, pp. 58–59.

²⁷ Judith Kalik, “Jews in Catholic Ecclesiastical Legislation in the Polish-

The prohibition on Jews employing Christian servants was intended to protect Christians from “corruption” by the “infidels”²⁸. It is noteworthy that corresponding proscriptions, aimed at isolating Jews from Christians, can be found in Jewish law and teaching²⁹. It is also characteristic that the frequency with which these bans were repeated testifies to their very limited effectiveness, given that even popes were known to employ Jewish physicians³⁰. The Bishop of Wenden (Cēsis), Aleksander Krzysztof Chodkiewicz († 1676) even gave a Jew keys to a church³¹.

On 11 October 1557, the bishop of Vilnius announced at a session of the chapter that many Christian women openly lived with Jews and other “infidels”, and that children had been born in these relationships. The chapter advised him that, in order to avoid the divine wrath that had once destroyed Sodom and Gomorra being turned on Vilnius for such appalling lawlessness, the bishop should try, if these women should persist in their sin without punishment, to reform these offenders using

Lithuanian Commonwealth”, in: *Jewish History Quarterly*, 2004, vol. 209, no. 1, pp. 26–39; Zakrzewski, *Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie*, p. 81.

²⁸ Jacek Krochmal, *Krzyż i menora*, pp. 141n; see also Adam Kaźmierczyk, “The Problem of Christian Servants as Reflected in the Legal Codes of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth During the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century and in the Saxon Period”, in: *Gal-Ed*, 1997, vol. 15–16, pp. 23–40; Judith Kalik, “Christian Servants Employed by Jews in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 17–18th Century”, in: *Polin: Studies in Polish Jewry*, 2001, vol. 14, pp. 259–70; Jakub Goldberg, “Sprawa zatrudniania przez Żydów czeladzi i służby chrześcijańskiej w Rzeczypospolitej w XVI–XVIII wieku”, in: Jakub Goldberg, *Żydzi w społeczeństwie, gospodarce i kulturze Rzeczypospolitej szlacheckiej*, Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 2012, pp. 71–76.

²⁹ Magda Teter, “There Should Be No Love Between Us and Them”: Social Life and the Bounds of Jewish and Canon Law in Early Modern Poland”, in: *Polin: Studies in Polish Jewry*, vol. 22: *Social and Cultural Boundaries in Pre-Modern Poland*, eds. Magda Teter, Adam Teller and Antony Polonsky, 2010, Oxford; Portland, Oregon: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, pp. 253n.

³⁰ Majer Bałaban, *Historia i literatura żydowska ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem historii Żydów w Polsce*, Lwów: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1925, vol. 2, p. 75; Jacek Krochmal, *Krzyż i menora*, p. 142.

³¹ *Kościół zamkowy czyli katedra wileńska: w jej dziejowym, liturgicznym, architektonicznym i ekonomicznym rozwoju*, vol. 3: *Streszczenie aktów kapituły wileńskiej*, ed. Jan Kurczewski, Wilno: Nakład i druk J. Zawadzki, 1913, p. 182.

the means at his disposal, imposing penalties and even imprisonment. As a last resort, the stubbornly disobedient could be reported to the king³². A complaint of similar content was noted in the capitular acts a century later. On 21 May 1668, the bishop of Vilnius addressed the chapter, asking, with a heavy heart, for counsel regarding what could be done with those Jews and Tatars who kept Christian women in their houses, fathered children with them, and later smothered them. Should he turn to the king for help, or summon those accused before the episcopal court? The chapter advised the bishop to ask the king for the execution of the law forbidding Christians (in royal possessions) to serve in households of Jews and Tatars³³. This accusation should not be confused with accusations of ritual murder, which became more common during the seventeenth century³⁴.

In 1598 the papal nuncio Germanico Malaspina evidently regarded the situation in Vilnius as scandalous: “Ordinary Catholic men marry heretic [Protestant] women, and vice versa, and although the Catholic man or woman almost always converts the heretic to his or her faith, such marriages are forbidden by canon law. Bishops do not usually permit them and prohibit parish priests from solemnizing matrimony, although they sometimes look the other way”³⁵. It is worth adding that while marriages between different Christian denominations were accepted, marriages between Christians and Jews had to be preceded by conversion. The acts refer to several cases of Jews converting to Catholicism. The Vilnius chapter put some effort into supporting

³² *Acta Capituli Vilmensis* (hereafter – *ACV*), vol. III, ff. 171v–72, constitute f. 43, s. 210/1–225, in: *Manuscript Department of the Wróblewski Library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences*.

³³ *ACV*, vol. XV, fol. 29.

³⁴ Marcin Zgliński, “Nagrobki i kult ofiar rzekomych żydowskich mordów rytualnych na historycznych ziemiach litewskich w XVII–XIX wieku”, in: *Dailės istorijos studijos*, vol. 4: *Socialinių tapatumų reprezentacijos Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės kultūroje*, ed. Aistė Paliušytė, Vilnius: Lietuvos kultūros tyrimų institutas, 2010, pp. 303–43. For the Polish Crown Cf. Zenon Guldon, Jacek Wijaczka, *Procesy o mordry rytualne w Polsce w XV–XVIII w.*, Kielce: DCF, 1995.

³⁵ *Relacye nuncyuszów apostolskich i innych osób o Polsce od roku 1548 do 1690*, vol. 2, ed. Erazm Rykaczewski, Poznań and Berlin, 1864, p. 90.

converts from Judaism. On 21 May 1674, it instructed the subcustodian of the cathedral to disburse 40 *złoty*s to a converted Jew, Józef Józefowicz, to support him in his craft as a tailor. On the same day it was decided to aid “a certain freshly converted unmarried orphan” with 20 *złoty*s³⁶. Finally, Maciej Dobratycki, who was a secretary and scribe to bishop Paweł Holszański and a supernumerary canon of Vilnius, was *ex Iudeo Christianus factus*³⁷.

Were converts from Judaism really considered noble, as the letter of the Third Lithuanian Statute suggests? In describing the severity of punishment for killing a Jew³⁸, it proposes: “And if a Jew or Jewess shall accept the Christian faith, then every such person and their descendants shall be considered noble”³⁹. Some light may be shed on the interpretation of the law in an ecclesiastical town in the later seventeenth century by a complaint made to the Vilnius chapter on 3 October 1667 by the burghers of Poswol (Pasvalys) against local Jews. They complained, firstly, that Jews owned more than eight houses in Poswol; secondly, that a Jew who was wronged or assaulted by Christians received compensation according to the rights of a nobleman, whereas a Christian wronged or assaulted by Jews received compensation as ordinary burghers. They also asked to remove from lease Izaak Moszkowicz, a Jew, and reported that

³⁶ *ACV*, vol. XVII, fol. 38.

³⁷ *Vetera monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae gentiumque finitimarum historiam illustrantia; maximam partem nondum edita ex tabulariis Vaticanis deprompta collecta ac serie chronologica disposita*, vol. 2: *ab Ioanne PP. XXIII. usque ad Pium PP. V. 1410–1572*, ed. Augustinus Theiner, Rome: Zeller, 1861, pp. 552–553.

³⁸ According to the First Lithuanian Statute (1529), the punishment for killing a Jew was the same as for killing a nobleman – 100 *schocks* of Lithuanian *grosze*. The life of a burgher was priced at just 12 *schocks*. See Anatol Leszczyński, “Sytuacja prawna Żydów ziemi bielskiej od końca XV w. do 1795 r.”, in: *Biuletyn Żydowskiego Instytutu Historycznego*, 1975, vol. 96, no. 2, p. 34.

³⁹ *Litovskij Statut 1588 goda*, vol. 2, ed. Ivan Ivanovič Lappo, Kaunas: “Spindulio” sp., 1938, p. 450. It is notable that at least some Jews who changed their confession were enobled even before the adoption of the Third Lithuanian Statute: Jakub Goldberg, “Żydowsky konwertycy w społeczeństwie staropolskim”, in see: Jakub Goldberg, *Żydzi w społeczeństwie, gospodarce i kulturze Rzeczypospolitej szlacheckiej*, pp. 247n.

Jews had taken a site where Christians had hitherto had a slaughterhouse. The chapter's reply is equally suggestive: "1) Jews may not have more than eight sites and houses. But they may receive neighbouring Jews on one site and into one house; 2) in disputes between Christians and Jews, punishments should be equal; 3) the arendator has the right, according to the contract, to lease property until the feast of St Casimir [4 March]; and the chapter will discuss the situation after that"⁴⁰; 4) Regarding the site of a former slaughterhouse, the chapter decided that although "Jews have paid the heirs of the owner, Christians are free to pay the Jews. In case of competition between a Christian and Jews for the lease of empty sites, the Christian shall have priority as closer and as better suited to business"⁴¹.

Although we might suppose that the Catholic clergy celebrated every newly-caught soul, the chapter showed a certain reserve regarding conversions from Judaism. At a capitular session on 30 September 1670, a case was discussed concerning a Jew who had apparently abducted his daughter (a convert) and her child from the house of her Christian husband. For this he had been arrested and incarcerated in the episcopal prison by Wojciech Oborski, who was the canon of Piltyń (Piltene), dean of Minsk (Менск) and the parish priest of Iwieniec (Івянец). In the meantime, a noble arendator, Pożaryski, wishing to free the Jew, filed a suit against Reverend Oborski in the castle court at Minsk, and simultaneously slandered him. The chapter 1) resolved to summon Pożaryski before a consistory court, in order that he might hear the punishments he had incurred by violating the bull *In Coena Domini*⁴²

⁴⁰ Izaak Moszkowicz's lease was probably extended. In any case he was mentioned as an inhabitant of Poswol alongside the *wójt* of Trakai (Troki) Abraham Moszkiewicz on 2 March 1695. See *Birżę dwaro teismo knygos*, p. 89.

⁴¹ *ACV*, vol. XV, fol. 9. See *Kościół zamkowy*, vol. 3, pp. 185–86.

⁴² The bull *In Coena Domini* (1366) was a statement of ecclesiastical censure against heresies, schisms, sacrilege, infringement of papal and ecclesiastical privileges, attacks on person and property, piracy, forgery and other crimes. Traditionally read out on Maundy Thursday, it caused controversy well into the nineteenth century, as evidenced by *Papal Diplomacy and the Bull "In Coena Domini"*; or, *A Collection of Authentic Facts and Documents, Proving that the Principles of the Bull "In Coena Domini" are the Only Principles of International Law Recognized by the Papacy*, London: J. Hatchard, 1848.

and committing an illegal evocation (*evocatio*)⁴³ of a priest; 2) suggested that Reverend Oborski sue Pożaryski for slander; 3) forbade Oborski to appear before the Minsk castle court; and 4) ordered the *oficjał* (*officialis*) of the diocese to inform the starosta of Minsk about a *démarche exceptio forum*⁴⁴ with regard to the dean⁴⁵. In cases involving Christians, Jews were to answer before the palatine's court⁴⁶. In this particular case, however, the dispute over a Jew occurred between a clergyman and a lay nobleman. Moreover, the Catholic clergy, on the basis of the privilege *privilegium fori*, was exempted from lay jurisdiction (with the exception of suits over landed estates)⁴⁷.

A few weeks later, on 17 December 1670, the Jew, who had been kept in the episcopal prison, expressed his fervent desire to accept baptism and, moreover, pointed to six Vilnan Jews who had supposedly hidden two abducted baptized Jewesses. He also advised the imprisonment of those Jews. However, the chapter considered this denunciation suspicious. In the question of abduction, it judged it better to summon not the Jews of Vilnius, but those of Minsk. As for the possible baptism of the incarcerated Jew, it recommended that a Jesuit be sent to examine him; if the sincerity of his wish to be baptized was confirmed, then the Jesuit should instruct the Jew in the principles of the Catholic faith⁴⁸.

Both in the sixteenth and in the seventeenth century, Jews were often assigned leases of taverns and other property. The conditions that

⁴³ In old Polish law this meant a summons before a court that was inappropriate for the person summoned, for which there were punishments *poenae evocatoriae*, see Zygmunt Gloger, *Encyklopedia staropolska ilustrowana*, vol. 2, Warsaw: Druk P. Laskauere i W. Babicki, 1901, p. 138.

⁴⁴ A formal-legal complaint with regard to the course of court procedure, made by the summoned person during the court session.

⁴⁵ *ACV*, vol. XV, fol. 99.

⁴⁶ Adam Kaźmierczyk, *Żydzi w dobrach prywatnych w świetle sądowniczej i administracyjnej praktyki dóbr magnackich w wiekach XVI–XVIII*, Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2002, pp. 160n.

⁴⁷ Zdzisław Kaczmarczyk and Bogusław Leśnodorski (eds.), *Historia państwa i prawa Polski*, vol. 2: *Od połowy XV wieku do r. 1795*, ed. Juliusz Bardach, Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1968, p. 82.

⁴⁸ *ACV*, vol. XV, fol. 112.

were applied, however, differed from those for noblemen and burghers. Christians paid their dues in instalments, whereas Jewish arendators usually paid the entire sum for a specified duration of the lease up front⁴⁹. The Chapter of Vilnius leased taverns and other property to both Jews and converts from Judaism. The known cases attest to a considerable care shown by the corporation with regard to both kinds of leaseholders. On 18 June 1571, the chapter heard that the permanent assistant priest (*wikary*) of the parish church of Vitsebsk (Віцебск), Reverend Seweryn Pankowski, had leased a tavern in the town to a baptized Jew. The lease was to be paid in several instalments, amounting to 110 *schocks* of Lithuanian *grosze*. Despite the fact that Pankowski had not consulted anyone in making his decision, the chapter agreed to issue a receipt for the lease⁵⁰. The question came up again the following year – on 1 July 1572 – before the lease had expired. Vilnan canons and prelates, and the assistant priests of Vitsebsk, considered the proposal of the palatine of Vitsebsk, Stanisław Pac (†1588), who wished once again to take the lease of the tavern, which was currently held by the converted Jew. Assistant priests of Vitsebsk, represented by the sub-dean, Jakub Młyński, and Maciej Chmielewski, left the decision to the Vilnius chapter⁵¹. At a capitular session on 25 August 1572, the procurator of the chapter, Canon Wawrzyniec Wolski, presented letters from the manager of the chapter's Vitsebsk properties, Bazyli Bohdanowicz, and the unnamed arendator of the tavern. Both advised the chapter against leasing the tavern to Palatine Pac, among other reasons because he had demanded to see the measures used for vodka, beer and other drinks. When the arendator had asked for time to consult the chapter, Pac “violently sent military Cossacks and his servants to the tavern, who having broken the doors and locks, partly drank the vodka and beer, partly sold it, and poured the rest from its barrels onto the ground, breaking open some barrels,

⁴⁹ Michał Wąsowicz, *Kontrakty lwowskie 1676–1685*, Lwów, 1935, pp. 44n; Jakub Goldberg, “Władza dominalna Żydów w XVII–XVIII w.”, in: *Przegląd Historyczny*, 1990, vol. 81, p. 194.

⁵⁰ Herburt, § 128–30, ff. 205–06; *ACV*, vol. V, ff. 42v–43.

⁵¹ Herburt, § 230–31, fol. 211; *ACV*, vol. V, ff. 70v–71.

and in doing so causing damage reckoned at 100 *schocks* of Lithuanian *grosze*. Such serious violence was committed by him there, despite and overriding protests from the gentlemen in charge of the inspection of the said church in Vitsebsk and of recording its income⁵². In this situation, the chapter resolved to send a vicar of the cathedral, Maciej Chmielewski, along with the capitular notary to Vitsebsk⁵³. It was only five years later – on 5 October 1584 – that the Vitsebsk tavern was given on a three-year lease to Stanisław Pac⁵⁴. On 7 April 1587, the lease was extended for further three years, commencing on 2 February 1588⁵⁵. Soon afterwards, on 28 September 1588, Pac died, and the chapter decided to accede to the requests of Lew Sapieha, the vice-chancellor of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, to lease him the taverns, which belonged to the Vitsebsk parish, for three years⁵⁶. The acts of the chapter indicate that the leasing of the Vitsebsk taverns to a converted Jew was but an episode. Nevertheless, Jews still played a part in their functioning. On 15 July 1597, at the request of an “infidel Jew”, Jakub Ilinicz, a trader in the Vitsebsk taverns, the chapter instructed the manager, Hieronim Podlecki, immediately to repair the buildings that belonged to the tavern, including storehouses. The costs were to be met by the chapter⁵⁷.

Clergymen sometimes took the side of their Jewish leaseholders in court. In 1670, the Vilnan prelate Krzysztof Przeclawski successfully testified in the defence of Fajwiz, his leaseholder, in a case against a Jewish criminal gang accused of forgery, theft and murder. Fajwiz was probably their partner in crime but, in order to obtain his own acquittal, he had decided to betray the gangsters⁵⁸.

⁵² Herburt, § 237–38, ff. 211–12; *ACV*, vol. V, ff. 73–4.

⁵³ Herburt, § 237–38, ff. 211–12; *ACV*, vol. V, ff. 73–74.

⁵⁴ Herburt, § 290–92, fol. 267; *ACV*, vol. VI, ff. 375–78.

⁵⁵ Herburt, § 111, fol. 285; *ACV*, vol. VII, ff. 59v–60.

⁵⁶ Herburt, § 202–04, ff. 293–94; *ACV*, vol. VII, ff. 104–05.

⁵⁷ Herburt, § 853–854, fol. 335; *ACV*, vol. VII, fol. 305.

⁵⁸ Judith Kalik, “Economic Relations between the Catholic Church and the Jews in the Polish - Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 17th – 18th Centuries”, in: <http://icj.huji.ac.il/conference/papers/Judith%20Kalik%20.pdf> (2013-05-20).

Prince Hieronim Sanguszko, suffragan bishop of Vilnius and later bishop of Smolensk, declared in a contract of 1651: “I have leased [the Raków estates] to Mr Idel Jakubowicz, one of my Jews from Raków, for three years for 27,000 Polish *złoty*s, reckoning 9000 for each year, and of which a sum of 27,000 Polish *złoty*s I have already received in full”⁵⁹. This was not a secured loan but a lease, in which the lord or the starosta obtained credit, as it were, from the arendator. The payment of the entire sum for the lease in advance strengthened the latter’s position, because if the contract were breached by the former, he would have to repay a substantial amount to the Jew⁶⁰, who thus could enjoy relative stability and could make his investment grow.

Contacts between the Vilnius chapter, both as a corporation and its individual members, with Jews, both those in the city of Vilnius and those living in capitular estates, were, because of the proximity of their residences, certainly more frequent than the sources indicate. Such co-existence, unsurprisingly, gave rise to conflicts. At the same time common interests necessitated compromises. These are particularly visible in the urban space of Vilnius, which the papal nuncio Aloisius Lippomano called, in 1555, “Babylon, because [–] there are Armenians, Muscovites, Ruthenians, Tatars, Lithuanians, Germans and Italians, but few good Christians”⁶¹. The streets of Vilnius

⁵⁹ Quoted after Goldberg, “Władza dominalna Żydów”, pp. 193–94.

⁶⁰ Wąsowicz, *Kontrakty lwowskie*, pp. 44n; Goldberg, “Władza dominalna Żydów”, p. 194.

⁶¹ “Questa Citta e una Babilonia, perche pare che vi sia d’ogni natione, quae sub coelo est: Armeni, Moscoviti, Rottoni [sic], Tartari, Turchi, Littuani, Tedeschi et Italiani, ma pochi buoni Christiani” (Vilnae, 3 XI 1555), (*Acta Nuntiaturae Poloniae, Aloisius Lippomano (1555–1557)*, vol. 3/1, editor Henryk Damian Wojtyśka, Romae: Institutum Historicum Polonicum, 1993, p. 77, no. 50.) It is interesting that Lippomano mentioned neither “Poles” nor Jews. The composition of the Vilnius chapter in the second half of the sixteenth century is also notable: of the 75 canons and prelates who were members of the chapter during this period, just 17, or 23%, came from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (including its Ruthenian, but not its Podlasian territories). Six came from Podlasie (8%), all of whom were installed while Podlasie was still formally part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Among the remaining members of the chapter, we can establish an origin in one or other lands of the Polish Crown, not including

were filled by a multilingual crowd. “Ethnic” differences overlapped with religious ones⁶².

Catholic and Jewish religious authorities alike sought to restrict contacts between Christians and Jews – they officially opposed mixed relationships. In practice, though, the boundaries could be crossed. Marital bonds between a Catholic and a non-Christian partner were preceded by the conversion of the latter, which was a source of great distress to the rabbis. They in turn treated informal sexual relations between Jews and Gentiles as idolatry. Formal prohibitions and both secular and canon law restricted, but could not entirely prevent, personal contacts between individual priests or the chapter as a whole and Jews, which we may generally characterize as correct. The acts of the Vilnius cathedral chapter contain relatively little evidence of either fervour to convert Jews to Catholicism or phobias about ritual murder or profanation. In the more frequent economic problems, the chapter generally strove to uphold the rights of “its” Jews, whether they were

Royal Prussia, for a further 41–55 % of the total. Nine persons (12 %) came from places beyond the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Polish Crown and one person (1 %) came from Royal Prussia. We have insufficient information to establish the origin of one clergymen. See Wioletta Pawlikowska-Butterwick, “A “Foreign” Elite? The Territorial Origins of the Canons and Prelates of the Cathedral Chapter of Vilna in the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century”, in: *Slavonic and East European Review*, 2014, vol. 92, no. 1, pp. 44–80. The figures published in my article “The Prelates and Canons of Vilnius in the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century: A Prosopographical Study of Selected Questions”, in: *Studies in Church History*, vol. 5: *Religious Communities in Lithuanian History: Life and Identity*, ed. Arūnas Streikus (LCAS Annals, vol. 36, series B), Vilnius: 2012, pp. 40–41 need to be corrected. It has since been possible to establish the territorial origins of a further six persons (8%).

⁶² See *Акты издаваемые Коммиссиею, Высочайше учрежденною для разбора древних актов в Вильню*, vol. 29, Вильна; Wilnianie: *Żywoty siedemnastowieczne*, ed. David Frick, Warsaw: Przegląd Wschodni, 2008; David Frick, “Jews in Public Places: Chapters in the Jewish-Christian Encounter in Seventeenth-Century Wilno”, in: *Polin*, 2010, vol. 22, pp. 215–48; David Frick, “According to the Confession in Which I Die: Taking the Measure of Allegiances in Seventeenth-Century Wilno”, in: *Central Europe*, 2010, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 107–22; David Frick, *Kith, Kin, and Neighbors: Communities and Confessions in Seventeenth-Century Wilno*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013; J. Niedźwiedz, *Kultura literacka Wilna (1323–1655): Retoryczna organizacja miasta*, Kraków: Universitas, 2012.

converts or not, against those noblemen and burghers who challenged them – sometimes violently. Contacts between Jews and Christian burghers were often far less polite. Was this perhaps due to the fact that, for the chapter, Jews were a source of income, whereas for the burghers they were unwelcome competitors?

SERGEJUS TEMČINAS

JEWISH ATTITUDES TO BYZANTIUM'S TROUBLES?
 THE DEFINITION OF HEBREW *KAFTOR*
 IN THE CYRILLIC MANUSCRIPT MANUAL
 OF HEBREW (ACCORDING TO THE EXTANT
 SIXTEENTH-CENTURY COPY)

An East Slavic copy of *Miscellany*, written in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the third quarter of the 16th century (Moscow, Russian State Archive of Early Acts, F. Mazurin collection (f. 196), inventory 1, No 616, *in quarto*), contains a previously unknown text which can be called *Cyrillic manuscript manual of Hebrew* (on f. 124–130). Certain features show that this is a later (to a certain extent corrupted) copy of an earlier original which can be tentatively dated back to the second half of the 15th century¹.

The manual is a result of joint efforts of Jewish and East Slavic bookmen, although designed for a Christian audience. It comprises material of three different kinds: a) Hebrew texts written in Cyrillic (Gen 2.8, 32.27–28; Ps 150; So 3.4 (or 8.2), 8.5; Is 11.12)²; b) a bilingual

¹ The text has been published with a general characteristic: Сергей Юрьевич Темчин, “Кириллический рукописный учебник древнееврейского языка (XVI в.): публикация и общая характеристика памятника”, in: *Naujausi kalbų ir kultūrų tyrimai*, eds. Violeta Meiliūnaitė, Nadiežda Morozova, Vilnius: Europos kalbų ir kultūrų dialogo tyrėjų asociacija, 2012, pp. 137–180. The teaching methods applied in this manual have been analyzed in: Сергей Юрьевич Темчин, “Кириллический рукописный учебник древнееврейского языка (список XVI в.) и его учебно-методические приемы”, in: *Slavistica Vilnensis 2013* (Kalbotyra 58 (2)): XV Международный съезд славистов (Минск, 20–27 августа 2013 г.). Доклады литовской делегации, Vilnius, 2013, pp. 7–33.

² For the Hebrew pronunciation reflected in these texts see Sergei Y. Temchin,

Hebrew-Ruthenian glossary with explanatory notes³; c) quotations from the Ruthenian translation of three Old Testament books (Genesis, Isaiah, Song of Songs) which illustrate certain entries of the Hebrew–Slavic glossary⁴.

On folio 125v, the bilingual Hebrew-Ruthenian glossary presents an interesting explanation of the Hebrew word *kaf̄tor*: **по ѿв’рейскій, каѿторъ; рѣше, на врѣхѣу лѣствицѣи въсходѣць прѣ двѣрьми стѣнѣнѣми** (“Caphtor in Hebrew is a small ascent on the top of stairs before the entrance hall door”. This means ‘threshold, sill’ (the top of door-steps).

Hebrew *kaf̄tor* is a polysemic word, described by Gesenius as having three meanings:

כַּפְתוֹר, כַּפְתוֹר

1. *capital* of pillar;
2. *knob* or bulb, ornament of the golden lamp-stand in Tabernacle;
3. prob. *Crete* (Cappadocia, certainly wrong; Cyprus, the cost of the Nile Delta; Philistines, originally pirates from SW coast of Asia Minor, and the Aegean islands);

“Learning Hebrew in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania: Evidence from a 16th-century Cyrillic manuscript” (forthcoming).

³ One entry from this glossary (that which explains Hebrew ‘*almāh*’) has been analyzed in: Сергей Юрьевич Темчин, “Толкование др.-евр. ‘*almāh*’ в рукописном кириллическом учебнике древнееврейского языка (по списку XVI в.)”, in: *Беларуская кніга ў кантэксце сусветнай кніжнай культуры: вывучэнне і захаванне: зборнік навуковых артыкулаў*, [вып. 4], рэд. Марына Аляксандраўна Мажэйка, Мінск: Беларускі дзяржаўны ўніверсітэт культуры і мастацтваў, 2012 (XVIII Міжнародныя Кірыла-Мяфодзіеўскія чытанні, прысвечаныя Дням славянскага пісьменства і культуры “Кніга ў фарміраванні духоўнай культуры і дзяржаўнасці беларускага народа” (Мінск, 16–18 мая 2012 г.). У 2 т. Т. 2), pp. 64–73.

⁴ The quotations from the Song of Songs found in the Cyrillic manual of Hebrew follow the same Ruthenian translation as in the famous Vilnius Old Testament Florilegium known in a copy of early 16th-century (*Wróblewski Library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences*, f. 19-262), see Сергей Юрьевич Темчин, “Кириллический рукописный учебник древнееврейского языка (XVI в.) и Виленский ветхозаветный свод”, in: *Кныготыра*, 2011, т. 57, Vilnius, pp. 86–99.

כַּפֶּת רִי

only pl. as subst. *Cretans*.⁵

The second meaning (“knob or bulb”) does not have any relation to the definition given in the Cyrillic manual of Hebrew. The first one (“capital of pillar”) is thematically very close to, but not identical with the definition in question (“threshold, sill”). The third meaning (a place name) can also be implied, since the Cyrillic manuscript source presents the entry for Hebrew *kaftor* within the thematic group of words related to Egypt (where also Hebrew *par’oh* “pharaoh” and *Mizraim* “Egypt” are explained)⁶.

Let us examine in more detail the possibility to relate the definition of Hebrew *kaftor* presented in the Cyrillic source to the first and/or third meaning(s) of the word.

THE FIRST MEANING

The definition “a small ascent on the top of stairs before the entrance hall door” cannot be deduced from any Bible verse containing Hebrew *kaftor* and seems to be derived etymologically from *kaf-tor*, since Hebrew *kaf* means “palm of hand”, but also “sole of foot”, while *tor* means “plait”, but also “turn”⁷, which results in *kaf-tor* * “the turn point for the sole of foot”, in fact “threshold, sill”. In any case, the definition given in the Cyrillic manuscript corresponds to the meaning of the Hebrew words *miftān* (used in 1 Sam 5.4–5; Ezek 9.3; 10.4, 18; 46.2; 47.1; Zeph 1.9) and *saf* (used in 25 Bible verses)⁸, both meaning “threshold”.

⁵ William Gesenius, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Boston etc.: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, The Riverside Press, 1906, p. 499.

⁶ Сергей Юрьевич Темчин, “Кириллический рукописный учебник древнееврейского языка (список XVI в.) и его учебно-методические приемы”, pp. 25–26.

⁷ William Gesenius, *op. cit.*, pp. 496–497, 1064.

⁸ Abraham Even-Shoshan, *A New Concordance of the Bible: Thesaurus of the language of the Bible, Hebrew and Aramaic Roots, Words, Proper Names, Phrases and Synonyms*, Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer Publishing House, 1990, p. 812.

THE THIRD MEANING

The Bible mentions Caphtor as a place name (Deut 2.23; Jer 47.4; Am 9.7) and the Caphtorites as its dwellers (Gen 10.14; Deut 2.23; 1 Chron 1.12). The place does not have a clear identification: “The location of Caphtor [...] is in dispute. Most scholars consider Caphtor to be the ancient name for Crete and the surrounding islands (cf. “islands” in LXX, Jer. 47:4). In Jeremiah 47:4 Caphtor is defined as an island. Furthermore, several verses place the origin of the Philistines among the Cretans (Ezek. 25:16; Zeph. 2:5), while elsewhere they are identified as coming from Caphtor. The descent of the Caphtorim from the Egyptians (Gen. 10:14) hints at the close relationship that existed between Egypt and Caphtor. [...] Those who reject the identification of Caphtor with Crete look for it on the southern coast of Asia Minor, near Cilicia, on the basis of the Septuagint and Targum Onkelos which use the name Cappadocia (Gr. Καππαδοκία) in place of Caphtor.”⁹ Recently, an attempt was made to (re)identify Caphtor with Cyprus¹⁰.

On the other hand, traditional Hebrew authors, like Saadiah Gaon (882–942), Benjamin of Tudela (second half of 12th c.), and Maimonides (1135–1204), place Caphtor in Egypt – at Caphutkia (also Capotakia, or Kapotakia) in the vicinity of Damietta (at the eastern edge of the Nile Delta near classical Pelusium)¹¹. Although this tradition may go back merely to the first six centuries CE¹², it does not contradict the Bible, where the Caphtorites are mentioned (in the Table of Nations: Gen 10.13–14; cf. 1 Chron 1.11–12) as descending from Mizraim (e.g. Egypt).

⁹ Bustanay Oded, “Caphtor”, in: *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, second edition, eds. Fred Skolnik, Michael Berenbaum, vol. 4, Detroit etc.: Thomson Gale, Keter Publishing House, 2007, p. 445.

¹⁰ John Strange, *Caphtor/Keftiu: a New Investigation*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1980.

¹¹ *The works of John Lightfoot*, ed. John Strype, vol. 2, London: Printed by William Rawlins, 1684, pp. 290–291; Norman Golb, “The topography of the Jews of Medieval Egypt [Part Two]”, in: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 1974, vol. 33, no. 1, Chicago, p. 126.

¹² Norman Golb, “The topography of the Jews of Medieval Egypt [Part One]”, in: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 1965, vol. 24, no. 3: Erich F. Schmidt Memorial Issue, Chicago, p. 270.

The Egyptian context of the entry for *kaftor* in the Cyrillic manual of Hebrew puts it in line with both the Bible and the Medieval Jewish tradition. It presents Hebrew *kaftor* not as a common noun (“capital of pillar”), but as a place name with an etymologically derived meaning “threshold”, which does not correspond to the real meaning of the word. This semantic disagreement can be also explained as a result of a later corruption of the primary text which might have associated the given definition with another Hebrew noun (*miftān* or *saf*), which was mechanically omitted by a later scribe, resulting in a secondary association of Hebrew *kaftor* with its present definition: *kaftor* [“capital of pillar”; *miftān* or *saf*] “a small ascent on the top of stairs before the entrance hall door”. Although the extant copy of the Cyrillic manual of Hebrew does have omissions of this kind (notably, in the same Egyptian thematic group, in the immediate textual vicinity to the entry for *kaftor*)¹³, this speculative guess would imply Hebrew *kaftor* not as a place name, but as a common noun and thus destroy the congruence of the thematic group of nouns thematically related to Egypt, clearly presented in the source, since neither Hebrew *miftān* nor *saf* have any direct Egyptian association (about certain indirect associations see below).

Thus, it is safer to consider the entry for Hebrew *kaftor* an original definition and not a result of a later corruption. But why was this word chosen to be explained in the Cyrillic manual of Hebrew?

Caphtor was considered the original place of two closely related nations, both descending from Mizraim “Egypt”: the Caphtorites and the Philistines (Gen 10.13–14). The Bible explicitly describes the Philistines as descendants from the *island of Caphtor* (Jer 47.4; cf. Am 9.7), probably Crete (Ezek 25.16; Zeph 2.5). This association is not accidental, since the Hebrew root *p-l-š* (the basis for the name of the Philistines) means “to divide, go through, penetrate”¹⁴, which well

¹³ See Сергей Юрьевич Темчин, “Кириллический рукописный учебник древнееврейского языка (список XVI в.) и его учебно-методические приемы”, pp. 16, 25.

¹⁴ Marcus Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Bavli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*, vol. 2, London–New York: Luzac & Co., G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1903, p. 1185.

corresponds to the biblical image of the Philistines as invaders. This is paralleled by the semantics of Hebrew *saf* which means “threshold, sill”, but it is also a personal name of a Philistine¹⁵.

Since the Philistines were much more important for the Hebrews in the biblical times than the Caphtorites, we can assume that Hebrew *kaftor* was relevant to the compilers of the Cyrillic manual first and foremost as the original place of the Philistines (Am 9.7).

The Bible contains a sole episode which implies the ethnic meaning of *kaftor* “son of Mizraim; the original place of the Philistines”, while explicitly using both Hebrew *kaf* “palm of hand” (relevant to the etymological interpretation of *kaftor* as a composite *kaf-tor* reflected in the Cyrillic source) and *miftān* “threshold” – in the description of the death of Dagon, the god of the Philistines, which occurred in front of the ark of the covenant, captured by the Philistines from the Hebrews in the battle of Eben-Ezer: “And when they [the Philistines – S.T.] arose early on the morrow morning, behold, Dagon was fallen upon his face to the ground before the ark of the Lord; and the head of Dagon and both the *palms* [*kafot*] of his hands lay cut off upon the *threshold* [*miftān*]; only the trunk of Dagon was left to him. Therefore neither the priests of Dagon, nor any that come into Dagon’s house, tread on the *threshold* of Dagon in Ashdod unto this day.” (1 Sam 5.4–5)

This episode suggests the paradoxical idea that Dagon, the national god of the Philistines who had originated from the place named *kaftor*, later ended up, with his head and his both hands (*kafot*) cut off, at another *kaftor* (= *miftān*), if we consider its etymologically reconstructed meaning “threshold, sill”, explicitly presented in the Cyrillic manual of Hebrew. In short, those who have come from Caphtor (the Philistines and their god Dagon) also ended at *kaftor* = *miftān*.

Another question is why the compilers of the Cyrillic manual of Hebrew, working presumably in the second half of the 15th century, were interested in the chronologically very distant story of the Philistines and their god Dagon? What kind of message did it have to convey to the target Christian audience? The possible answer is the following:

¹⁵ William Gesenius, *op. cit.*, p. 706.

Because it was understood as a parallel to the actual fate of the Byzantine Greeks.

There were at least three reasons to think so:

a) The biblical place name Caphtor, be it understood as linked to Crete or Cappadokia, could be associated by the compilers of the Cyrillic text solely with the Byzantine Greeks, since the Egyptian Caphutkia was no longer existent in the 15th century. We should not forget that both the Medieval Jews and the Byzantine Greeks had a strong tradition of modernizing and actualizing the meaning of traditional ethnic names to fit their own times.

b) The name of the Philistine god Dagon was traditionally understood as derived from Hebrew *dāg* “fish”¹⁶. In line with this popular (probably incorrect) explanation, Medieval Jewish writers described an ichthyomorphic image of Dagon, while debating which part of him was shaped as a fish¹⁷. In the 15th century, it could be easily associated with the Christian understanding of Greek *ἰχθύς* “fish” as the acronym for Jesus: *ΙΧΘΥΣ* = Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, Θεοῦ Υἱός, Σωτήρ “Jesus Christ, God’s Son, Saviour”. It is interesting to note that in the pseudo-epigraphic *Letter to the emperor Theophilus concerning the holy and venerable images*, ascribed to John of Damascus (actually, it is a secondary version of the *Letter of the three Oriental Orthodox patriarchs to the emperor Theophilus*, compiled in the 9th century), its iconodulic writer/editor accuses his iconoclastic opponents (allegedly influenced by the Jews) of considering Christ as Bel and Dagon (“[...] ὥς γὰρ τὸν Βήλ καὶ Δαγῶν τὸν Χριστὸν λογιζόμενοι, τούτου καὶ σεπτὰς εἰκόνας κατέκασαν”)¹⁸.

c) In the 15th century, the beheaded trunk of Dagon might have been figuratively understood as an image for the besieged Constantinople,

¹⁶ The earliest attestation of this explanation was provided by Jerome in his *Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum* (written ca 390): “Dagon, piscis tristitiae”, later paralleled by Rashi (1040–1105), David Kimchi (1160?–1235?) and others.

¹⁷ See Robert Alexander Stewart Macalister, *The Philistines: Their History and civilization*, London: Oxford University Press, 1913, p. 100.

¹⁸ *Patrologiae Cursus Completus*, Series Graeca, ed. Jacques Paul Migne, t. 95, Parisiis: Excudebatur et venit apud J.-P. Migne, 1864, col. 372.

cut off from the former Byzantine territories. Indeed, the Byzantine Empire inherited from the pagan Roman Empire not merely the name, but also the predominantly negative Jewish feelings about it¹⁹, which became even worse in the Christian period, when the social position of the Jews became much more complicated²⁰. The dramatic decline of the formerly vast and powerful state, in the 15th century already reduced almost entirely to its capital city, and its final destruction may have been viewed by the Jewish community as a result of the Divine Providence²¹, analogous to the mystic destruction of Dagon in front of the ark of the Lord.

This parallel must have been apparent at least to the Romance-speaking people, like the Italian or Sephardi Jews, whose communities spread to the Eastern Mediterranean region, cf. Latin *caput* “head; capital (city)”. The analogy is not complete, since “the *head* of Dagon and both the *palms* of his hands lay cut off upon the threshold; only the *trunk* of Dagon was left to him”, in contrast to the Byzantine Empire, which until 1453 still kept its “head” (Constantinople) and both “palms” (the nearest region in Thrace and the Despotate of the Morea in the Peloponnese), but this reverse discrepancy could not prevent the analogy.

¹⁹ Nicholas Robert Michael de Lange, “Jewish attitudes to the Roman Empire”, in: *Imperialism in the Ancient world*, eds. Peter D. A. Garnsey, Charles Richard Whittaker, Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press, 1978, pp. 255–281.

²⁰ See Nicholas Robert Michael de Lange, “Jews and Christians in the Byzantine Empire: problems and prospects”, in: *Christianity and Judaism: Papers read at the 1991 Summer Meeting and the 1992 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, ed. Diana Wood, Oxford–Cambridge (Mass.): Blackwell Publishers, 1992 (*Studies in Church History*, vol. 29), pp. 27–30; Nicholas Robert Michael de Lange, “Hebrews, Greeks or Romans? Jewish culture and identity in Byzantium”, in: *Strangers to themselves: The Byzantine outsider: Papers from the Thirty-second Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies* (University of Sussex, Brighton, March 1998), eds. Dion C. Smythe, Aldershot etc.: Ashgate, 2000 (*Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies. Publications*, vol. 8), pp. 113–118.

²¹ Cf. “The fall of Constantinople appeared to Jews to herald the Redemption: the Targum for Lamentations 4:21 was held to prophesy the downfall of the ‘guilty city’; some predicted that redemption would occur in the same year, 1453”, see Andrew Sharf, “Constantinople”, in: *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, second edition, eds. Fred Skolnik, Michael Berenbaum, vol. 5, Detroit etc.: Thomson Gale, Keter Publishing House, 2007, p. 183.

These three different aspects, however hypothetical they may be, allow a parallel between the biblical story of Dagon and the fate of the Byzantine Empire through ethnic modernization of the people originated from Caphthor (the Caphthorites and the Philistines → the Greeks), whose god in one way or another was associated with fish (Dagon and Jesus), and understanding of the decapitated Dagon as a biblical image for the Byzantine Empire prior to the fall of Constantinople. This analogy rests on the combination of ethnic (a), religious (b), and textual (c) grounds, based predominantly on certain interpretation of the actual realities of the 15th century through the Bible text and, *mutatis mutandis*, on the reinterpretation of the Bible in the light of new historical events. The process was enhanced by the traditional Jewish pan-temporal view of history in which past, present and future are not easily distinguishable.

It is quite possible that the definition of Hebrew *kaftor* presented in the Cyrillic manual of Hebrew (known in a manuscript copy of the third quarter of the 15th century) reflects Jewish attitudes to Byzantium's troubles prior to or shortly after the fall of Constantinople in 1453.

ELENA KEIDOŠIŪTĖ

WHAT SHOULD A CATHOLIC KNOW? SHIFTING
TRENDS IN THE PREPARATION OF A JEWISH
CATECHUMEN FOR BAPTISM IN 18-20-CENTURY
LITHUANIA

The mission of the Roman Catholic Church to the Jews has been a complex story of different outlooks, changing approaches and complicated interactions between the clergy and the Jewish minority. Meanings that ordinary Christians, churchmen and especially missionaries ascribed to the existence and proximity of Jews varied through the ages and the understanding of the roles of both agents in the contexts of Christendom, Messianic feelings or God's plan took new forms. Emphasis on the necessity of converting the Jews was shifting, but it was a constantly debated issue, influenced and altered by changing political environment and sociocultural conditions. This process of transformation is especially evident in the territory of Lithuania that was subject to many different political environments throughout the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth. This article will analyze one of the components of the conversional procedure – the preparation of a Jewish catechumen for baptism in the Catholic Church. By looking into the constituents of this process, defined loosely as “becoming a Catholic”, we will try to describe what specific changes took place in the preparation of a Jew for a Catholic life and what tools and skills were considered necessary or sufficient to take upon the sacrament. Most importantly, we will evaluate how adequate and thorough the knowledge transferred by a member of clergy to a convert from Judaism was as well as how its content varied in different periods of time. The enquiry will also question the very possibility of one being fully prepared for smooth integration into the Catholic society in the

light of how nominal, one-sided and superficial certain preparation practices conducted by churchmen often were.

When preparing a Jewish catechumen to receive the sacrament of baptism, there were always several key demands to be met: good understanding of the faith and its proclaimed truths as well as proof of sincerity in one's decision that must come from inner religious calling. However, looking at a longer period of time, namely, from the end of the 18th century to 1941, when the majority of the Lithuanian Jewry perished and there were no more baptism cases, we can observe modifications of the main elements in preparing a Jewish catechumen for conversion – namely, in terms of religious literature, teaching and examining. By analysing these elements we can evaluate efforts of the Catholic Church, or lack thereof, to develop a thorough system for preparing neophytes. This article covers periods when the Lithuanian territory was under rule of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the Russian Empire that ruled Lithuania throughout the nineteenth century and the interwar Lithuanian Republic, ending with an overview of the Holocaust situation; this will allow to see how the understanding of ways to approach and prepare a potential Jewish convert changed along with social and cultural shifts in the territory. There is a rich historiography on Jewish conversions in various periods and regions¹, mainly focusing

¹ Main texts dedicated to Jewish conversions in the East European region, just to name a few: Jacob Goldberg, “Żydowsy konwertyci w społeczeństwie staropolskim”, in: *Spółeczeństwo staropolskie*, vol. 4, Warszawa, 1986; Michael Stanislawski, “Jewish Apostasy in Russia: a Tentative Typology”, in: *Jewish Apostasy in the Modern World*, ed. Todd M. Endelmann, New York: Holmes & Meier, 1987, pp. 189–205; Mikhail Agursky, “Conversions of Jews to Christianity in Russia”, in: *Soviet Jewish Affairs*, 1990, vol. 20, no. 2–3, pp. 69–84; Todd M. Endelman, “Jewish Converts in Nineteen-Century Warsaw: A Quantitative Analysis”, in: *Jewish Social Studies*, 1997–1998, vol. 4, no. 1; Chaeran Freeze, “When Chava Left Home: Gender, Conversion, and the Jewish Family in Tsarist Russia”, in: *Polin*, vol. 18, pp. 154–188; John D. Klier, “State Policies and the Conversion of Jews in Imperial Russia”, in: *Of Religion and Empire: Missions, Conversion, and Tolerance in tsarist Russia*, eds. Robert P. Geraci, Michael Khodorkovsky, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001, pp. 92–112; Magda Teter, “Jewish Conversions to Catholicism in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries”, in: *Jewish History*, 2003, vol. 17, issue 3, pp. 257–283; Artur Markowski, “Konwersje Żydów w północno-wschodnich regionach

on the issues of changing a convert's legal status and characteristics of Jews who decided to change their religious affiliation. However, there is little specific focus on the means of ensuring one's sufficient readiness for conversion, as well as on how the content of this process changed over time. Research in this article is based a corpus of Jewish baptismal files² and religious literature. The former are mostly individual files composed of correspondence between religious and secular institutions and statements of Jewish catechumens. The religious literature used here is mainly one specifically targeting Jews as potential converts or Catholics who might be interested in the missionary activity³.

ATTEMPTS TO CREATE AN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM FOR EASIER INTEGRATION OF JEWISH CONVERTS IN THE 19TH CENTURY

Back in 1741, a convert, or a churchman undersigned as a neophyte⁴, Jan Krzysztof Lewek, wrote that the essential assistance needed for a Jew converting to Christianity is financial help to make the

Królestwa Polskiego w pierwszej połowie XIX wieku”, in: *Studia Judaica*, 2006, vol. 9, no. 1 (17), pp. 3–32; *W poszukiwaniu religii doskonałej? Konwersja a Żydzi*, ed. Agnieszka Jagodzińska, Wrocław: Wydawn. Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2012.

² Jewish baptism files are kept in: *Lithuanian State Historical Archives* (henceforth – LVIA), f. 604, f. 669 and f. 694; *Manuscript Department of the Wróblewski Library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences* (henceforth – LMAVB RS), f. 318; *Manuscript Department of Vilnius University Library* (henceforth – VUB RS), f. 57.

³ Such as Jan Chryzostom Gintyllo, *Mokslas krikščioniškas zemajtiškaj parašitas / Christian science laid out in Samogitian: Kunigo Jono Krizostomo Gintilos žemaitiškas katekizmas hebrajų rašmenimis*, ed. Jurgita Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2009; Jan Chryzostom Gintyllo, *Nauka czytania po polsku dla młodzi wyznania starozakonnego*, Wilno: druk i nakład Zawadzkiego, 1817; Frederyk Pistol, *Żydowstwo i Chryścijaństwo czyli słowa prawdy do braci w Izraelu*, Wilno: Wydawnictwo Misyj Wewnętrznych Archidiecezji Wileńskiej, 1933; Frederyk Pistol, *Misja nawracania Żydów*, Wilno: Wydawnictwo Misyj Wewnętrznych Archidiecezji Wileńskiej, 1932; Wincenty Danek, *Katechizm dla konwertytów*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Apostolstwa Modlitwy, 1939.

⁴ This is debatable, Magda Teter seems to doubt if the author is actually a newly converted Jew, see Magda Teter, “Jewish Conversions to Catholicism in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries”, in: *Jewish History*, 2003, vol. 17, issue 3, pp. 269–270.

transition, zealous teachers and a set of “useful”, non-exploitative skills⁵. Lewek envisioned the proper circumstances for catechumens’ education to be mutually inspirational for both, the potential neophytes and the missionaries:

If those who want to convert were assigned a place and stable provisions or if there was a foundation for their livelihood, there would be enough zealous teachers and apostolic men who could, with the help of God’s grace [...] attract many souls and direct them in the path of eternal salvation.⁶

The advice was heard by Józef Stefan Turczynowicz, the priest founder of the *Mariae Vitae* female congregation that was confirmed in 1752 by Pope Benedict XIV and Vilnius Bishop Michał Zienkiewicz. Since then, we have a clearer understanding of how a Jewish catechumen (at least female) was led towards baptism. The Rule of the Congregation⁷ included the unique Sixth chapter which ordered to

provide [*converts*] with food and appropriate clean clothing according to the possibilities and needs, and keep them [*in the convent*] until they figure out and are provided with a means for living.⁸

The social programme of the Mariavites was created with the prevention of apostasy in mind. That was what made this Congregation exceptional in the context of the Church policies towards non-Christians at the time. Most importantly, it was forbidden to let catechumen out of the convent and it was obligatory to take care of them and find them an occupation in a Christian environment afterwards so they were not tempted to apostatize, sometimes keeping a girl for a while or placing her somewhere safely so she did not wander back to her family. These

⁵ “Z literatury antyżydowskiej w Polsce XVIII wieku (Jan Krzysztof Lewek, List pewnego statysty, Wilno 1741)”, published by Bogdan Rok, in: *Z historii ludności żydowskiej w Polsce i na Śląsku*, Wrocław: Wydawn. Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 1994, pp. 222–223.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 217.

⁷ Małgorzata Borkowska OSB, “Regula druga mariawitek”, in: *Nasza Przeszość*, Kraków, 2000, vol. 94, pp. 333–347.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 339.

elements were meant to guarantee smooth integration of a neophyte into the new society and create a new “social face” for a neophyte: a new set of religious practices, a way of living, a name and a surname, an occupation, etc. So all in all, the process of preparation for the conversion was not limited to teaching how to be a Catholic, but more than that – how to be a fully functioning individual in the Catholic society, in the Congregation’s case, someone’s wife with necessary female skills like cooking, washing, sewing and gardening; as Turczynowicz himself put it, Jewesses were poor and stray and absolutely incapable of work⁹. Nonetheless, despite this seemingly well-considered system, the Mariavites were constantly struggling financially in their everyday lives, which inevitably reflected badly on the process of missionizing. We do not have many statements from neophyte girls, however, in one of them, a catechumen says:

but what of it, when instead of learning prayers and other religious basics, I was tortured with work – I had to take care of livestock, wash clothes, cook, pick vegetables in the garden and so on. [...] Mother Superior told me that, firstly, I must work for a whole year and only after that were they going to start preparing me.¹⁰

The preparation of the catechumen was eclipsed by the need to survive, thus altering the girl’s illusions about the life-changing period of preparation¹¹.

Comparing a single baptism file from the year 1787 and three available ones from 1818, all concerning male converts, we can see that a questionnaire, a so-called “examination”, was applied when admitting one to the Catholic Church as new Jewish communities were entering

⁹ “List okolny fundatora siostr Maryawitek s. p. X. Kanonika Turczynowicza”, in: *Dzieje dobroczynności*, Wilno: Typografia A. Marcinowskiego, 1820, pp. 392–395.

¹⁰ Quoted after: Krzysztof Lewalski, *Kościół chrześcijański w Królestwie Polskim wobec Żydów w latach 1855–1915*, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 2002, p. 184.

¹¹ More on the history and activity of the Mariavites please see Elena Keidosiute, “Missionary activity of *Mariae Vitae* Congregation”, in: *PaRDeS. Zeitschrift der Vereinigung für Jüdische Studien / PaRDeS. Journal of the association of Jewish Studies*, Potsdam, 2010, pp. 57–72.

the complicated confessional picture of the Russian Empire. It focused mostly on the most basic personal information (age, place of origin), confirmed sincerity and motivation of the act of conversion. The very term of examination can be questioned here, since it was more of a bureaucratic measure to ensure free will of an applicant, as few problems in the transition as possible and proceed with administrative changes arising from individual's changed position in the social scheme of estates. The questionnaire also asked a person to provide some information on what they were planning to do after baptism – what they were to work, what work they were capable of and if there was any threat of apostasy in the light of possible financial difficulties after baptism. The Russian authorities initially took over the practices used in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, simplified them and, in the cases from the late 1830s (up until the end), a statement by a catechumen and a protocol from the local police authority with the basic details of an individual's registration¹², age and place of origin would suffice. Specific duration of the preparation period, often referred to as the “probation” (in Russian “испытание”), when a catechumen stayed in a monastery or presbytery, is not stated, but sources suggest it mostly varied from six months to a year. However, the prolongation of the period was not always necessarily due to lengthy teaching, but rather complicated bureaucracy that the Catholic Church was subjected to in the Empire. Nonetheless, we can assume that this period of time should have been considered more or less sufficient to transfer basic knowledge to a catechumen, but not necessarily a complete know-how of living in an entirely different social environment. In the case of the Mariavites, to teach some basic skills to survive in a new community, even though the teaching was confined to within the walls of the convent with no real practice outside. Catholic Consistory also had to receive two certificates from a churchman preparing a Jew: one about the catechumen's good behavior and the second one about his or her adequate knowledge on questions of faith. When it came to “good behavior”, in most cases this concerned diligence while studying and avoiding interaction with the outside world,

¹² In rare cases an applicant would expand upon the jobs of his or her parents.

especially the native Jewish community, or indecent behavior (in the sources, this would usually include inappropriate liaisons, drinking and making forays into the nearest city¹³). When catechumens were clearly manipulating the situation and did not respect the clergy, the Roman Catholic Consistory would not hesitate to terminate the conversion process. First, the authorities made efforts to grant a catechumen one more chance to come around by sending him or her to another parish or monastery¹⁴. If no improvement was observed, the clergy member preparing for baptism was instructed to ask the catechumen him or her to leave¹⁵. Despite this, there were cases of individuals who were far from being exemplary believers to see the day of conversion. Even after such seemingly unambiguous verdicts as

she avoids being acquainted with the Christian teachings and following them, she does not want to know the Christian reconciliation and piety, she holds onto ill Jewish habits and justifies them, she avoids any, even smallest domestic work [...] In short, there is no hope for her to become an exemplary Christian¹⁶,

or suspicions of theft and continuous relations with Jewish brethren¹⁷, catechumens would get another chance and eventually, after a year or so, come back and get baptised. It is impossible to say now if, after sufficient time, a person would arrive at a significant change of heart; however, it is safe to suggest that the decisive voice here was that of a member of the clergy of the lower ranks who was preparing the catechumen to get baptised. It was their patience and good will or determination to ignore some of their pupils' not-quite-proper behaviour in the name of greater numbers of the newly admitted to the Catholic church that influenced the outcome of a baptismal case.

We cannot firmly specify what kind of religious curriculum each

¹³ Cf. *LVIA*, f. 604-5-3371, 3544, 3879, 8245.

¹⁴ Cf. *LVIA*, f. 604-5-3879, 8245.

¹⁵ Cf. *LVIA*, f. 604-5-6953, 3840.

¹⁶ *LVIA*, f. 604-5-3480, fol. 19.

¹⁷ Cf. *LVIA*, f. 604-5-4156.

catechumen received. What is pretty clear from the baptism files of the period is that an overwhelming portion of Jews who turned to the Catholic Church were illiterate (or barely literate)¹⁸, so the option of educating via religious literature was not available and the truths of Catholicism had to be transferred orally, while ability to recite Catholic prayers was a proof of sufficient religious knowledge¹⁹. Moreover, the outcome of the preparation period was highly dependant on skills and dedication of a churchman or a churchwoman, whose ability to transfer knowledge and piety as well as understand a Jewish catechumen would lead to a successful conversion. However, being educated by a clergyman was hardly a guarantee of adequate disposition for a smooth transition to the everyday life in the Catholic environment, unless one's teacher or a sponsor provided or helped to find the means to make a living²⁰.

There is one curious example, possibly created, in part, in response to the problem of the Jews' illiteracy in non-Jewish languages. It concerns writings of a rather controversial figure, Samogitian Bishop²¹ Jan Chryzostom Gintyło (1788–1857), who targeted the Jewish audience and laid out texts in Yiddish and Samogitian in Hebrew characters; most importantly, he wrote a Catholic catechism²². Gintyło

¹⁸ According to my calculations almost 70 % of the catechumens in Vilnius and Telšiai Dioceses were illiterate, and the rest were literate or barely literate, i.e. they could put a signature in Russian or in Hebrew characters. However, it is worth noting that inability to sign did not necessarily mean inability to read. This nuance is difficult to estimate, more on this see Shaul Stampfer, *Families, Rabbis and Education. Traditional Jewish Society in Nineteenth-Century Eastern Europe*, Oxford: Littman Library of Jewish Civilisation, 2010, chapter "Literacy among Jews in Eastern Europe in the Modern Period", pp. 190–210.

¹⁹ For example, in a case of baptism of Chaia Ichelevna (1844) administrator of Wiłkomierz (Ukmergė) church rejoices over her ability to say prayers from memory, in: *VUB RS*, f. 57-B54-134, fol. 3.

²⁰ There were cases when nuns would find dowries and husbands for girls, or Christians would take upon care of a convert.

²¹ He was nominated as a bishop by the tsar. However, this position was never confirmed by the pope. Gintyło stayed in this position from 1844 until 1850.

²² This corresponded with his general initiative that Catholicism should

was known as a Hebraist and was interested in issues of bringing Christian education to the Jews. Composing a Catechism in Hebrew letters allowed Gintyllo to expand his potential readership by including Jews who did not necessarily know Polish but were able to read any of the Jewish languages. It was structured mainly in the form of questions and answers – an old tradition that we will be able to trace right to the interwar period. Quite conventionally, it focused on the most debated issues between Jews and Christians: the nature of Jesus Christ as the Messiah, the notion of the Holy Trinity and the connection of both Testaments and the promise of the New Testament in the Old Testament. It also made an attempt to explain the primacy of Catholicism above all the other Christian denominations. However, it never became a properly employed tool in the preparation of Jewish catechumens, since, for whatever reasons, it was never published nor used in practice and stayed more of an ambitious private experiment of Gintyllo.

The only published text by Gintyllo was *The science of reading in Polish for the young believers in the faith of the Old Testament*²³. The textbook for Jews to learn Polish emphasizes how immanently the Polish language – the tongue of the Catholic religion and prayer in the region in the nineteenth century – was considered to be the main tool of spreading Christianity and surely not by the bishop alone. According to the Jewish baptism files available from the middle of the nineteenth century, mainly from 1848–1857, churchmen did not avoid corresponding in Polish. Moreover, Jewish catechumens also reasoned their transition more than solely in theological terms: “in order to know the Catechism better and praise the Lord better, I am

be reinforced by using local languages in the pastoral work. More on his efforts, the analysis and the publication of the whole text see Jan Chryzostom Gintyllo, *Mokslas krikščioniskas zemajtiškaj parašitas*; see also Arvydas Pacevičius, “Jonas Krizostomas Gintila: keli Žemaičių bibliofilo portreto bruožai”, in: *Alsėdžiai* (ser. *Žemaičių praeitis*, 10), Vilnius, 2002, pp. 233–244; Ieva Šenavičienė, “Gintila Jonas Krizostomas”, in: *Žemaičių Kalvarijos mokykla 1803–1836*, ed. Arvydas Pacevičius, Vilnius, 2005.

²³ Jan Chryzostom Gintyllo, *Nauka czytania po polsku dla młodzi wyznania starozakonnego*, Wilno, 1817.

learning the Polish language”²⁴; or stated a wish to embrace the “Polish faith”²⁵. These examples, although sparse, testify to the complicated relation between religious and ethnic identities as well as to the blurred distinction between the Poles and the Lithuanians (not to mention a major ethnic group of Belorussians in the region), thus suggesting that teaching the Catholic faith and its language was also teaching one to belong to a totally different ethnos.

REVISION AND INHERITED TRADITIONS OF APPROACHING A JEWISH CATECHUMEN IN THE INTERWAR PERIOD

After the fall of the Russian Empire and WWI, such practices were overshadowed by more urgent calamities and transformations. As we move on to the period of the interwar, when the Catholic Church gained back its strength and independence from the overly tight bureaucracy and could once again focus on evangelization, we can notice some subtle changes in the understanding of missionizing of Jews. It was influenced by the modernization of both Christian and Jewish communities and the nation states they ended up in. Unfortunately, due to scarcity of sources, little can be said about the catechesis or written material employed in Lithuania at this point. Merely a couple of priests mention the preparation period of half a year²⁶, and others do not specify the period before baptism. Only in one of the files do we have a priest mention a catechumen to be learning from a catechism written by Koncevičius²⁷, which was actually intended for children preparing for the First Communion. Most likely, there was little Catholic religious literature targeted at the Jews in Lithuania at the time.

The situation in Vilnius region, annexed by Poland, is more eloquent

²⁴ LVIA, f. 694-1-1991, fol. 54.

²⁵ LVIA, f. 694-1-1854, fol. 16.

²⁶ Half a year, in: LVIA, f. 1671-5-516, fol. 26; each Sunday for half a year, LVIA, f. 1671-5-505, fol. 159.

²⁷ Most likely: Juozas Končius-Koncevičius, *Trumpas katekizmas: vadovėlis pradžios mokykloms ir pirmai vaikų išpažinčiai*, Vilnius: „Zničo“ sp., 1918.

and diverse. At this point, we should begin by briefly introducing the Section for converting Jews that was established in Vilnius Archdiocese in 1929 as a part of a wider net of the Society of Interior Missions (*Towarzystwo Misyj Wewnętrznych Sekcja Nawracania Żydów*). Before that, the Society had been named after St. John, but that year it was renamed the Section for converting Jews²⁸. As the Chairman of the Section, priest Stanisław Miłkowski, put it, the St. John Society had had barely 20 members and its activity had not been very productive; and only after its reorganization in April 1929 into one specifically aimed at Jewish conversion, had it been revived and begun to develop²⁹. In June 1930 it had 170 members in Vilnius and 10 members outside of the city³⁰. That year the Society took care, “morally and financially”³¹, of 15 Jews (four baptised earlier, probably before the establishment of the Society, two baptised before June 1930 and nine catechumens). The exact date when the Society was closed is unknown – the last available correspondence of priest Miłkowski is dated 1 December 1931³².

As mentioned above, the chairman of the Section was priest Miłkowski, but the mission was *de facto* lead by a convert Jew, Frederyk Pistol, who came to Vilnius from Lviv. He had been born into a Jewish Orthodox family, who had hoped he would become a rabbi. Thus he was well-educated and well-versed in Jewish religious literature. This knowledge of his is well reflected in one of his published books, *Jewishness and Christianity or the words of truth to brothers of Israel*³³, that was dedicated to revealing the immanent connection between the Old Testament and the New Testament. It was clearly meant for potential Jewish converts or, to some extent, assimilated (since the book is in Polish and not in Yiddish, only Biblical quotes are in

²⁸ Miłkowski’s Report, in: *LMAVB RS*, f. 318-34598, fol. 76.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² Miłkowski’s letter to a person in Dzisna, in: *LMAVB RS*, f. 318-34598, fol. 116.

³³ Frederyk Pistol, *Żydostwo i Chrześcijaństwo czyli słowa prawdy do braci w Izraelu*, Wilno, 1933.

Hebrew) literate religiously-educated Jews. Throughout his book, Pistol attempted to emphasize an undeniable connection between the Old and the New Testaments, he referred to the prophets and criticized Jewish commentators. He compared two different religious systems, calling both religions equally Jewish³⁴, arriving at the conclusion that Judaism was not the faith of Moses and the prophets anymore, since its believers were misled by a set of false beliefs of Talmud. Pistol also explained some verses in the New Testament and called upon the Israelites to open their hearts as the first Christians, Jews themselves, once had. By going through the Old Testament step by step, and analysing and explaining passages that had supposedly been misinterpreted or misunderstood, he tried to convince the Jews of a purely rational approach of textual analysis which exposed that “*Jews, who became believers of the opposite system [meaning Judaism], did not have reason the same way their ancestors hadn’t [meaning those who rejected the teachings of Jesus]*”³⁵.

In his other book, *The mission of converting the Jews*³⁶, that Pistol wrote on the basis of his own lecture, the convert related a story of his own path toward conversion and also presented a dialogue he supposedly once had with a certain Jew, on religious issues. It could also be viewed as a tutorial for anyone willing to missionize. Pistol was convinced that religious Jews, or Talmudic Jews as he called them, were always keen to discuss faith, so there was hope to convert them this way, by persuasion. Another group, the secular Jews or as he also called them, “progressive Jews” (quotation marks by Pistol), was a more complicated issue, since the work of convincing them in the existence of God in general had to be accomplished first. To this group he mainly ascribed sionists, bundists and socialists³⁷. Here again he urged the Jews to seek answers in the Scripture, suggesting that only by analysing the holy text or having someone to analyse and explain it

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

³⁶ Frederyk Pistol, *Misja nawracania Żydów*, Wilno, 1932.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

to them will one truly enlighten one's mind. Pistol also insisted that a place for Jewish catechumens to gather, where someone would discuss faith with them, tell them about the Gospels and where to find religious literature, including Jewish, was essential for the preparation to join the community of Christians³⁸. Some of the steps towards that kind of arrangement were taken shortly.

The Section offered courses of the Polish and German languages, in that way seeking a path towards Jewish souls via linguistic education – very likely in the hope of making rich religious literature available to them. It is worth noticing that due to strong cultural and linguistic nationalism in Poland, the idea of reaching the Jews via religious literature translated into Yiddish was completely abandoned. The tradition of immanently interconnecting the Polish language and the Catholic faith as essential constituents of Polishness not only continued but also got stronger. A reading room in Vilnius, offering collections of literature on religious topics, was also opened and would host readings of the Bible twice a week. We can see that, in the interwar period, the strategy of missionaries changed in response to transformation of the Jewish community itself – higher literacy rates called for a more diverse approach and offered more ways to do it, while awareness of Christian modes of life via some level of acculturation made the preparation less to do with acquiring a completely foreign way of thinking and behaving. However, both initiatives were not very successful and somewhat secondary, since Pistol put most of his energy into private conversations with potential neophytes. Communication and personal connection with potential Jewish converts was the main method for seeking out new members of the Church. As Pistol put in his book on missions to the Jews,

It shouldn't be only about the quantity, but about the baptism itself. A Jew admitted to the true Church has to be not only baptised, but also converted. Jews have to be convinced in the true religion.³⁹

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

Pistol was aware that many Jews converted for very worldly considerations, but he nonetheless believed that every effort had to be made in order to actually convince them in the supremacy of Christianity, and this work had to be done paying attention to the Jewish “customs, way of thinking and psychology”⁴⁰. This ambivalence speaks of both that each person had to be approached individually and also that Jews composed a separate and unique group with a set of certain group traits that had to be appreciated and possibly fought by a missionary. Pistol, a former insider, shared the knowledge about the Jewish community that the Catholic clergy and believers supposedly did not have, however, his claims were in fact just old truths: Jews had to be approached via the Old Testament’s connection with the New Testament and that a Jew was actually able to become a good and sincere Catholic, once persuaded into the right faith (the latter was far from an accepted truth, as scepticism prevailed among a great part of the Catholic clergy).

If we analyse the corpus of baptism files, both from the interwar Vilnius region and the independent Republic of Lithuania between 1918 and 1940, we do not find much evidence to support the idea of a very thorough process of conversion. Curias did not supervise very closely the diligence of a parish priest preparing catechumens. We only have a few files where an explicit list of materials for a catechumen is presented. For example, a Karkažiškės parish priest told Vilnius Curia in 1935 that he presented the following literature to three catechumen girls: the Old and the New Testament, the History of the Catholic Church, Dogmatics, Catholic Ethics and Wincenty Danek’s Catechism⁴¹ for converts⁴². The latter, which evidently reached Vilnius Archdiocese, was also composed in the form of questions and answers. It had separate chapters for each non-Catholic denomination. The one dedicated to the Jews was the most voluminous one, as Jews were said to be further from the Catholic truths than all the others. A fictional dialogue between a Catholic and a Jew yet again focused on outlining

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁴¹ Wincenty Danek, *op. cit.*

⁴² *LMAVB RS*, f. 318-21973, fol. 1.

the truths shared by both the Jews and the Catholics, passages in the Old Testament connecting both faiths, the nature of Jesus Christ as the Messiah and the Holy Trinity.

THE AMBIVALENT (NON)PREPARATION OF
JEWS FOR BAPTISM IN 1941

Before looking any closer into the situation of 1941, it is worth mentioning that Lithuanian Catholic Curias did notice a growing number of Jews willing to baptise in the context of the Holocaust. By that time Vilnius region had already been incorporated into the territory of the Republic of Lithuania. According to calculations based on the numbers of Jewish baptismal files available from the interwar period and the year 1941, it can be estimated 187 people expressed their wish to get baptised in both the Republic of Lithuania and Vilnius region between the wars, whereas in 1941 alone 114 Jews applied for conversion – most of them, 102, in the second half of that year, when atrocities inflicted upon the Jews were in full swing. And these are only the ones that were officially recorded and at least partially processed.

People who took part in rescuing Jews or were witnessing efforts by others during the Holocaust in Lithuania mention in their memoirs cases when priests would issue fake baptismal documents or would date them a few years back so they would not seem that recent⁴³. These testimonies should be judged with caution, since they were written some time after the war and the information they provide is inevitably selective. Prelate Mykolas Krupavičius (1885–1970) wrote in 1962 that Jewish baptisms were becoming a mass phenomenon which made the Church authorities to warn their subordinates not to baptise solely because of the current circumstances and to inform Jewish catechumens that receiving the sacrament would hardly help them or be a solution to their problems⁴⁴.

⁴³ See *Išgelbėję pasaulį... Žydų gelbėjimas Lietuvoje (1941–1944)*, eds. Dalia Kuodytė, Rimantas Stankevičius, Vilnius: Lietuvos Gyventojų genocido ir rezistencijos tyrimo centras, 2001.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 63.

Some priests who helped the persecuted ended up in prisons. Sofija Lukauskaitė-Jasaitienė (1901–1981), a prominent public figure and émigrée, wrote in 1946 that people would often try to save Jewish children by issuing them new birth certificates and adults by granting them new identity documents⁴⁵; naturally, these are the cases that did not end up among the official baptismal files mentioned above. Memoirs tell us of both successful and tragic outcomes of such endeavours, most often determined by mere luck and mercy of a prosecutor.

When it comes to the warnings by the church authorities, Prelate Krupavičius most likely had in mind two editions of very similar instructions on Jewish conversion that were issued in Kaunas Diocese and Vilnius Archdiocese⁴⁶. Both singled out Jews as exceptional potential neophytes and warned that the procedure of their conversion had to be handled with utmost diligence. Priests were urged not to take the matter lightly and to collect all evidence that the conversion was sincere and not motivated by fear. The instruction issued in Vilnius said:

When it comes to Jews, [...] we continue to demand a period of evaluation for those who convert to the Church of Christ. Both the faith and the morals have to be evaluated. Current special circumstances demand a greater and longer evaluation.⁴⁷

Similarly, the instruction issued in Kaunas stated: ...the Holy Baptism should not be granted to individuals of the Jewish nationality without a proper all-round investigation⁴⁸. Interestingly enough, despite a seemingly strict tone of the instructions, they did not outline any new specific recommendations or stricter rules that had not been employed before and remained quite laconic. They hardly indicated how that “evaluation” had to be conducted and what concrete measures it entailed or what proof of eligibility would be considered sufficient. Apparently, the Church authorities did not find it necessary to make

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 198.

⁴⁶ *LMAVB RS*, f. 318-23035, ff. 2–4; *LVIA*, f. 1671, ap. 5, b. 134, fol. 11.

⁴⁷ *LMAVB RS*, f. 318-23041, fol. 4.

⁴⁸ *LVIA*, f. 1671-5-134, fol. 11.

more detailed guidelines available, thus suggesting that they were mostly nominal, which is not to say that the Church encouraged insincerity, it simply left a free hand for priests willing to help the Jews and some of them used this opportunity. Baptism files from 1941 show that the tradition of rather limited catechumens' education prevailed and, moreover, in the light of the difficult circumstances the Jews found themselves in, was often skipped. Sources show that permissions to baptise by the Curia were issued very quickly following applications or even on the same day. During the Holocaust, there is no mention of lengthy one-year periods of preparation in the fashion of nineteenth-century practices. When it comes to fake documents or ones dated retrospectively, there can be no question about proper education (or even proper applications) and the need to react to violent events trumped thoroughness.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, there are several observations to be made. The procedure of preparation and its constitution was gradually getting simpler and shorter. However, core elements of the theological approach to Jewish conversion remained unchanged and focused on the same issues they had in the greater part of the Jewish-Catholic debates. Reaching the Jews via the most questionable issues – like the figure of Jesus Christ as a Messiah or the Holy Trinity – laid out in the form of questions and answers or a private dialogue prevailed. However, they were more of use for preparing missionaries. Leading one to baptism was never limited to theological education. The social dimension of the conversional transformation was always an issue and, moreover, there was a constant cry for a better system of social integration, namely, a place for catechumens to gather and interact with properly-trained and zealous teachers. However, it was never fully developed and the issue was mostly neglected by churchmen. The Church and its missionaries made attempts to include some knowledge and social skills that would help converts become a properly integrated element of the Catholic society, be it via a set of working skills or, most often, the language of

the dominant community. Nevertheless, it had never turned into a fully-developed system, with the exception of the *Mariae Vitae* Congregation which was nevertheless unable to bring it to its full potential due to limited material resources. Finally, during the Holocaust, the social dimension of Jewish integration into the gentile society was completely displaced by the need to “dissolve” in that society as quickly and as quietly as possible.

PHILIPPE DENIS

MISSION, CIVILISATION AND COERCION IN
COLONIAL NATAL. ABBOT FRANTZ PFANNER
AND THE AFRICAN “OTHER” IN MARIANNHILL
(1882–1909)

It is fitting, in a conference on Christians and the non-Christian “Other”, to present a paper on the African people. In more than one respect, black people were complete “Others” to the Europeans who colonised and evangelised them. There is perhaps a difference, although in degree rather than in nature¹, in the manner in which the Jews and Muslims, who cohabited with Christians for long periods of time in various parts of the world, and the Africans were considered. In the eyes of their conquerors, the latter were not only different but inferior. They were deemed to be so “savage”, so “primitive” that one seriously doubted, at least at the time of the first encounters, that they were human at all.

The first European travellers, traders, missionaries and colonial administrators who had dealings with black people in South Africa found, explains David Chidester in a book entitled *Savage Systems*², that they had no religion and therefore no right to land. They would have earned some respect if they had a religion, even false, but they had none. Their strange habits amounted to “superstition”, which, in the categories inherited from scholastic theology that were then in favour, was the antonym of religion. Later on, the missionaries and colonial

¹ As highlighted by Edward Said in his famous essay *Orientalism* (1978), western representations of Oriental culture are also clouded by imperial prejudice.

² David Chidester, *Savage Systems: Colonialism and Comparative Religion in Southern Africa*, Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1996.

agents revised their judgment and admitted that the Africans had indeed a religion, but a very primitive one with none of the attributes of the Christian religion. The only way of joining the civilised world, they told their converts, was to abandon all their ancestral customs, including polygamy, circumcision, bride-wealth (*lobola*), traditional dancing and ritual slaughtering of animals.

On arriving in South Africa in 1838, Patrick Griffith, the bishop of the newly-erected Catholic vicariate of the Good Hope, found the African people “base and barbarous” and lent credence to the pseudo-anthropological literature of the time which described them as “the connecting link between Beast and man”³. After a chance encounter with an African chief called Macomo in the Eastern Cape, however, he realised, as he wrote to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in Rome, that the indigenous people were capable of prayer and that their “prolonged cries” were a form of religious music⁴. Griffith was not the only one to be ambiguous about the religion of the African people. During the first century of colonial conquest, the Christian missionaries oscillated between a complete rejection of the African customs and a more selective approach consisting in only excluding the practices and rituals deemed offensive to the Christian religion⁵. Typical of the first attitude is J. C. Warner, a Methodist minister employed as an administrator by the colonial administration. Xhosa belief and practices, he was quoted as saying in an influential *Compendium of Kafir Laws Customs* in 1858, formed “a regular system of superstition which answers all the purposes of any other false religion”. To avoid the danger of

³ *The Cape Diary of Bishop Raymond Griffith for the Years 1837 to 1839*, ed. J. B. Brain, Mariannhill: Mariannhill Press, 1988, p. 130. On Bishop Griffith and the African people, see Philippe Denis, *The Dominican Friars in Southern Africa (1577–1830): A Social History*, Leiden: Brill, 1998, pp. 91–99.

⁴ “Patrick Griffith to the Central Committees of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, Cape Town, January 1840”, in: *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi*, 1841, vol. 13, p. 354.

⁵ Wallace Mills, “Missionaries, Xhosa clergy and the suppression of traditional customs”, in: *Missions and Christianity in South African History*, eds. Henry Bredenkamp and Robert Ross, Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press, 1995, pp. 151–171.

“building Christianity on the rotten foundation of pagan superstition”, this system had to be “denounced and overturned”⁶. The most famous representative of the second attitude was John William Colenso, the first Anglican bishop of Natal in the mid-nineteenth century, who refused to ask his polygamist converts to quit their second and third wives and made considerable effort to understand, by conversing with his indigenous assistants, the worldview and the ways of reasoning of the Zulus⁷.

A REMARKABLE EXPANSION

Catholics were latecomers on the missionary scene in South Africa. The Oblates of Mary Immaculate, a missionary congregation founded in the aftermath of the French Revolution, were only successful in Lesotho. In Natal, where they arrived in the early 1850s, they struggled to make converts⁸. Through well-adapted missionary methods, Franz Pfanner, the founder of the Mariannahill monastery, turned the situation around. In less than ten years, he established a flourishing mission station which provoked the admiration and envy of his Protestant rivals.

There is no shortage of studies on Pfanner’s life, spirituality and missionary activities, but most of them are written from an apologetic perspective⁹. Academic work on the early years of Mariannahill is still

⁶ J. R. Warner, “Notes”, in: *A Compendium of Kafir Laws and Customs*, ed. John Maclean, Mount Coke: Wesleyan Mission Press, 1858, pp. 73, 75.

⁷ Jeff Guy, *The Heretic: a Study of the Life of John William Colenso, 1814–1883*, Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 1983; Jeff Guy, “Class, imperialism and literary criticism: William Ngidi, John Colenso and Matthew Arnold”, in: *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 1997, vol. 23, pp. 213–241.

⁸ J. B. Brain, *Catholics in Natal and beyond*, Durban: T. W. Griggs and Co, 1975.

⁹ Anton Roos, “Mariannahill zwischen zwei Idealen. Entwicklung Mariannahills von Trappistenkloster zur modernen Missionskongregation 1886–1936”, unpublished dissertation, Innsbruck, 1961; English translation by Adelgisa Hermann, *Mariannahill Between Two Ideas: The Inner Development of Mariannahill from a Trappist Monastery Into a Mission Congregation, 1884–1936*, [Mariannahill], 1983; [Timotheus Kempf], *Unter Christen und Muslims: Ein Vorarlberger Priester und Klostergründer, Wendelin P. Franz Pfanner 1825–1880*, Rome: Congregation of Mariannahill Missionaries, 1981; *Der Herold Gottes in Südafrika*, vol. 1: *Die missglückte Abtei*, Rome: Congregation of

scarce¹⁰. In this paper, we will examine Pfanner's relationship to the African people. His attitude to race and culture was unconventional but also fraught with contradictions. He faced the same dilemma as the other missionaries: how to respect people other than yourself when you are convinced of the innate superiority of your culture and religion? Unlike the majority of settlers and a good number of missionaries, Pfanner believed in the fundamental equality of all human beings and he criticised the entrenched racism of colonial society. Yet he was a colonist at heart. His dream, consciously or not, was to transform his African converts into people who would conform, for everything except the colour of their skin, to the European model of life. He does not seem to have reflected on the contradiction inherent in this position.

Wendelin Pfanner was born to a family of farmers in Langen near Bregenz in the westernmost part of Austria on 20 September 1825. The value attributed to manual work, which was to characterise his work in Mariannahill in the 1880s and 1890s, was a trait inherited from his childhood. A letter he wrote to his old friend Ludwig Haitinger in 1903 makes it very clear:

When I was younger, I was not only eager to work, but I worked furiously. Someone who is not used to hard work from childhood [...]

Mariannahill Missionaries, 1980; *ibid.*, vol. 2: *Mariannahill ist sein Name*, Remlingen: Mariannahill Mission Press, 1983; *ibid.*, vol. 3: *Abt Franz unter dem Kreuz*, Reimlingen: Mariannahill Mission Press, 1984; *The Dumbrody Episode: The Futile Attempt to Establish the Trappists in the Sundays' River Valley of the Cape Province, South Africa. A Documentation in Three Parts*, ed. Alcuin Weiswurm, Mariannahill: Mariannahill Mission Press, 1975; Adelgisa [Hermann], *100 Years Mariannahill Province: History of the Congregation of the Missionaries of Mariannahill in the Province of Mariannahill*, Mariannahill: Mariannahill Mission Press, 1984; Annette Buschgerd, *For a great Price: The Story of the Missionary Sisters of the Precious Blood*, Reimlingen: Mariannahill Mission Press, 1990; Adalbert Ludwig Balling, *Der Apostel Südafrikas oder Gott schreibt gerade, auch auf krummen Zeilen*, Würzburg: Missionsverlag Mariannahill, 2011.

¹⁰ Marc-André Heim, "Tätigkeit der Mariannahiller Mission unter ihrem Gründer Franz Pfanner bzw. bis zu dessen Tod 1882–1909", unpublished Masters dissertation, University of Vienna, 2009; Christoph Ripe, doctoral student in cultural anthropology at the Institute of Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology at Leiden University in the Netherlands, is currently writing a thesis on Mariannahill's photographical production.

will not know how to get others to work and, still less, how much he may reasonably demand from them [...]. I have learned this better than city boys, and I tell you frankly that if my father had not been so strict about hard work, there would be no Mariastern or Mariannahill.¹¹

The young Pfanner grew up in a strong Catholic environment. His paternal uncle and godfather was a priest. He joined the diocesan clergy soon after his studies. After serving as vicar in an Austrian parish for ten years and chaplain to nuns in Croatia for three years, he decided to join religious life. Received in the Trappist monastery of Mariawald near Aachen in Germany in 1862, his determination, his work ethic and his integrity soon designated him for leadership positions. In 1869 he founded the Trappist monastery of Mariastern in Bosnia, which, less than ten years later, already numbered a hundred monks. In 1879, as he was about to become the abbot of Mariastern, he caught everybody by surprise, at the General Chapter of the Trappist Congregation of Rancé, by responding positively to the call of James Ricards, the bishop of the Eastern Cape, who wanted to establish a Trappist monastery in his vicariate. The plan did not work out because of the weather conditions in this dry part of the Cape colony as well as the lack of funds. In December 1882 Pfanner and his companions relocated to a farm near Pinetown in the Natal colony and, this time, with more fertile land and better means of communication, the mission station soon developed.

Mariannahill grew at an astonishing speed. By the end of 1883 the first three buildings, a dormitory, a chapter hall and an oratory, as well as a forge, workshops for sewing, carpentry and threshing, had already come off the ground. In 1884 the Trappists opened a college for boys and, the following year, a school for girls. By then there were 203 names in the baptism register. In 1886 the first group of sisters arrived from Germany. Nicknamed the Red Sisters, they later formed the congregation of the Precious Blood Sisters. The same year the first outstation was established in a place called Reichenau with another

¹¹ Letter of Franz Pfanner to Ludwig Haitinger, Emaus, 1903-03-21, in: *Mariannahill Monastery Archives*, Abbot Franz Pfanner Papers, Box 10, Document 10006.

nine mission stations founded in the following five years. In 1888 the monastery and its outstations counted 150 monks, priests and brothers, not to mention the sisters whose numbers were also expanding. In 1900 Mariannahill owned 96,870 acres (4000 hectares) of land. By 1909, the year of Pfanner's death, out of a total of 27 Catholic mission stations in the Natal colony, 25 had been established by the Trappists. More than half of all Catholic mission stations in the country – 28 out of 49 – were offshoots of Mariannahill¹². Among the factors explaining this remarkable expansion we can mention: the founder's work ethic, a strong spirituality among the monks, highly successful recruitment drives in Europe, a funding strategy based on an extensive use of media and communication, large availability of land and a school system which emphasised the acquisition of manual skills.

CONVERSION AND CIVILISATION

Pfanner was a prolific writer. To recruit vocations and attract funding, he wrote, mostly in German, numerous articles in the newsletters and magazines published in Mariannahill with a printing press imported from Europe for that purpose¹³. He also contributed to local newspapers with a view to establishing Mariannahill's reputation in the settlers' community. This paper makes use of these sources. Three types of documents are examined: the articles published during 1884, the year of the monastery's first outreach programme, those concerning the recruitment and training of the first Zulu priests at the end of the same decade and a collection of articles published in the local media concerning the so-called Native Question in 1893 and 1894.

¹² Joseph Dahm, *Mariannahill, seine innere Entwicklung, sowie seine Bedeutung für die katholische Missions und Kulturgeschichte Südafikas: 1. Zeitabschnitt: von der Gründung Mariannahills (1882) bis zur Trennung vom Trappistenorden (1909)*, Mariannahill: Mariannahiller Missionsdruckerei, 1950, p. 149; Marcel Dischl, *Transkei for Christ: A History of the Catholic Church in the Transkeian Territories*, [Umtata], 1982, p. 96.

¹³ *Fliegende Blätter aus Dunbrody* (1880–1882); *Fliegende Blätter aus Mariannahill* (1883); *Der Trappist unter den Kaffern* (1884); *Vergissmeinnicht* (1885–1915); *St Joseph's Blätter* (1885–1895); *Der Mariannahiller MissionsKalender* (1889–1911).

In 1884, to reflect the growing emphasis on missionary work, the monastery's newsletter took the name *Der Trappist unter der Kaffern* (The Trappist among the Kaffirs) before changing it a year later to *Vergissmeinnicht* (Do not forget me), possibly to avoid the negative connotation of the word "Kaffir". In the first issue, which appeared on 16 April 1884, Pfanner outlined his vision for the monastery's school. Three principles, he explained, were to guide the Trappists' educational project: gratuity of education, priority to the poor and the orphan and equality of all races and religions. On the last point, his views were particularly outspoken:

We do not discriminate according to colour or religion. All boys accepted in our institution receive board, lodging and education irrespective of their being pagan, Muslim, Protestant or Catholic, white or coloured, English, Dutch, German, Italian, Indian or black. All sleep in the same room, eat at the same table, receive the same food and sit on the same school benches. Only the black boys who return to their kraal every day sit on special benches as a way of controlling their body odour.¹⁴

Pfanner did not try to mix children from established settler families and the offspring of neighbouring kraals. The white boys who received hospitality in the monastery's boarding school were all orphans. At first they felt the mixing of races outrageous. They insulted the black children and threw stones at them. To change their attitude their teachers put them on a diet of bread and water. This was a reflection, Pfanner noted, of a society which treated "black people as half humans" and thought they could be "herded like cattle"¹⁵.

Six months later the superior of the monastery triumphantly declared the experience a success. In fact, there is no evidence that it lasted very long, probably because white orphans ceased to be referred to Mariannahill by the colonial authorities. It was sufficient, however, for Pfanner to express the conviction that racism was the result of prejudice and that a better school system could eradicate it:

¹⁴ *Der Trappist unter den Kaffern*, vol. 1 (1884-04-16); see [Kemf], *Der Herold Gottes*, vol. 2, p. 107.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

It is well known that dogs and cats can live together when they are mixed early enough. Why should we not bring up together white and black children? We made a first start and we can already say that it works. None of the prophecies that were made has been accomplished. ... Not a single white child ran away at the arrival of black children. None has done any harm to them, and even laid a hand against them. The warm and peaceful atmosphere reigning between white and black boys is particularly noticeable when they play together.¹⁶

Pfanner's vision of race relations is exposed in another issue of *Der Trappist unter den Kaffern*. The whites must give up their pride, he wrote, and the blacks their heathenism. Some white settlers were already occupying land next to Mariannahill. He was prepared to exchange a few hectares for a white village to be built nearby with the understanding that land would be let to black people on the monastery's property and that soon a black village would be established. The two races would live next to each other, although not together. Mariannahill, he announced, should be the place where "blacks and whites come together and give each other the hand of brotherhood"¹⁷.

What we have here is a trade-off. Blacks deserved to be well treated, Pfanner advocated, but in exchange they were expected to adapt to the colonial order. The plan had two implications. The first was that the black people had to abandon "heathenism" and embrace "civilisation". They had to embrace the European way of life, Christianity included. The second requirement, which struck a chord with many colonists, was that they were to develop good work habits. Pfanner, a hard-working man himself, was adamant that the alleged "laziness" of the Natives had to be combated with great vigour. Work, for him, was key to progress. "Without work," he declared, "we are only half humans"¹⁸.

With great attention to details Pfanner outlined in the monastery's

¹⁶ *Der Trappist unter den Kaffern*, vol. 4 (1884-10-26); see [Kemf], *Der Herold Gottes*, vol. 2, pp. 123-124.

¹⁷ *Der Trappist unter den Kaffern*, vol. 3 (1884-08-26); see [Kemf], *Der Herold Gottes*, vol. 2, p. 113.

¹⁸ *De Trappist unter den Kaffern*, vol. 2 (1884-07-09); see [Kemf], *Der Herold Gottes*, vol. 2, p. 117.

newsletter the changes he expected from his converts. In all they were to conform to the way of life of the colonists. They were to build houses “on the European model” (*nach Europäischer style*) with doors, windows, chairs and tables and they were expected to sleep in beds. Their diet had to include bread, vegetables and lamb and they had to eat with spoons. Great emphasis was placed on clothing. “Without clothes,” he insisted, “there is no decency, no morality, no culture, no civilisation. If people walk around naked, they will never give up polygamy.”¹⁹ Traditional dances, seen as a source of immorality, slaughtering of animals and physical fights were to be avoided. The perfect convert was a man with one wife, tenant of a house he had built or renovated himself, skilled in some trade and a hard worker. Together the converts were to form villages similar to but distinct from the residential areas for whites. Segregation, one must note, was implicit in this scheme.

This programme, however, was to be applied with flexibility. For the celebration of the first baptisms the Trappists authorised music and the slaughtering of animals. Was this fitting for monks? Jesus, Pfanner responded when criticised by some of his fellow monks, had provided food to the people sitting to hear his preaching. People had come from far to attend the baptisms at Mariannahill²⁰.

AFRICAN TEACHERS AND PRIESTS

At the centre of Pfanner’s scheme for the upliftment of black people was vocational training. With proper skills in farming, carpentry, construction and other trades, they would find their place in colonial society. As long as they accepted the European model of life, they would be treated fairly and without discrimination. The same principle guided the abbot of Mariannahill in pastoral matters. Long before others did he see the need to train African pastoral workers. He was the first Catholic missionary – the Protestants had been ordaining black ministers in South

¹⁹ *Ibid.*; see [Kempf], *Der Herold Gottes*, vol. 2, p. 118.

²⁰ *Mariannahill Kalender* for 1890, p. 65; see [Kempf], *Der Herold Gottes*, vol. 2, p. 163.

Africa since the mid-1850s²¹ – to recommend African men for priestly training. In a landmark sermon on the opening of an outstation's chapel in 1889, he predicted the moment when local people would replace the missionaries:

We have built this chapel for you, and we provide a priest for you. But a real church will have to be built by you and, what is more, you will have to provide your own priest, and a black priest for that matter.²²

Other missionaries, the French Oblates of Mary Immaculate for example, considered that a long period of time would be necessary before black converts would be ready for ordination²³. Pfanner had no such hesitation. As early as 1884, he recruited a recently-converted Mosotho saddler as a teacher for the Trappist school. When, in 1887, a fifteen-year-old boy by the name of Kece Mnganga, who had been baptised two years before²⁴ and was studying at the Latin school of Mariannahill, expressed the desire to be a priest, he sent him to Rome in the company of David Bryant, the future anthropologist, by then a Trappist novice, to complete his secondary education and study for the priesthood²⁵.

²¹ The first black minister in South Africa, Rev Tiyo Soga, was ordained in the Presbyterian Church in 1856; see *The Making of an Indigenous Clergy in Southern Africa*, Pietermaritzburg: Cluster Publications, 1995.

²² *St Josefsblättchen aus Marianhill*, vol. 5–4 (24 September 1889).

²³ See Jerome Skhakhane, “The Beginnings of Indigenous Clergy in the Catholic Church in Lesotho”, in: *The Making of an Indigenous Clergy*, ed. Philippe Denis, p. 115–122; on the history of black priests in South Africa, see George Mukuka, *The Other Side of the Story: The silent experience of the black clergy in the Catholic Church in South Africa (1898–1976)*, Pietermaritzburg: Cluster Publications, 2008.

²⁴ [Kempf], *Der Herold Gottes*, vol. 2, p. 437. Mnganga was baptised on 8 February 1885 and received his first communion in 1887.

²⁵ Mariannahill Chronicle, 1882–1895, p. 50 in South Africa, Mariannahill Monastery Archives; on Edward Mnganga, see Vitalis Fux, “Der erste Priester aus dem Stamme der Zulus”, in: *Vergissmeinnicht*, 1945, vol. 63, pp. 235–238; Thomas Respondek, “Die Erziehung von Eingeborenen zum Priestertum in der Mariannahill Mission”, in: *Zeitschrift für Missionwissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft*, 1950, no. 34, pp. 47–49; George Mukuka, “The experiences of the first indigenous Catholic priest in South Africa: Fr Edward Müller Kece Mnganga 1872–1945”, in: *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, 2005, vol. 31/2, pp. 77–103; George Mukuka, *The Other Side*

Mnganga was born at Umhlatuzana in the outskirts of Durban in 1872 or 1873. His father, Jamkofi Shozi, seems to have been the chief of a tribe which suffered dispossession as a result of the arrival of the Trappists in the area²⁶. According to Francis Schimlek, a later missionary, he consented to having his son educated by the Trappists but refused to join the church²⁷. At his baptism Mnganga was named Edward Müller after his godfather²⁸. He was ordained in 1898 in Rome after completing a doctorate in theology and philosophy²⁹. Described as very intelligent by a woman who later worked for him³⁰, he came back from Rome with a good knowledge of Latin, English, Italian, German and Greek³¹.

Pfanner's plan was to receive Mnganga as a monk in Mariannhill. The Zulu priest would have been an asset for the missionary work of the monastery. However, he was advised by his former professor of canon law, the bishop of Brixen, that the priests sent for studies at the College of Propaganda Fide in Rome were at the disposal of the local bishop. As abbot of a monastery in a missionary territory, he could not accept local candidates for the priesthood³². This is the reason why Mnganga did not

of the Story, pp. 46–67; Philippe Denis, "Race, politics and religion: the first Catholic mission in Zululand (1895–1907)", in: *Studia Historiae Ecclesasticae*, 2010, vol. 36/1, pp. 90–92.

²⁶ For the history of the Shozi family, I rely on an unpublished paper presented by Eva Riedke (University of Siegen) presented at the conference "Land divided: land and South African society in 2013 in comparative perspective", Cape Town, 2013-03-23 – 2013-03-27, under the title "Limited Power through Land: Strengthening Different Bases of Legitimacy and Authority in the Face of growing Land Disputes".

²⁷ Francis Schimlek, *Mariannhill. A study in Bantu life and missionary effort*, Mariannhill: Mariannhill Mission Press, 1953, p. 70.

²⁸ [Kempff], *Der Herold Gottes*, vol. 2, p. 267.

²⁹ *Mariannhilller Kalendar*, for 1896, vol. 46–45, see [Kempff], *Der Herold Gottes*, vol. 2, p. 439.

³⁰ Malukati Mncadi, interview conducted by George Mukuka in September 1994 in Mariathal, quoted in: George Mukuka, *The Other Side of the Story*, p. 56.

³¹ Izindaba Zabantu, *Society of the Missionaries of Mariannhill*, 1928-09-07, quoted in: George Mukuka, *The Other Side of the Story*, p. 50.

³² Bishop Simon Epus to Frantz Pfanner, Brixen, 1888-10-30, quoted in: [Kempff], *Der Herold Gottes*, vol. 2, p. 268.

become a Trappist in Mariannahill and joined instead the diocesan clergy. His first posting was in Ebuhleni, a mission station of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate in Zululand, as an assistant to David Bryant³³.

An incident aboard a ship taking Bryant and Mnganga to Europe in late 1887 gave Pfanner the opportunity of reasserting his views on race relations. A passenger insisted that the Zulu boy left the dinner table before sitting down. Bryant having refused to comply, the other passengers moved to another table. Pfanner only heard of the incident when Bryant came back from Rome a couple of years later. He launched a scathing attack against the white colonists' racism in *Vergissmeinnicht*. How can they behave in such a manner, he asked, and pretend to be Christians?

How arrogant the Christians from South Africa! When you have nothing to be proud about, you show your skin. And those people speak so well of the true Christian love. If they cannot suffer black people, why, I wonder, did they come to civilise and even Christianise the African nation? How can you civilise and Christianise people for whom you feel disgust and hatred?

Pfanner did not question in any way the legitimacy of the colonial enterprise. What he condemned was the hypocrisy of the white settlers who claimed to advance the cause of civilisation and Christianity but behaved in a manner that was neither civilised nor Christian. Their attitude, he complained, ruined the entire project:

When shall we bring to an end in South Africa this deep-seated and radically perverse prejudice? If we do not do this, we may well educate the black people, but we shall not convert them. As long as the African will hear from the mouth of the white man that to be human one has to be white, he will never be able to adopt his religion, since becoming a white man is impossible.³⁴

³³ Philippe Denis, "Race, politics and religion", p. 90.

³⁴ [Frantz Pfanner], "Anbegrifflich", in: *Vergissmeinnicht*, vol. 5–7 (April 1889), p. 26. See: [Kempf], *Der Herold Gottes*, t. 2, p. 437.

THE “NATIVE QUESTION”

Because of a conflict with the authorities of his Order on the interpretation of the Trappist rule, Pfanner was suspended in October 1892 and he resigned as an abbot a few months later. He spent the rest of his life as a recluse in Emaus, a small mission station on the western border of the Natal colony. He was assigned to silence for some time but, once his resignation was accepted, he resumed his habit of communicating on various topics through letters, articles in newspapers and memoirs.

In November 1893, while still in Lourdes, a mission station at some distance from Mariannahill, he sent a paper on the “Native Question” to the *Natal Witness*, the Pietermaritzburg-based daily, which published it in four instalments³⁵. In a slightly different format, the same material was also published in the *Natal Advertiser*³⁶. An offprint of the *Natal Witness* article was printed, with a run of 1,000 copies, in Mariannahill the following year³⁷.

“I am busy with the Native Question, as the British call the Kaffir question (*Kaffernfrage*),” he wrote to his Austrian friend Berchtold Hütisau three months after his arrival in Emaus. “Thousands of articles have appeared in South African newspapers.”³⁸ Pfanner claimed to be making an original contribution to the debate in two ways. The first was that, unlike most authors who remained at the theoretical level, he made essentially practical suggestions. It was not the “what” that mattered, he

³⁵ Frantz Pfanner, “The Native Question”, in: *Natal Witness*, November 8 and December 1893, no. 15, 23, 28

³⁶ *Natal Advertiser*, November 1893, no. 16, 24, 29.

³⁷ Frantz Pfanner, *The Native Question*, Pinetown: Printing Establishment Mariannahill, 1894, p. 27. By July 1894, the pamphlet was still in press, see letter of Frantz Pfanner to Msgr Berchtold Hütisau, Emaus, 25 July 1894, in South Africa, Mariannahill Monastery Archives, Abbot Franz Pfanner Papers, Box 6, Document 06010. On the number of copies see letter of Nivard Streicher to Abbot Amandus Schölzig, 19 April 1894, *Ibid.*, Box 32, Document 32014.

³⁸ Letter of Frantz Pfanner to Berchtold Hütisau, 1894-07-15, in: [Kempf], *Der Herold Gottes*, vol. 3, p. 28.

explained, but the “how”. After twelve years in Mariannhill, he spoke as a man of experience. Secondly, his proposals aimed at “improving” the condition of the black people, an intention he assured, not without some exaggeration, the other writers did not have³⁹.

The “question”, of which the black people were the object, had agitated white society since the middle of the nineteenth century. Its ultimate “solution” would be the apartheid regime, instituted in 1948. Another milestone was the Land Act of 1913 which resolved, in a forceful way, the vexed question of the occupation of the land. The “question” that opinion-makers, colonial officers and missionaries wanted to resolve was how to contain the black population, which kept growing, what part of the land blacks should be allowed to occupy and how to make use of their labour force in the mines and on the farms, where there was always a need for cheap labour. The “Native Question” was about control and power. With rare exceptions, black voices were never heard. The African people were spoken about but not listened to. The “Native Question” was, in Adam Ashforth’s words, “the intellectual domain in which the knowledge, strategies, policies and justifications necessary to maintenance of domination were fashioned”⁴⁰.

Various commissions made recommendations to the government on the “Native Question”. The most influential was the South African Native Affairs Commission (SANAC), which sat between 1903 and 1905. Seen as natural mediators between the African people, with whom they were in close contact through their ministry, and the settler society, the missionaries made a significant contribution to the work of the Commission. Their role was to speak on behalf of the black people who, being uncivilised, were not considered able to speak in their own right⁴¹. But the missionaries did not wait for the SANAC to contribute

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ Adam Ashforth, *The Politics of Official Discourse in Twentieth-Century South Africa*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990, p. 1.

⁴¹ On the role of missionaries in SANAC, see Ashforth, *The Politics of Official Discourse*, pp. 26–29; Richard Elphick, *The Equality of Believers: Protestant Missionaries and the Racial Politics of South Africa*, Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2012, chap. 7.

to the national debate on the “Native Question”. Pfanner’s articles in the *Natal Witness* must be seen in that light.

Two “hostile and opposing armies”, Pfanner wrote in his paper on the Native Question, were “contending for the possession of the political field”: those who, in the image of the “Boers”, wanted to “destroy” the black people and the philanthropists who treated them with too much benevolence. A middle ground had to be found between those two positions.

Among the “Boers” and their likes who showed no respect for black culture, Pfanner would have counted Francis William Reitz, the president of the Orange Free State, who had suggested, in a much debated article two years earlier, that “civilized South Africa” had to get rid of the tribal system, abolish chieftainship, break up all locations, suppress by law all pagan rites and discourage polygamy. The African locations had to be “broken up” to ensure that no black people remained idle. Their only occupation should be to work for white people. President Reitz made no effort to disguise his supremacist views:

The Kaffir, as an individual, may be “a man” and (unter due reservations) “a brother”, but as a member of a tribe, and the subject of a fat and arrogant chieftain, he can never be such. He is divided by an impassable barrier from the laws and customs of civilized humanity, and there is no room for him in his tribal conditions in our European system of political economy.⁴²

Pfanner rejected with equal vigour the other position which, in the way he understood it, was to “flatter and spoil” the African through a “system” which would make of him “a profound hypocrite and a moral pest to society”. Such was, he contended, the view held by the “people of Downing Street” and “mistaken pietists at home”. It was, one may say, the liberal position, which very few colonists supported in Natal. Since the early 1870s, under pressure from philanthropists and the Aborigines Protection Society, the British government had declared that it would not grant the Natal colony self-government until it could be satisfied

⁴² President Reitz, “The Native Question”, in: *Cape Illustrated Magazine*, November 1891, reproduced in: “Native policy: the Reitz-Shepstone correspondence on 1891–1892”, in: *Natalia*, 1972, vol. 2, p. 11.

that in such an event the interests of the African people would be effectively protected. In 1893, the year of Pfanner's paper, it eventually granted responsible government to the Natal colony with no conditions attached. This long delay provoked bitterness among the settlers, who resented being told how to treat the African population⁴³. The Austrian monk echoed this sentiment in his paper.

Pfanner probably felt some sympathy for the views of Theophilus Shepstone, the former Natal secretary for native affairs, who had rebuked Reitz's stance on the African people in the local newspapers. Emphasising that the latter were the "aboriginal inhabitants and owners of the land", Shepstone stopped short of calling the Free State president a proponent of slavery. The western values Reitz claimed to uphold, he argued, should incite him to treat the black people with justice⁴⁴. Yet, unlike his former friend John William Colenso, the bishop of Natal, from whom he was now estranged, Shepstone considered the black people an "inferior race" which "civilised government" was entitled to "control", as he wrote in *Natal Advertiser* in response to his local critics⁴⁵. Pfanner did not believe that the black people were an "inferior race" but he thought, like Shepstone and unlike Reitz, that they should live in locations with a certain degree of autonomy.

Of all the systems of "Native management" proposed as a solution to the "Native Question" in the early 1890s, the closest to Pfanner's views was the one experimented in Glen Grey, an area east of Queenstown in the Cape colony which is known today as Lady Frere. Following the recommendations of a commission which travelled to 54 places and heard 622 witnesses during a period of 15 months, the Parliament of the Cape colony adopted a train of measures on land occupation

⁴³ Enock Gasa, "The Native Question in Natal, 1880–1893: An Inquiry with Reference to the Struggle for Constitutional Reform in the Colony", unpublished master thesis, Pretoria, University of South Africa, 1974.

⁴⁴ Theophilus Shepstone, "The Native Question", in: *Natal Mercury*, 1882-01-19, reproduced in: "Native policy: the Reitz-Shepstone correspondence on 1891–1892", in: *Natalia*, 1972, vol. 2, pp. 14–20.

⁴⁵ *Natal Advertiser*, 1882-02-09, reproduced in: "Sir Theophilus Shepstone and his Local Critics", in: *Natalia*, 2010, no. 3, p. 19.

called the Glen Grey Act in 1894. The instigator was Cecil Rhodes, the prime minister of the colony, and it received the support of the Afrikaner Bond⁴⁶. The similarity between Pfanner's plan and the work of the Commission was highlighted in an article published in the *Natal Witness* in May 1893⁴⁷. The Glen Grey Commission recommended the establishment of African locations in which indigenous people would receive, under certain conditions, a piece of land on which they would build a house in exchange for their work on agricultural land. District and General Councils, on which representatives of the residents would sit, would see to the developments of the locations. Only the first born in each family would be allowed to inherit the family's property, a measure intended to force the other children to seek work elsewhere so as to be able to pay the "labour tax" imposed on all African people in the district. This clause was heavily criticised by the Cape liberals who accused Rhodes of instituting forced labour to please his political allies of the Afrikaner Bond⁴⁸.

PFANNER'S "VILLAGE SYSTEM"

The founder of Mariannhill's 1893 paper built on the comments made in the Mariannhill newsletters a few years earlier. Divided into 72 articles, it took the form of a comprehensive plan for villages where the African people would reside and work under the authority of the colonial government. "I hope," he wrote in the preamble of the document, "my motive will be considered pure in championing the cause of the down-trodden Kafir."⁴⁹ He refused to accept that the Africans should be

⁴⁶ On the Glen Grey Act, see R. J. Thompson, B. M. Nicholls, "The Glen Grey Act: Forgotten dimensions of an old theme", in: *South African Journal of Economic History*, 1993, no. 8/2, pp. 58–70.

⁴⁷ *Natal Witness*, 1893-05-29, quoted in: *Vergissmeinnicht*, 1894, no. 10, pp. 54–55. See [Kemp], *Der Herold Gottes*, vol. 3, p. 79.

⁴⁸ Thompson and Nicholls, "The Glen Grey Act"; see also: Richard Rose-Innes, *The Glen Grey Act and the Native Question*, Lovedale: Mission Press, 1903, reprinted 1936.

⁴⁹ Pfanner, *The Native Question* p. 1.

“destroyed and annihilated”. On the contrary, he went on, “they yearn and long for the higher life to which they are called.” But for this they had to be “civilized and elevated through discipline and labour”. They should be “taught and compelled to abstain and sustain”⁵⁰.

Pfanner took pride in being a practical man. He felt, as he wrote to Berchtold Hütisau, that the other reform proposals, those submitted in Parliament and in the media, did not take sufficiently into account the daily aspects of the problem:

In this brochure I make 72 proposals and deal with the black man from head to feet through his entire life (work, village system, education, marriage, polygamy), including voting rights and village constitution, in short the entire black man.⁵¹

In Pfanner’s system, the African people lived in “locations” and “communities”. A big location could be subdivided into several communities (art. 1). The communities formed “villages”, which were distinguished from the rest of the environment by a fence or a ditch (art. 2). The heads of families – or “burghers” as he called them – received a site for houses and a plot of arable land, the allocation of the plots being done by lot (art. 6). Three or four acres of land (12,000 to 16,000 square meters) were deemed to be sufficient for a family (art. 5). The people who worked hard and cultivated well their first plot received as many plots as they could cultivate (art. 13). The sites were big enough for the erection of five houses or huts (art. 24). The occupation of the houses was permanent (art. 33) but title deeds were only given after ten years of residence, once proof had been presented that the occupants were good workers (art. 54).

Residents were encouraged to build houses in stone or red bricks with large verandas for the rain (art. 52). The houses and the plots were numbered, with the same number allocated to the houses and plots of the respective family (art. 47). The owners had the responsibility to fence, drain, plough, sow and maintain their plot. Grain, beans,

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 3–4.

⁵¹ Letter of Frantz Pfanner to Berchtold Hütisau, 1894-07-25, in [Kempf], *Der Herold Gottes*, vol. 3, p. 28.

potatoes or any other vegetables would be grown with a maximum of five per cent of the surface to be used for *amabele* (sorghum), the plant used to make beer (art. 10). Unlike plough land, grazing land was owned communally. Cows, oxen, pigs, calves and other animals were kept in general paddocks fenced with stones or wires outside the village (art. 30). No one had the right to graze the plough land without special permission (art. 16).

The villages were under the responsibility of a Steward or Administrator who reported to the Resident Magistrate (art. 3-4). His main function was to supervise the surveying of the land and the allocation of houses and plots to the residents. A committee of two or three residents helped him in this task (part. 56). He also gave advice to the residents and taught the necessary skills to farm the land, build roads and maintain their properties (art. 60). He had the responsibility of arbitrating and judging minor disputes, the bigger ones being referred to the Resident Magistrate (art. 9). An Inspector General was appointed over all the communities and Stewards (art. 57).

The village comprised schools, market squares, chapels and cemeteries (art. 34-35). Streets were laid out according to the topographical situation, either straight or curved (art. 7). Provision was made for the housing of missionaries (art. 36) and policemen (art. 37). A piece of plough land was reserved to each school in order for the children to be initiated to manual labour (art. 38). A special house was built for the infected in case of epidemics (art. 41). Wherever possible, industrial work was favoured. The development of water power through waterfalls was encouraged. Factories such as cornmills, bonemills, grindmills, butter-factories, woolwashing factories, jam and preserve factories, starch factories, breweries were to be established with the support of the colonial government (art. 58).

Pfanner's perspective was developmental. He believed in education and training and envisaged that, given the right opportunities, the indigenous people would be able to improve their condition. The last part of his plan contained detailed proposals for the establishment of industrial and agricultural schools (art. 64-71). In many ways, he was remarkably flexible, considering his conservative Catholic background.

He thus made provision for polygamous marriages (art. 24) and he anticipated that there would be missionaries from different confessions (art. 36).

On the other hand, under the guise of experience, Pfanner openly displayed racial prejudices. He described the African people as “lazy” (art. 9) and “idle” (art. 13), especially the young. “The Natives,” he wrote, “are but grown up children.” (art. 21) Left alone, they indulged, according to him, in “excessive drinking” (art. 12).

Convinced as he was of the “dignity of labour” (art. 9), he recommended the use of coercion to incite the village residents to cultivate their plots, build communal roads and make drains (art. 9-10). The recalcitrant received fines (art. 12) and, if they were young enough, they lost their “licence to marry” (art. 20). In Pfanner’s seventy-two recommendations, phrases such as “compelled to”, “forced to”, “allowed to”, “forbidden” abound. He was adamant that forcing black people to work in the village was the right thing to do:

My contention is that until the Government compel the Kafir, especially the young men, to work, the reformation of them is impossible; because the present young men will be the fathers of the next generation, and what can we expect from them? But you must compel him to work his own lot of ground to become a fieldworker, a peasant; it is no use for him to work on the railway extension, or in the goldmines, or to enter domestic service in a kitchen or a dining room or nursery. By working at home he will become attached to the soil, to his house and village, and will settle down and be fixed.⁵²

CONCLUSION

One cannot help thinking, when reading Pfanner’s paper on the “Native Question”, that his ideal was to transform his African converts into Austrian farmers. The “African villages” he proposed as a model to the government of Natal were not very different, after all, from those of his country of birth. The size of the plots, the configuration of the villages, the material of the houses, the choice of the seeds, the

⁵² Frantz Pfanner, *The Native Question*, p. 14 (art. 61).

food to put on the table and even the spoon to eat it: all had to be modelled on the European way of life. Pfanner believed in the equality of all races and condemned the racist attitudes of the Natal settlers. He recommended that indigenous people should receive title deeds for the houses put at their disposal by the government. But for him, respecting the African people was to inculcate in them the values and the way of life he considered to be the best. If he tolerated some of the African customs, it was not, as with Theophilus Shepstone, because he appreciated them but because he felt it was too early to remove them. The key to progress, in his opinion, was manual labour.

Pfanner may have been a benevolent missionary but he was also an adept of disciplinary methods. Considering the gap separating the African and the European cultures, he came to the conclusion that a certain degree of coercion was necessary to lead the black people, against their own will, on the road to civilisation. It is not surprising that the contemporaries saw a similarity between his seventy-two proposals and the recommendations of the Glen Grey Commission: both plans recognised the need for black people to own or at least to occupy a piece of land individually and both advocated some form of forced labour. Pfanner was an enlightened man but he was, first and foremost, a colonist. He did not want to see or could not see that his emphasis on manual labour fitted perfectly the needs of the Natal colony. While stressing that black people had to be treated with respect, he had no objection, like the majority of his contemporaries, to a model of town planning based on the idea of separate development.

JOSÉ ANDRÉS-GALLEGO

CHRISTIANS IN SEARCH OF NON-CHRISTIAN
CERTITUDES: NATURISM, SPIRITUALISM,
THEOSOPHY (FROM CATALONIA TO ASIATIC
CULTURES, 1917–1930)

My contribution to this conference came from the following experience: I am working on a biography of a Spanish social activist who lost his Catholic faith in his youth and began searching for truth in the most varied experiences: he tried Esperanto, continued with naturism, then spiritualism and finally arrived to theosophy.* His name was Guillem Rovirosa.

Rovirosa studied Management in the Electrical and Mechanical Industries School of Barcelona Industrial University. It was a very interesting Catalan institution that brought together a group of very singular students. As much as possible, I have reconstructed the lives of each member of this group, as well as that of Rovirosa, since 1917, and have observed several affinities among them. They were all people with a deep interest in any technical novelty and shared an important ability to innovate (a great propensity for creativity). Rovirosa was himself an inventor of most diverse types of electromechanical solutions, from mechanical toys to cinematographic projectors and even an electromechanical method to make wines age faster – perhaps much faster – than usual¹; his friend Josep Grau was one of the promoters of

* This essay is part of the Projects HAR2010-17955/HIST & HAR2012-39352-CO2-02, both undertaken in the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (Spanish National Research Council).

¹ Xavier Garcia, *Rovirosa: El hombre y los hechos*, vol. 1: *Los primeros treinta años (1897–1933)*, ed. with an introduction by José Andrés-Gallego & Donato Barba Prieto, Madrid: Ediciones HOAC.

using X-rays in Spain². Josep Grau's brother Jaume was not a student, but worked in the Industrial University and installed a chemistry lab at his home for his own entertainment and because he was a good poet and appreciated chemical reactions as aesthetic experiences³.

The fourth friend – Frederic Pujulà i Vallès – was the eldest of the group and exerted great influence on the rest. He had finished his studies in law in Barcelona University before his future companions began their own professional careers in 1917. In this year, Rovirosa was the youngest of the lot, aged twenty, while Jaume Grau was twenty-one, Josep Grau twenty-nine and Pujulà forty. He was a lawyer and also a very creative and innovative modernist writer. He did not understand anything about electromechanics or chemistry, but he knew Esperanto very well, he was a poet, just like the Grau brothers, and – judging by his later attitudes – also lost his Catholic faith much like his three companions.

This group of friends and companions included more members. However, I focus on these four because I have worked with very rich documentation of Rovirosa's life and studied the personal archives of Pujulà and Jaume Grau, the latter containing sufficient information about his brother Josep as well. In all, I have enough documentation to study their lives, feelings and thoughts⁴.

When I was studying Rovirosa's interests in Esperanto, naturism, spiritualism and theosophy between 1917 and 1930, I read – naturally – some Spanish historiography on them and discovered a link – or, rather, a multitude of links – among some of these five concerns of Rovirosa's: Esperanto, anarchism, naturism, spiritualism, and theosophy. So I wonder whether Rovirosa's interest in them between 1917 and 1930 was a result of personal experiences or a logical and – for some people – historical sequence and, in this case, could be the reason for their connections. This is the subject of this essay.

I would like to propose that the experience of these four companions

² *Diario de Villanueva y Geltrú*, 1910-02-19.

³ Jaume to Josep Grau, 10 April 1941, in: *Katalano Esperanto Federacio archives*, (henceforth – *KEFA*), f. Jaume Grau Casas.

⁴ *Ibid.* Frederic Pujulà i Vallès fund is in the Biblioteca de Catalunya.

was a way of searching for a non-Christian alternative to their Catholic upbringing.

In fact, the point of departure for that sequence of four movements was not Esperanto, the universal language created by Ludwik Lazarus Zamenhof, the well known Russian-Polish Jew⁵. Remember that the four companions were Catalanists (Catalan nationalists), and Catalanism had (and still has) a very strong linguistic foundation. So among the Catalanists of the late nineteenth and the early twentieth century, Esperanto was seen as the best way out of any linguistic dependence: first from Spanish (i.e., Castilian) and then from French, which was the *lingua franca* for diplomatic and international relations in the whole world of that time. In 1905, Pujulà – the modernist writer – had the first great political Catalanist coalition in history, the Catalanist Union (*Unió catalanista*), accept the compromise of teaching Esperanto. In the future independent or autonomous Catalonia, children were to study Catalan as their mother tongue and Esperanto as their second language⁶.

We may not think, however, that it was either the single or the main reason to wish for the triumph of Esperanto in Catalonia. Esperanto provided hope to any people aspiring to universal understanding and a more loving comprehension of the whole humankind. It was an idealistic proposal; perhaps the last great idealistic – and rationalist – proposal in linguistics⁷. Its simplicity, its rationality and the extent of the change that its imposition could bring to the whole world were very attractive for the Spanish people as various as Catholic priests, army officers, freemasons, anarchists, even vegetarians⁸.

⁵ René Centassi, Henri Masson, *L'homme qui a défié Babel: Ludwik Lejzer Zamenhof*, París: Ramsay, 1995, p. 398.

⁶ Francesc Poblet i Feijoo, *Els inicis del moviment esperantista a Catalunya: La komenca esperanto-movado en Katalunio*, Sabadell: Associació Catalana d'Esperanto & O Limco Edicions, 2004, pp. 26, 28.

⁷ José Passini, *Bilingüismo: Utopia ou antibabel*, Campinas, SP: Juiz de Fora Mg & Edujff, 1993, p. 154.

⁸ Francesc Poblet i Feijoo, *El Congrés Universal d'Esperanto de 1909 a Barcelona: La Universala Kongreso de Esperanto de 1909 en Barcelono*, Sabadell: Associació Catalana d'Esperanto, 2008, p. 35.

Our four companions came from very different backgrounds. Pujulà was probably born to a middle-class family. He frequented the bohemian milieu in *fin du siècle* Barcelona. In fact, he was a regular client of *Els quatre gats* (“The four cats”), a cafe that remained open between 1897 and 1903 and was the epicenter of the aesthetic modernism. It was located on the ground floor of a building that was also modernist, Martí house, designed by the architect and also Catalanist politician Josep Puig y Cadafalch. *Els quatre gats* was at the same time a cafe, an art gallery, a venue for literary readings and concerts and, of course, for *tertulias* (habitual friends gatherings). There, the young Andalusian painter Pablo Picasso immortalized Pujulà and the most singular people he knew in the Barcelonese bohemia in a celebrated series of portraits. Other Catalan painters and writers (Ramón Casas, Santiago Rusiñol, Miguel Utrillo) were the owners of that little enterprise, inspired by the Parisian cabaret *Le chat noir* (active between 1881 and 1897)⁹.

Pujulà, a Catalanist himself, became famous in 1905, when some army officers from Barcelona garrison stormed and vandalized the offices of *Cu-Cut!*, a satirical Catalan journal that mocked the Spanish army as from continuously defeated. You must remember that seven years before, in 1898, Spanish army had been effectively beaten by the US marines in Cuba and the Philippines, and this had spelled the end of Spain’s Asian-American colonial empire¹⁰. Pujulà reported about the aggression against the *Cu-Cut!* in the Parisian Esperantist journal *Tra lo mondo* and was tried in a military court, so he opted for exile in France. In order to be able to return to Spain without any problems, he became a French citizen and, in 1908, when he could return, he received a great formal

⁹ Marilyn McCully, *Els Quatre Gats: Art in Barcelona around 1900*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978, p. 159; María Teresa Puig, Sonia Serrano, *Els Quatre Gats: Cerveteria, restaurante modernista, pinacoteca: Breus anotacions del seu origen*, Barcelona: Els Quatre Gats, 1994, p. 14.

¹⁰ Joaquín Romero-Maura, *The Spanish Army and Catalonia: The “Cu-Cut! Incident” and the Law of Jurisdictions, 1905–1906*, London: Sage, 1976, p. 31; Ricardo Lezcano, *La ley de jurisdicciones, 1905–1906 (Una batalla perdida para la libertad de expresión)*, Madrid: Akal, 1978, p. 185; María Isabel García Soler, *El militarismo y su significado en la sociedad española de la Restauración: La Ley de Jurisdicciones*, Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona, 1992, p. 473.

homage in Barcelona¹¹. In 1921 he joined the freemasons and began a promising political career that would be interrupted by Primo de Rivera's dictatorship between 1923 and 1930 and by the civil war of 1936–1939¹².

The Grau brothers came from a very different background, but they arrived to meet Pujulà in Esperanto's camp; they were born to a poor Catholic family; one of their grandfathers was a Carlist – a traditionalist – and their father was remembered as an “honest worker” – probably a porter of a house – who joined the Regionalist League (*Lliga regionalista* in Catalan), the first great conservative Catalanist party, founded in 1901. Both brothers as well as their only sister – were naturally intelligent, which allowed them to become autodidact. Great lovers of Esperanto, the eldest brother Josep was more realistic than his younger sibling Jaume who became an esteemed poet in Esperanto and whose political evolution turned him from a conservative to a radical Catalanist when the civil war broke out. Involved in the 1934 revolution – a revolutionary mixture of Catalanists, anarchists, and socialists – and convicted by a military court when this revolution was defeated, he remained in prison in 1934–1935. Afterwards, during the Spanish civil war, he was also sucked into struggles between leftist factions that erupted in Catalonia in 1938. He opted for exile in France in 1939 and spent nine years in French and German concentration camps with Jews and Spanish leftist prisoners: he spent time in Argelès, Bram, Argelès again, Récébedou, Nexon, Séreilhac, Tombebouc, Toulouse (1939–1948)¹³. In 1944, in his unpublished writings – memoirs written while interned in these camps – he introduced himself as a communist, an admirer of Joseph Stalin, an agnostic, but one who used to pray Our Father when his loneliness and, sometimes, fear got the better of him¹⁴.

¹¹ Francesc Santolaria Torres, “El fets del *Cu-cut!*: Una reflexió historiogràfica”, in: *Els fets del Cu-cut!: Taula rodona organitzada pel Centre d'Història Contemporània de Catalunya el 24 de novembre de 2005*, Barcelona: Centre d'Història Contemporània de Catalunya, 2006, p. 123.

¹² A copy of official freemason documents concerning him in 1921–1947, in: *KEFA*, f. Jaume Grau Casas.

¹³ According to his biography in: <http://lacomunidad.elpais.com/usuarios/jgraug>.

¹⁴ See his unpublished *La Química i l'Alquímia, l'Astronomia i l'Astrologia, la Medicina i la Religió*, in: *KEFA*, f. Jaume Grau Casas.

Before that, in 1917–1918, when they met each other, Rovirosa – the fourth of the group – also sympathized with active Catalanism; but he was the most anticlerical of the four friends and the most critical of Christianity. Only Pujulà could consider his positions close to Rovirosa's. Rovirosa was born to a well-off middle-class family of Villanueva y Geltrú, also in Catalonia. In 1920 he had to abandon his studies because of and, in 1921, he got married. He lost touch with the other three friends, it seems, in 1930, when he and his wife emigrated to Paris in order to make more profit from his electromechanical inventions¹⁵.

Above, I have mentioned the success of Esperanto among Spanish anarchists and Spanish vegetarians. The two groups are quite different, but the dissimilarity should not be exaggerated. Remember that I have also mentioned Catholic priests among Esperantists. In 1909, the Universal Esperanto Congress was held in Barcelona and the bishop of Barcelona went ahead to concede a license provided in Catholic canon law to eat meat on two Fridays during the Congress¹⁶. It was not a question of whether the congressmen were Catholic or not; it did not matter.

But for some people it was a big problem; when the fifth Esperantist, Francisco Ferrer Guardia, went to participate in the Esperanto Congress, he was arrested by the police and accused of being the main instigator of the “Tragic Week”¹⁷. The “Tragic Week” was the name given to the last week of July 1909 – some weeks before the Universal Esperanto Congress; it was the first anti-Catholic social explosion in Spain in the twentieth century; it began as a general strike and degenerated into systematic destruction of religious buildings and persecution of priests and nuns¹⁸. In fact, Ferrer Guardia was a modest railway employee, an autodidact, and a promoter of schools – he called them “The Modern

¹⁵ Xavier Garcia, *Rovirosa*.

¹⁶ Francesc Poblet i Feijoo, *El Congrés Universal d'Esperanto de 1909*, pp. 33–34.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 27–28, Francesc Poblet i Feijoo, *Els inicis del moviment esperantista a Catalunya*, p. 26.

¹⁸ Cf. *Analecta sacra Tarraconensia: Actes de les jornades sobre la Setmana Tràgica (1909): Barcelona, 5, 6 i 7 de maig de 2009*, Barcelona: Barcelona Balmesiana, 2009, vol. 82.

School” – where children were instructed in anarchism, according to documents read in the Spanish Parliament during a debate that his execution provoked¹⁹. He had inherited a fortune from his dealings with a French lady and used it to publish anti-ecclesial, antimilitarist and Republican books and pamphlets, arguing for free love and universal happiness, but also condoning violence, if necessary, against the State, the Army and the Church. It is unlikely that he provoked the outburst of the Tragic Week. But judicial and governmental authorities were of a different opinion and he was sentenced to death, executed and became a martyr and a symbol of free thought in entire Europe²⁰.

Still in 1929, the Spanish socialist Manuel Burgos insisted on the value of Esperanto for redeeming the working class and on the possibility of reconciling that language with historical materialism²¹.

In respect to the possibility of relating anarchy and naturism, we must also remember that naturism was more than a diet option. In the end, it responded to the conviction that there is a natural order and the best thing is to bring human life closer to that order. Naturists did propose to entirely eliminate artifices – Esperanto was artificial – yet they confined artifices to what was necessary – including not only food but also attitudes. For a naturist, it made sense to feed on vegetables, without killing any animals, but the whole existence had to be conceived in terms of peace and not violence. They were, therefore, peaceful and, because of that, also enemies of any constraint, including that constituted by political authority, however legitimate it could seem. In fact, many of them arrived to the conclusion that a natural ideal of life was anarchist and, in that vein, tried to articulate their own lives in small

¹⁹ I quoted and commented on several of them in “Sobre las formas de pensar y de ser”, in: *Revolución y Restauración, 1868–1931*, t. XVI, vol. 1: *Historia general de España y América*, Madrid: Edit. Rialp, 1981, pp. 283–382, especially chap. 6: “Las otras éticas”.

²⁰ Cf. Dolores Marín, *La Semana Trágica: Barcelona en llamas, la revuelta popular y la Escuela Moderna*, Madrid: La Esfera de los Libros, 2009; Juan Avilés, *Francisco Ferrer y Guardia, pedagogo, anarquista y mártir*, Madrid: Marcial Pons Historia, 2006; Jordi de Cambra Bassols, *Anarquismo y positivismo: El caso Ferrer*, Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas, 1981.

²¹ See Manuel M. Burgos, *Un idioma para el mundo proletario: El esperanto*, Valencia: Cuadernos de Cultura, 1933, pp. 24–29.

communities like the so-called “Naturist Cultural Society” of Alcoy, the Valencian town.

I mention the fact because it was one of the first naturist societies in Spain and because Rovirosa and his wife joined it in 1922, albeit only for a few weeks, perhaps two months.

The formal foundation of this “Naturist Cultural Society” of Alcoy coincided with the Naturist Assembly held in Valencia in 1923, which lent more resonance to the Alcoyan initiative²². In addition to vegetarianism, the Alcoyan naturists practiced nudism in a waterfall near the town. In their old pictures, however, they appear in underwear, discreetly²³, perhaps out of decency. It is possible that in 1923 to be dressed in underwear was regarded as sufficiently revolutionary or even as a close equivalent to nude.

In 1924, Rovirosa’s life suffered a serious blow: the death of his brother in law Josep Canals with whom he had shared a great friendship and plans for future professional activities. Then Rovirosa turned to a practice that was already widespread in Spain: spiritualism. A spiritualist meeting usually involves a medium – generally a woman – who allows people sitting around a table to resume relations hips with dear but dead people.

This practice had already provoked heated disputes with Catholic writers, especially in the nineteenth century. In the eighties, a known Catalan theologian, Perujo, publicly refuted the works by Camille Flammarion, whose *Lumen: A History of a Comet in the Infinite* had been translated and published in Spain in 1874, two years after its original French edition²⁴. Flammarion was a popular writer fond of scientific esoteric astronomic speculations.

²² About this Assembly see Josep María Roselló, *La vuelta a la naturaleza: El pensamiento naturista hispano (1890–2000): Naturismo libertario, trofología, vegetarianismo naturista, vegetarianismo social y librecultura*, Barcelona: Virus editorial, 2003, p. 46.

²³ Agustín Belda Carbonell, *Naturismo, filosofía universal: 70 años de naturismo y desnudismo en Alcoy*, Alcoy: Gráficas el Cid, 1984, p. 27.

²⁴ Camille Flammarion, *Lumen: Historia de un cometa: en el infinito: Narración sobre el tiempo y el espacio como espíritu*, Madrid: Impr. y Libr. de Gaspar, 1874; Niceto Alonso Perujo, *Narraciones de la eternidad: Estudio sobre la vida de ultratumba, según los principios de la filosofía natural en constestación a la obra “Narraciones del infinito”, Lumen de Mr. Flammarion*, Madrid: Impr. y Libr. de J. Gaspar, 1882.

In the eighties, a very popular Catalan priest – Félix Sardá y Salvany – published two little books, one directed against political liberalism and another one criticizing spiritualism. The first volume – *Liberalism is a sin* (1884) – was translated into several languages and became a bestseller²⁵. Both books by Sardá attracted significant criticism²⁶. Spiritualism had started to become a popular practice, albeit clandestine, but polemicists realized the potential relationship between political and religious freedom, even when it concerned a cult as singular as spiritualism.

It is more remarkable that this relationship between political and religious freedoms was actively defended by relationship anarchists, especially in Catalonia. Among Catalan and other European anarchists, spiritualism became the true mystical aspect of universal love and happiness.

Rovirosa remained involved in spiritualism for two years, until about 1926. An avid reader, he read all spiritualist literature that he was able to find. He spoke French, English, Italian, in addition to Catalan and Spanish, and tried to discover theoretical foundations of any question and topic he studied. So he applied his usual rigour to his spiritualist readings and did not find any serious – or, above all, verifiable – explanation of spiritualism, and so rejected it as theosophy.

Paradoxically, his frustration with spiritualist literature was greater because of the qualification of the author he read: the French doctor Charles Robert Richet, Nobel prize winner in 1913 and one of the first true experts on parapsychology; his *Treaty on Metaphysics*, published in French in 1922, was translated to Spanish in 1923 and had a second Spanish edition in 1925, just as Rovirosa was searching for a solution for his religious preoccupations outside of Christianity²⁷. Richet's book was perhaps the first great scientific study about spiritualism; Rovirosa was greatly impressed by his work, but the impossibility to verify experimentally Richet's theories left him disappointed. Then he heard about theosophy.

²⁵ Antonio Moliner Prada: *Félix Sardà i Salvany y el integrismo en la Restauración*, Bellaterra: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 2000.

²⁶ Vid. *Refutación a los folletos El liberalismo es pecado y ¿Qué hay sobre el espiritismo? del Sr. D. Félix Sardá y Salvany, Pbro.*, Barcelona: Graf. Futura, 1887.

²⁷ Charles Robert Richet, *Tratado de metafísica: Cuarenta años de trabajos psíquicos*, Barcelona: Araluce, 1923 (2nd edition 1925, with a prologue by the author).

Roviroso came into contact with Barcelona's theosophists and he devoured the works by Helen Blavatsky, one of the founders of the Theosophical Society in 1875, whose main books had been translated to Spanish as early as 1893, two years after her death. In Roviroso's days, 1925, her main book, *The Secret Doctrine About the Creation*²⁸, was translated into Spanish. Encountering these and other writings, Roviroso was dazzled by Asian religious experiences, especially by Hinduism. Years later, he confessed that he had become really excited. He dedicated three years to theosophy. He came to join the Spanish Theosophical Society, which had its headquarters in Barcelona. He became enthusiastic about the society's motto: "There is no religion above the truth". He studied theosophical writings and saw that theosophists professed active syncretism; they claimed that all religions contained some truth, but neither had all the truth. However, to improve oneself, it was not sufficient to accept all religions, it was necessary to separate the wheat from the chaff, one by one, and thus to construct a synthetic religion, one containing only truth.

So he began to study all historical religions except Christianity, since he considered that Christianity was already superseded. By contrast, each new discovery in other religions brought him real pleasure, as he remembered later. His preferences, however, soon turned to the religion of the ancient Parsees, based on the wisdom of Hermes, also Buddhism, poetic as it is, and above all Hinduism. He also found the wonderful wisdom of Confucius, though, in his opinion, it could not be considered a real religion²⁹.

Theosophy had gained force in Spain in the 1870s. It was crucial to protect the wealthy Catalan José Xifré Hamel, a convinced theosophist. He financed the magazine *Sophia*, which was published between 1893 and 1914, and was soon joined by other journals in Seville, Barcelona,

²⁸ H. P. Blavatsky, *La doctrina secreta de la creación*, Barcelona: B. Bauza, 1925; see also Curuppumullagē Jinarājadā, *L'ideari de la teosofia: Conferència donada a l'estatge de l'Ateneu Barceloni el dia 4, d'octubre*, Barcelona: Impr. Joan Sallent, 1927.

²⁹ Roviroso: *Rasgos autobiográficos* (1956), *Archivo de la Comisión Permanente de la HOAC*, f. Xavier Garcia, and also his "El primer traidor cristiano: Judas de Keiro, el apóstol", in: *Obras completas*, vol. 1, Madrid: Ed. HOAC, 1995, pp. 548–549.

Madrid as well as many minor bulletins. By then, Xifré was in contact with engineer Francisco Montoliú and doctor José Roviralta, both Catalan too. Xifré had inherited a fortune from his father, one of many Catalans who had got enriched in Cuba, from where he had returned in the mid-nineteenth century. Once back in Catalonia, he established a relationship with the French consul in Barcelona, Ferdinand Lesseps, who told him about his projects to link the Red Sea with the Mediterranean via the Isthmus of Suez, and, indeed, Xifré's father was one of the first shareholders of this famous project³⁰.

Xifré's father was already fond of occultism and any variety of breakthrough approaches, as was his son later on. Josep Grau's technical training had similar origins. In the first half of the twentieth century, he was one of the advocates of using X-rays in Spain, before and after his studies together with Roviroso of 1917. The Grau family was poor; Josep probably began as a stoker in the Catalan railways when he was very young³¹. But he took full advantage of a cultural and technical initiative promoted and financed by another wealthy Catalan businessman, Catholic aristocrat Eusebio Güell, the count of Güell. Educated on social Catholicism, Güell instructed his collaborator Ferrán Alsina, an eminent textile technician, to design and manage a colony – a community of homes – for workers of his factory in Santa Coloma de Cervelló, in Catalonia. Alsina also had a solid knowledge in physics and economics and some of his science writings were translated at least into French³² and, in 1907, he created a so-called “experimental physics cabinet”, a “Mentora” – probably an Esperanto name that may mean

³⁰ See Antonio Guardiola, *El canal de Suez y Lesseps: La alucinante historia del famosísimo canal*, Madrid: Revista Literaria Novelas y Cuentos, 1957; see also Juan Bautista Vilar, “España en Suez, Mar Rojo y Adén durante el siglo XIX”, in: *Judería de Tetuán y otros ensayos*, Murcia: Universidad, 1969, pp. 163–196.

³¹ *La Vanguardia*, 1904-08-10, p. 3.

³² Eusebio Güell, López-Bacigalupi Güell, *Perspectivas de la vida*, Madrid: s. i., 1930; see also Pedro Gual Villalbí, *Biografía de Eusebio Güell y Bacigalupi, primer conde de Güell, escrita para el acto de colocar su retrato en la galería de catalanes ilustres*, Barcelona: Ayuntamiento de Barcelona, 1953; Miguel d'Esplugues, *El primer conde de Güell: Notes psicològiques i assaig sobre el sentit aristocràtic a Catalunya*, Barcelona: Arts Gràfiques Nicolau Poncell, 1921.

“mentor” in the sense of “master” – where everyone could see the newest mechanisms and their functions³³.

The young stoker Josep Grau did not waste the opportunity. He frequented the experimental physics cabinet studying its machines and eventually organizing guided tours to the Mentora. His interests finally settled on X-rays, as we know, and he became a prominent expert of them³⁴.

Rovirosa abandoned his theosophist convictions in 1928. He was not a rationalist; he recognized a continuous presence of mystery in his life and in any other life he examined. Simultaneously, though, he was very systematic and analytic in his way of thinking and working. He was always searching for a way to apply and to advance any knowledge he had. So, as a theosophist, he first studied the main theosophical writings and then began to research them. He concluded that all religions that withstood theosophical criticism were pantheistic. In particular, Hinduism proposed an idea of the norigin of the universe that could be reconciled with Evolutionism, but, like Evolutionism, raised the problem of the origin. He concluded that the truth lay neither in any religion or in all of them together. He fell into total skepticism. There was no way of knowing anything that transcended matter. Technique was the only approach that gave him a sense of full security. He was, after all, an accomplished technician. For him, those were the “truly true” things, he concluded³⁵.

He recovered his Catholic faith in 1934. You may ask how it was possible that Brahmanic emanation took him to skepticism and, five years later, he returned to Christianity, embracing, among other things, a belief in Creation by God. Well, it is paradoxically easy to explain it. What he discovered in 1933 was a distinction between Christianity and Christ as a historical person. He lived in Paris with his wife and one day, as he was going back home, he saw a little crowd in the street; he asked to know the reason for that little meeting and someone told him that

³³ *Índice de los aparatos y demás elementos de estudio expuestos en la Mentora*, Barcelona: Henrich y Ca, 1907.

³⁴ *Diario de Villanueva y Geltrú*, 1910-02-19.

³⁵ Rovirosa, *Rasgos autobiográficos*.

cardinal Jean Verdier was preaching in a nearby church; it was the chapel of the Catholic Institute of Paris, a very important institution for the so-called “sacred sciences”. Verdier had announced his intention to promote the establishing of a hundred parishes in the *banlieues* of Paris. It was supposed to add a service – a religious one, though not exclusively – to the people who inhabited those suburbs. The scheme also included an ambition to create jobs, as France suffered great unemployment following the 1929 crisis. And in order to make that happen, it was necessary to get a huge loan in order to pay for constructions. But aside from that, he commissioned young and daring architects, mainly Le Corbusier, to do the designs of the chapels. And Le Corbusier proposed a first design for a chapel that broke with the architectural tradition in Catholic religious buildings. Many people argued about all that, although they were not necessarily Catholic, like Rovirosa. Verdier’s proposal had become a cultural, even aesthetic problem, although a happy one for some people, unemployed or destitute.

On that day of 1933, moved by curiosity to know this priest, Rovirosa peeked into that church to see the famous cardinal, and as he did just that Verdier said almost verbatim: We are in the times of “specialists”, everyone talks about this or that “specialist”. As Christians, we have to be specialists in Christ.

Rovirosa considered himself a specialist in electromechanics. The expression “specialist” was familiar for him. And he discovered that he could consider himself a real specialist in Christianity – that he refuted – but not in Christ. He realized that he did not know anything about the historical person of Christ, a human being with his own life. And he began to do what he always did when he had a problem: first, to research what specialists already had some expertise on the matter and then try to instruct himself through work and study. Some months later, he made a confession before an Augustinian and received what he would call his “second first communion”. He had received his first communion when was a child, like most Spaniards³⁶.

Pujulá, the modernist writer and a freemason, was tried by a special

³⁶ *Diario de Villanueva y Geltrú*, 1910-02-19.

anti-Masonic court after the Spanish civil war, forced to retract his ideas, and spent the rest of his life engaged in literary writing, but publishing hardly anything. A great part of his unpublished work contains religious references. I am not able to add anything about his convictions in his later life; only that many of those religious references are funny, humorous, clearly anticlerical³⁷.

Moreover, after the war, the prudent and competent Josep Grau became an employee in the Siemens factory of Spain, in Valencia.

Of the four companions, the most singular and dramatic trajectory was that of his brother Jaume, the Esperantist poet. According to his writings in concentration camps, he had lost the habit of praying when he was thirteen, but now he did pray sometimes. He would say Our Father in order not to blaspheme, he sometimes wrote. When we are completely alone and helpless, he wrote in 1944, we need to find someone to protect us. According his notes, it does not matter whether we feel protected by Stoic philosophy or by God or the Virgin of the Helpless (*Desamparados* in Spanish). We must remember that praying to the Virgin of the Helpless has been a widespread practice in Catalonia and throughout the Spanish Mediterranean coast since the times when North African Muslim pirates captured boaters and people who lived near that coast.

In situations of loneliness and despair, Jaume Grau used to pray himself to sleep with Our Father, just like he did when he was a child, he writes. In concentration camps, when he spent months without any news from home, when he was hungry, cold or in misery, he felt the need to pray. Saying Our Father, he explained, made him think he was seeing his own father and saying “goodnight” to everybody in his household.

He did not recover his Christian faith. For him, religion was simply a force, a very strong force, and therefore did not need ministers or representatives of God, temples or shrines or altars. Actually, he adds, it is so because even irreligious people are religious³⁸. Is it so?

³⁷ His papers, in: *Biblioteca Central de Catalunya* (Barcelona, Spain), f. Pujulà i Vallès.

³⁸ Grau, *La Química i l'Alquímia...*, I, ff. 2-7.

ANTÓN M. PAZOS

VISION OF THE OTHER FOR CATHOLICS,
CHRISTIANS AND NON-CHRISTIANS IN THE
SPANISH CIVIL WAR (1936–1939)

At the beginning of the twentieth century, since World War I, the perception of others had become especially antagonistic in the West.* The “other” was transformed into the enemy. Moreover, it was an enemy that needed to be destroyed, since ideological confrontation deteriorated very quickly into direct conflict: right-left, red-white, fascist-communist – these were some of the partners in the *danse macabre* that took place in Europe between the Wars. In Spain, this confrontation reached its climax in the civil war which started in 1936, although recent scholarship has pointed out that there had been a clear lead-up to the war in the decades before. Very quickly, the “other” became a threat to one’s own survival. The concept of revenge permeated even the smallest pockets in which tolerance could resist.

Evidently, this binary perception extended beyond Europe. At the beginning of the 1930s, Brazilian feminist author María Lacerda wrote a short essay, *Clericalism and Fascism*¹, which put the Catholic papacy (Pedro) and Italian fascism (the new Caesar, the “Caesar of a tragic

* This article is part of the HAR2010-17955 Research project funded by the Dirección General de Investigación of the Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad of Spain.

¹ María Lacerda de Moura (1887–1945). The Argentine edition, which we have used, is entitled *Clericalismo y Fascismo: Horda de Embrutecedores!*, Rosario, R.A.: Librería Ruiz, 1936, with a prologue by Juan Lazarte, translated by Clotilde Bula. Miriam Moreira Leite, has written a recent biography of the author: *María Lacerda de Moura: uma feminista utópica*, Editora Mulheres, Santa Cruz do Sul, RS: EDUNISC, 2005.

carnival”²), both in the same bag. The text opens with a review of Italian authors from between the Wars who extolled violence as beauty and who paved the way towards real violence (“of castor oil and tourniquet”) of the Blackshirts: “Gabriele D’Annunzio, Giovanni Papini, Filippo Tommaso Marinetti, Luigi Pirandello, all imperialists, all neo-pagan priests and apostles, of the ‘Roman God’, and all Catholics... all instruments of overwhelming Jesuitism.”³ The roots of the clerical-fascist union were traced not only to the Lateran Pacts, but also to Pius XI’s address to Benito Mussolini⁴, when he did not denounce – the silence of Pius XII, *ante litteram* – the fascist violence of the preceding decade. Lacerda applied to him – and this is what is significant to me – all the stereotypes of anti-Semitic or anti-Masonic writing, though this time from the perspective of Anarchism and directed against Catholicism:

The Church, accomplice to Duce’s maneuvers (with the Black-Pope Tacchi-Venturi⁵ behind the scenes, the Satanic soul of Catholicism), adapted itself, transformed itself, stretched itself for centuries to come, like an immense octopus squeezing mankind, destroying reason and stifling conscience, trying desperately to impose a medieval era upon the world.⁶

Throughout the Western world, the “other” – Jew, Catholic, Protestant, Fascist, Communist – became an enemy to eliminate. Lacerda presented the idea that “our strong and generous cry of ‘Death to Fascism’ is not violence: it is the ‘ultimate resistance’ of our consciousness against organized savagery”⁷. Violence during the years of the Spanish Republic (1931–1936) was, like the Fascist literature of the 1920s,

² *Ibid.*, p. 10.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

⁴ In the encyclical *Non abbiamo bisogno*, of 29 June 1931. On the relation of Pius XI with fascism, see Emma Fattorini, *Hitler, Mussolini and the Vatican: Pope Pius XI and the Speech That was Never Made*, Cambridge: Polity, 2011.

⁵ The Jesuit historian Pietro Tacchi Venturi (1861–1956), who served as an informal link between the Vatican and the Italian government during the years of fascism.

⁶ Maria Lacerda de Moura, *op. cit.*, p. 158.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 167.

appropriating political discourse: words became rhetorical weapons that opened the road to the use of real weapons⁸. It is in this verbally and physically violent environment that one must contextualize opinions about “others” in the religious world – Spanish and European – in the years of the Spanish Civil War, 1936–1939.

Amidst growing tensions at the beginning of the twentieth century, the Spanish Civil War was considered the climax of the European ideological conflict. It was a clash between two political configurations, the democratic vision and the totalitarian vision in its two guises, Fascist or Communist. Curiously, this distinction faded in Spain during the Civil War. Communist totalitarianism supported democratic principles while fascism became diluted in the militarism and Catholic traditionalism of the new Franco state. We could say that, in the republic camp, democracy masked a strong revolutionary process – anarchist and communist – and in the rebel camp, fascism – and its symbols – shrouded the reality of the return to a traditional society, closer to classical bourgeoisie, under the guise of a national-sindicalist revolution.

In Spain, as in the entire Western world, the combative vision one held of the other was dualist. Each group even defined themselves in terms of aggression. The republicans presented themselves as anti-fascists, a term which welcomed communists, socialists, anarchists or bourgeois democrats. The rebels considered themselves anti-Marxists from the start. In either case, both found their justification in being anti-“other”.

We must now introduce religion into this dynamic of confrontation, which, in Spain, will be fundamentally Catholic.

THE “OTHER” FOR NON-CHRISTIANS

From a religious viewpoint, Spain during the war of 1936 – and in the preceding centuries – was essentially divided between Catholics and non-Catholics, given that other religious faiths were statistically less relevant. Logically, to the Catholic world, the concept of the

⁸ This was summed up nicely in the title of the book dedicated to the process of verbal violence in the years before the war: Fernando del Rey, *Palabras como puños: La intransigencia política en la II República española*, Madrid: Tecnos, 2011.

“other” was not limited to one religious group. The others could be Communists – or the godless, the usual term – Jews, Protestants or Muslims. All these groups were actors in the war. By contrast, for the Anarchists, Communists and republican bourgeois, the “other” – from a religious stand-point – was limited to the Catholic Church. A radio conference held by José Ballester, former Primary Education Director, at the beginning of the war in Valencia made it very clear. It was called “The Church, our greatest enemy in the War”⁹, and by the “Church” he meant Catholicism. His approach is useful in summarizing a large part of the republic’s opinion of Catholics. First, he made a radical distinction between Christianity and the Church. Christianity – summarized in “the Gospel” – was presented as something noble, beautiful, idealistic, an egalitarian theory full of concern for the afflicted. But the Church had strayed far from the Christian ideal, despite those who remembered their obligation, because:

to return to the Evangelical route requires that one live amongst the poor, give food to the hungry and water to the thirsty, console the sad and dress the naked. It involves living amongst pain, tears, injustice, poverty and misery, and requires one to help ease the pain, dry the tears, rectify these injustices, alleviate poverty and misery. To realise this mission, one needs to live in constant and intimate contact with the people that always smell of dirt, of misery and who were always down on their luck.¹⁰

In the republican imagination, the Catholic Church meant the hierarchy, the clergy, the religious orders – especially the hated Jesuits, “the genuine representation of reactionary Spain, black and intransigent”¹¹ – and the Catholic bourgeoisie. The “Evangelical” Catholics were spared, although it was clear that, once the war was won, there would be no place in the new society for the Church at all, though its existence wouldn’t be expressly prohibited. In closing his

⁹ José Ballester, *La Iglesia, nuestro mayor enemigo en la guerra*, Valencia: Radio Telégrafos Valencia, [1937].

¹⁰ José Ballester, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 9–10.

radio conference, José Ballester described his hope for a world based on a happy naturalism¹², one where no church would be necessary.

We welcome in the future an enormous and relentless task: to win the hearts and minds of our compatriots, hitherto anaesthetized by faith and religion, so that they may wake from the anesthesia and move towards a new religion of science, of art, of literature and contemplation and interpretation of Nature.¹³

An idyllic vision of the “other” – priests and nuns, as the average Catholic is no longer considered – was the approach of the Communist Party propaganda. In 1937, the Socorro Rojo¹⁴ published a pamphlet called “*Religion and Fascism*”, dedicated “to all those Christians and Catholics, our brothers, who have suffered harassment, persecution and death in the rebel zone of our beloved Spain, because of their faith and patriotic loyalty”¹⁵. In this case, the other is given a double interpretation, which the prologue by republican priest Juan García Morales elaborated very clearly. There were true and false Catholics. The true Catholics¹⁶ sided with the Republic and the Republic respected them by not staining itself with their blood¹⁷. And a significant number of biographies were written about Catholic martyrs who died for the Republic – for example, the case of Basque priests executed by the military.

¹² In line with the Institución Libre de Enseñanza, founded in 1876 by professors who had split from the official university because they disagreed with official Catholicism, and directed initially by Francisco Giner de los Ríos, follower of German philosopher Karl Christian Friedrich Krause’s ideas. It was the secular alternative to Catholic teaching until the Second Republic.

¹³ José Ballester, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

¹⁴ The Communist International Red Aid in Spain.

¹⁵ *Religión y fascismo*, Comité Ejecutivo Nacional del Socorro Rojo de España, 1937.

¹⁶ “The true Catholics, the Christians held in all Spain’s heart, at whose vanguard marched the Catholic Nationalist Basques, have no choice other than to condemn the subversive movement, savage and barbaric, that has transformed the love for our country into a sea of blood” (*ibid.*, p. 5).

¹⁷ “Our hands are clean of Christian blood” (*ibid.*, p. 6).

There were also the old “others”, the religious who had been recycled as guerilla priests – the militia – or nuns of the Socorro Rojo. It was clear where Christ was, and it wasn’t in the Church. Christ was with the oppressed, those who fought for the Republic. The text includes a testimony of a young priest who remembers having lost faith in the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church, since it has been endorsing this shameful subversion and prostitution of religious values in Spain.

I have been on the point of losing my most profound beliefs. The trench has saved me. I have returned here to find Christ. He, the great persecuted, mocked and betrayed, will be here, where I am, where he has always been: with the oppressed and dispossessed, with those who hunger and thirst for justice.¹⁸

Another priest, from Navarre, affirms having changed his “robes of a priest for those of the militia”, in the name of justice. Nuns from the Orphan Asylum of San José, in Valencia, continued working in the same place, now named the Socorro Rojo’s Children’s Home, but their role was seen in a new light: “There, among others, is Sister Elena, now Comrade Elena, a quiet and thoughtful girl who works as a militant more in a humanitarian fashion, caring for the children housed there.”¹⁹

There was, therefore, a Christian republic, an “other”, that was tolerated. On the opposite side there was “treason, perjury, paganism, tyranny, cruelty, all that is essentially anti-Christian”²⁰. The opposite side painted this “other”, as is appropriate in a propaganda leaflet, with thick strokes to stimulate rejection. A chaplain from the Basque militia commented in an interview: “No, we are not armed. Carrying arms is not needed to serve God. It seems that on the other side there are priests firing rifles and machine guns. We, Basque priests, do not want to put ourselves against the people.”²¹ One nun recalled that “when a church takes up arms, it is no longer a Church of God”. A Saint Sebastian pastor was certain that the others were “traitors and perjurers, vile murderers

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

... Pharisees that Jesus, if he returned to the world again, would not cast from the church with whips, but with a kick”²². To summarize, as the well-known Catholic republican author José Bergamín said in an interview with a French journalist Louis-Martin Chauffier:²³

The people saw in the Official Spanish Church all the allies and friends of the oppressors of the people. Religion means money, domination, power, inhumanity, capitalism, fascism. [...] The union between the Church and fascism was clear: and this was most clearly seen when churches and monasteries were converted into strongholds and weapon depositories. It seems strange to me that the people’s reaction wasn’t more savage than it was.²⁴

THE “OTHER” FOR CATHOLICS

Catholics obviously did not see things quite in the same way they were presented in republican propaganda. Cardinal Goma²⁵, Spanish

²² *Ibid.*, p. 42.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 43.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 43. Realistically, this would be difficult. Virtually all priests and members of the religious order who could not escape were murdered in the Republic zone, and all churches were destroyed. Public worship was banned and religious life went underground. The murdered numbered: over 4000 priests (15% of the total), more than 2000 male members of the religious order (20% of the total) and more than 200 female members of the religious order (3%). Given that the persecution was only in the Republic zone, it is clear that globally many dioceses were absolutely devastated. In Madrid alone, almost 40% of priests were murdered. In other areas, such as Barbastro, up to 80%. Those not murdered had obviously managed to escape or hide. The most extensive work covering the persecution is that of Antonio Montero Moreno, *La persecución religiosa en España 1936–1939*, Madrid: La Editorial Católica, 1960, republished in 1998. Recent texts on this theme include Vicente Cárcel Ortí, *La persecución religiosa en España durante la Segunda República (1931–1939)*, Madrid: Rialp, 1990, and Ángel David Martín Rubio, *La cruz, el perdón y la gloria: persecución religiosa en España durante la II República y la Guerra Civil*, Madrid: Ciudadela Libros, 2007, from a critical point of view. In English, a good summary is found in José M. Sánchez, *The Spanish Civil War as a religious tragedy*, Notre Dame, Ind: University of Notre Dame Press, 1987.

²⁵ Isidro Gomá y Tomás (1869–1949), Archbishop of Toledo (1933–1940) and unofficial representative of the Holy See before Franco in the initial months of the war (December 1936 to September 1937).

Church Primate, viewed the war as an ideological battle. Much like the Communist propaganda had put it, there were acceptable “others” – they were murdering priests and destroying temples, but they were still considered the Church’s children. They were “rebel sons and degenerates who are orchestrating the ruin of Spain”, but “doubly worthy of our paternal care for being so tremendously disgraced”, Goma said in a response to the Archbishop of Catanzaro²⁶ who wrote to him – as did many Bishops around the world – after the publication of the Collective Letter of July 1937, explaining the meaning of the civil war. In this Collective Letter, which summarized the thoughts of the Spanish Catholic hierarchy about the “other”, he wrote that it was a battle of civilizations, in which one of the groups – the Marxists – “sought the elimination of the Catholic religion in Spain”²⁷. A further distinction could be made within this group. On one side, there were the children of the Church, the baptized Spaniards. It said at the end of the Collective Letter:

Allow us one final declaration. God knows that we love and pardon with all our hearts those who, without knowing, have inflicted serious damage to the Church and to the Nation. They are our children. We invoke forgiveness, before God, our martyrs, the ten Bishops and the millions of priests and Catholics who have died [...].²⁸

On the other side were the instigators of the crimes: the revolutionary “other”, foreign, set against the Western Christian civilization, who triggered “the Communist revolution, allied to the Government armies, [that] were above all anti-divine”²⁹.

Therefore, there were two clearly delineated sides. One consisted of the nationalists and, against them, stood the true “others” who

²⁶ Isidro Gomá to Giovanni Fiorentini, Archbishop of Catanzaro (Italy), 27 November 1937, in José Andrés-Gallego and Antón M. Pazos, *Archivo Gomá: Documentos de la Guerra Civil*, Madrid: CSIC, 2001–2010, 13 vols., vol. 8, p. 418.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, vol. 6, p. 334.

²⁸ *Carta Colectiva de los Obispos españoles a los de todo el mundo con motivo de la guerra de España*, 1937-07-01, in: *ibid.*, vol. 6, pp. 348–349.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, vol. 6, p. 338. However, the document justifies this reality using documentation supposedly of Communist origin that today we know forms part of the anti-propaganda of the time.

were godless foreigners. Both groups represented two tendencies: the spiritual, on the side of the rebels, who came to the defense of order, social peace, traditional civilization and the country, and in large part to the defense of religion; and on the other side, the materialist, calling themselves Marxist, Communist or Anarchist, who wanted to replace the old Spanish civilization with the new ‘civilization’ of the Russian Soviets.³⁰ One should keep in mind that, within the general fratricidal character of the Spanish war, there was a sense in some regions that the enemy was in fact a brother, and this brotherhood could be perceived especially from a religious point of view. The clearest case was the clash between republican Basques and Navarrian Carlists in the north. Both areas were highly religious, with similar traditions, and both shared the Basque tongue. The conflict was so disconcerting that, when the war had barely begun, the Bishops of both dioceses³¹ jointly declared it unacceptable that Catholics fight against Catholics and, even less, that they did so united with the anti-Christian Marxists:

on the front lines they fought fiercely, and they killed each other, sons of our earth, of the same blood and race [Basque], with the same religious ideals, with an equal love of God, of Christ and their Church, who lived following the Law of Jesus Christ, but who killed each other over slight political differences. This is grave, but it is worse that they have found a common cause with acknowledged enemies of the Church and have fought alongside them against their enemies, who were their own brothers.³²

Here, there was as much sense of fatherhood and brotherhood as of the “otherness” – even on the battlefield³³. And in some cases,

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ Marcelino Olaechea, of Pamplona (Navarra), and Mateo Múgica, of Vitoria, Episcopal city of the Basque country.

³² The *Instruction* was widespread in Basque country, by pamphlets launched from airplanes. The original version, which was written by Gomá, in Anastasio Granados, *El Cardenal Gomá. Primado de España*, Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1969, pp. 127–132. Date on p. 128.

³³ Something similar to what happened between Navarrese people and Basques occurred in the Catalan attempt to invade Mallorca (both countries were brothers in culture and language). The Bishop, on celebrating the invaders’ retreat, lamented especially that the Catalans had behaved “with a cruelty that could never be explained,

they acted accordingly³⁴. In the first weeks of the war, this attitude – especially on the rebel side – could be seen in the behavior of some priests towards their parishioners who belonged to the Popular Front parties, which meant they were ideologically the “others”. In Galicia, where the military rebellion triumphed, the Army began executing leftist militants whom it deemed guilty of the revolution: radicals, separatists, Communists, Socialists or Anarchists – sometimes they were not even militants but objects of personal revenge. In these early days, a safeguard for survival was a “good Catholic” certificate that pastors gave to parishioners. As many pastors extended their favor to those who had been Communists or Anarchists in the previous months or years, the Archbishop of Santiago published a memorandum on 14 September 1936, instructing priests to “certify with conscience”, meaning that they should not give Catholic endorsement to those who were not practicing Catholics³⁵.

Aside from the “other” who was like a brother or son gone astray, there was the radical enemy who had disowned the Spanish people. In the imagination of the Church hierarchy at the start of the war, this “other” was absolutely foreign to Spain and to Catholicism. He was a stranger, stateless and atheist:

It was the Tatar soul, the genius of Communist internationalism that supplanted the Christian sentiment of a large part of our people and it launched itself with fury against the Spanish Catholic, who had to react, and the moment of conflict arrived between the two Spains, which is

an improper cruelty, not of brothers nor of civilized beings”. A key text in understanding the viewpoint the hierarchy had of the war, as reflected in the ecclesiastic bulletins, Alfonso Álvarez Bolado, *Para ganar la guerra, para ganar la paz. Iglesia y guerra civil: 1936–1939*, Madrid: Universidad Pontificia de Comillas, 1995, p. 57.

³⁴ José Andrés-Gallego has explored the idea of the “other” as a brother, and the protection of the enemy, in “La Guerra Civil como enfrentamiento entre cristianos”, in: Antón M. Pazos, *Religiones y Guerra Civil Española: Gran Bretaña, Francia, España*, Santiago de Compostela: CSIC, 2011, pp. 117–147.

³⁵ Tomás Muniz de Pablos, “Más advertencias y disposiciones con motivo de las presentes circunstancias”, in: *Boletín Oficial Eclesiástico del Arzobispado de Santiago*, Santiago de Compostela: Archidiócesis de Santiago de Compostela, 1936, pp. 249–253, cited in Alfonso Álvarez Bolado, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

better described as two civilizations: that of Russia, which is no more than barbaric, and that of Christianity.³⁶

Gomá, with fiery terminology, portrayed the war not so much as a civil war but as an international and ideological war. In this way, violence of religious hatred could be attributed to foreign elements, not to the Spanish.

Certainly, those who were killed were Spanish, but Gomá concluded that they were “others” so foreign that it was difficult to speak of them as Spanish or to speak of a civil war at all. In a piece about the causes of the war published at the end of 1936, Goma wrote:

“Though it’s true the fight is on the Spanish soil, red with the blood of brothers, it represents a theater of war in which the old Spain plays host to the storm unleashed upon it by this international barbarism called communism.”³⁷

Hence, finishing – and winning – the war relied upon expelling the “Tatar soul” from Spain. The Catholic hierarchy insisted on the duty of reconciliation among the Spanish people, who were to be reminded that they were brothers: brothers by faith³⁸ and brothers by country. Just as pastors had given false Catholicism certificates, the tonic of the Church hierarchy upon the arrival of peace was to welcome and pardon the “other” while inviting them, of course, to cease being the “other”. The Bishop of Madrid recalled in 1939:

³⁶ Isidro Gomá, *El caso de España: Instrucción a sus diócesanos y respuesta a unas consultas sobre la guerra actual*, Pamplona: 1936, in: José Andrés-Gallego and Antón M. Pazos, *Archivo Gomá, op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 51.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ It is unknown how many Spanish people in the twenties and thirties, at least among the members of socialist and anarchist workers’ organizations, underwent “civil baptism”. The presumption was that many, because many children of workers were baptized in the Catholic Church in the post-war, though many of them had been born during the Republic and the war. Social groups had probably adopted the social benchmark of getting baptized and being buried in sacred ground. In the years before the war there had been Socialist and Communist “baptisms”, demonstrating the social roots of the rite, but there are no statistics around this phenomenon, which, had it continued, would have had an undoubtable effect on the history of the Church in the country.

Those who pursued us, crazed by absurd sermons and troubled by Satanic hatred, are also our brothers and fellow countrymen. We overcome evil with good. We ask our Father to call His prodigal sons home, which they should never have left, and if on the open road you cross paths with them, welcome them with open arms, for the love of God and the love of Spain.³⁹

THE “OTHER” FOR NON-CATHOLIC CHRISTIANS

For the non-Catholic Christians of Spain, there were also two “others”, depending on which group they identified themselves with. In general, the Catholic hierarchy lamented that those theoretically Christian “brothers” – English and American Protestants above all – did not understand the persecution suffered by the Spanish Church. Or, the Church expressed bewilderment at seeing that the Protestant world held a political rather than religious view, which led them to side with those who were the true enemies of Christ.

To a large extent this was true. The Protestant world, above all in Great Britain and the United States, understood the Spanish Civil War to be essentially religious but, instead of accepting it as a religious crusade, saw it in reverse: as a religious distortion⁴⁰. Catholics were the “others” responsible for distorting not only the idea of the just war but the idea of Christianity itself. Protestant authors generally used the stereotypes of the Spanish Church to explain the Civil War: power, inquisition, wealth and oppression. Cambridge Professor Charles E. Raven identifies an exception to this stereotyping in the preface to his book *Christianity and Spain* as he highlights the importance and impartiality of the author in that:

³⁹ Letter of Bishop of Madrid-Alcalá dated 28 March 1939: Leopoldo Eijo Garay, “La hora presente: Carta pastoral”, in: *Boletín Oficial del Obispado de Madrid-Alcalá*, 1.660 / 1 mayo, 1939, p. 18, quoted in: José Andrés-Gallego, “La Guerra Civil como enfrentamiento entre cristianos”, in: *op. cit.*, p. 144.

⁴⁰ A critical summary of the opinions published in the Protestant press about the Spanish Civil War in: C. Crivelli, “I Protestanti e l’attuale conflitto spagnolo”, in: *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 2097 (1937 / IV), pp. 210–224. The author is a Jesuit expert in the contemporary evolution of the reformed denominations and sects.

he draws attention to essential facts to which most of the propagandists on both sides are blind, which the British public generally ignores, and which can never be omitted if the present conflict is to be seen in perspective and in its true colours.⁴¹

But according to Professor Raven, the book is especially valuable because it proves the historical guilt of the Catholic Church in Spain and the impossibility that Christ was on the side of Franco⁴². The “other”, from the Anglican point of view, was not so much the Communists or the revolutionaries as the Catholic hierarchy. And it considered religious persecution, such as murdering of bishops and priests or destruction of churches, to be a constant in Spanish history:

Those who see in the anti-clericalism of today the ‘red hand of Moscow’ and the teaching of Karl Marx can never have read a Spanish history. The scenes we have witnessed are the result of factors deep in the pages of history, and form only the latest, if worst, examples of a process which has gone on continuously for a hundred years.⁴³

Certainly, the author acknowledges the thousands of priests killed, and accepts that the Spanish situation could be compared with the Russian or French revolutions. Even so, he understood that, through persecution, one was freeing oneself from a hateful oppression. The “others” should not be defended:

When hearkening to the plea that the Church is only fighting for its life, one must remember that in that case its ‘life’ involved the denial of education, social services and even a reasonable standard of life for the majority of her children in God, that to save her life the Church has

⁴¹ Charles E. Raven, in Henry Brinton, *Christianity and Spain*, with a Preface by Revd. Canon Charles E. Raven, Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, London: United Editorial, [1937], p. 3.

⁴² “In particular his book is valuable because, writing as a convinced and enthusiastic Christian, he shows how impossible it is to accept the claim, put forward by champions of the ‘United Christian Front’, that General Franco’s cause is the cause of Christ, that a Church whose past record and present policy are here set out deserves our unquestioning support, and that the future of Christianity will be advanced if that Church is restored to power as an instrument of fascist domination” (*ibid.*).

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

blasted the lives of a whole generation. And all this is for the institution whose founder said: “He who would save his life shall lose it”.⁴⁴

When Spanish bishops, largely to counter the viewpoints in the Catholic world which we have just seen published the above-mentioned Collective Letter in 1937, responses from the Protestant side further reinforced the rejection of this “other”, presented as Christian. On 4 October 1937, the *New York Times* published a reply⁴⁵ to the Spanish bishops. It appeared as an “open letter” to the Catholic hierarchy, signed by 150 Protestants and later released in the form of a prospectus⁴⁶ along with other documents which surfaced in the heat of the controversy. The Open Letter made it clear that the struggle in Spain was between fascism and democracy and that the position of the Catholic Church clashed head-on with the American democratic tradition⁴⁷. And, of course, attacks on people and sacred buildings had to connect them with the Spanish anti-clerical tradition, a logical continuation for a Church that had always clashed with the people:

However deplorable such incidents may be, it is difficult to accept the hierarchy’s contention that the Popular Front Government was, or is, responsible. It is well known that for centuries the Spanish people have identified the hierarchy with the privileged classes. [...] In the light of this background of anti-clerical hostility, extending back over more than a century, the pastoral Letter seems most inadequate when it attempts to picture the present hostility against the Church as a recent importation.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

⁴⁵ The Collective Letter of the Spanish Bishops to the world, 1 July 1937, explaining their version of the civil war. It had a great effect on propaganda. Extensive correspondence by the Bishops regarding the letter is found in José Andrés-Gallego and Antón M. Pazos, *Archivo Gomá, op. cit.*

⁴⁶ *American Democracy vs. the Spanish Hierarchy*, New York: Spanish Information Bureau [1937].

⁴⁷ “Certainly the hierarchy can hardly expect to gain sympathy here either for itself or for the Catholic religion with a declaration that treats with contempt principles that are the precious heritage of the American people” (*ibid.*, p. 13).

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

American Protestants accepted the Communist or Anarchist propaganda spread about priests and monks portrayed as the “other”, radical enemy of the people, not only for constantly siding with bourgeois power, but, from July 1936, for fighting directly against the people with weapons in hand. In a propaganda pamphlet published in Buenos Aires about how the military coup had played out in different regions of Spain, priests were portrayed as weapon-wielding fighters. Frederica Montseny, Anarchist Minister⁴⁹, wrote that in Barcelona:

The churches and monasteries attacked, and the people spontaneously turned all their anger against them [...]. The Falange, the Carlist, had sought refuge there [in the monasteries] and started a fire, together with the monks, against the masses. The ancient hatred, the fury of the multitudes against the Church, increased a hundredfold, stirring energy. The fire spread from one building to another while the friars escaped through the sewers and underground tunnels.⁵⁰

This image of the religious orders firing upon the people was obviously a piece of Popular Front propaganda, but it was a very widespread viewpoint – even accepted by pro-Franco foreigners⁵¹ – and served as justification for the destruction of churches. It originated in Barcelona, when a group of soldiers barricaded themselves in the convent of the Carmelites and, from there, tried to defend themselves against the resistance. But what is interesting to see is the construction of the “other” as a stereotype that was not only negative but also allowed for the justification of the destruction of that “other”. A reply to the *New York Times* Open Letter called the Popular Front “a governmental regime

⁴⁹ Between November 1936 and May 1937, she was the first female Minister in Spain.

⁵⁰ Federica Montseny, “19 July, Catalonia”, in: AA. VV., *Como se enfrentó al fascismo en toda España*, Buenos Aires: Ediciones del Servicio de Propaganda España, 1938, pp. 10–11.

⁵¹ “The French vice-admiral H. Jouber”, in: *La guerra d’Espagne et le catholicisme: Réponse a M. Jacques Maritain*, Paris: S.G.I.E., 1937, accepted this legend, however naive (p. 11), see Gonzalo Redondo, *Historia de la Iglesia en España*, vol. II: 1936–1939, Madrid: Rialp, 1993, p. 21, note 14.

that has carried on a ruthless⁵² persecution of the Christian religion”⁵³. Catholics who signed the reply accused the editor of the Open Letter of being “guilty of a hiss of hate against Catholicism”. American Catholics judged the Protestant view of Catholics as prejudiced. Moreover, the Catholic reply argued that the Spanish war was not primarily religious but civil, a fight between those who wanted to impose Communism and those that rejected it. Catholics concluded that Protestants should see Communists as the “other”, not the Catholic hierarchy, and emphasized that Catholics were persecuted Christians to whom other Christians should show solidarity.

The majority of Protestants did not see it that way, of course⁵⁴. Even people as even-handed as the Director of the Spanish Quaker Mission – who impartially assisted to the needs of both sides during the war – hinted at the shadow of anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish prejudice in the story of his mission:

The first day in Spain⁵⁵ is full of unforgettable scenes. I felt that I had witnessed the death of a rich culture when I saw the people who defended their freedom so jealously and fled from the horrors of a civil war only to be followed by a totalitarian state. Everything that had been achieved since the Inquisition seemed to evaporate before my eyes.⁵⁶

⁵² The systematic nature of the persecution, beyond the excesses of uncontrolled groups in the early days, is highlighted in the recent investigation by Julius Ruiz, *El Terror Rojo: Madrid 1936*, [Madrid]: Espasa, [2012].

⁵³ Francis Talbot, *Catholic Reply to Open Letter of 150 Protestant Signatories on Spain*, (ser. *Clarifying Spanish Civil War collection*), New York: Catholic Mind, 1937. It is divided in two parts. The first pages are a reply to the letter published in the *New York Times*, and are signed by many representative Catholics. The second part is a piece written by the Jesuit Francis Talbot clarifying some points of the letter and claiming that “the writer of the *Open Letter* and the nucleus responsible for its publication are guilty of a hiss of hate against Catholicism” (p. 21).

⁵⁴ Nor many of the Catholics who visited the region. It could be said that the idea of the “other” was so marked that each person who visited the area reinforced their own convictions.

⁵⁵ In 1939, in the republican Catalonia but about to be conquered by Franco troops.

⁵⁶ Howard E. Kershner, *La labor asistencial de los cuáqueros durante la guerra civil española y la posguerra: España y Francia 1939–1941*, foreword by Pedro Bermejo

Visiting Catholics also held the view that the Catholicism of Franco's Spain was a distortion of religion, as illustrated in the account of German Prince Loewenstein's visit to Republican Spain. Upon finding himself among Basque Catholic soldiers, he expressed his appreciation of being a Catholic, because siding with the Republic had proved "to many non-Catholic Spanish Republicans that the Church and Democracy are closely connected by their very nature and that only a misconception of Christian ideals can bring the Church into line with Fascism".⁵⁷

To conclude, foreign Protestants had two points of view about the religious situation during the war. The first is exemplified by the French Pastor Jules Jézéquel's visit to Spain in 1937 as vice president of the pacifist organization *Rassemblement universel pour la paix*⁵⁸, who was shown the normality of Protestant worship in the Republican zone. Interestingly, although the first building set on fire in Barcelona was an evangelical chapel⁵⁹, Protestant worship went largely uninterrupted during the war. Pastor Jézéquel, who carried out religious functions in different Spanish cities, noted the contrast of the freedom of Protestant worship and the absence of open Catholic churches. As a pacifist, he was very balanced in his views, but nevertheless raised questions about the responsibilities of the Church during the persecution:

Marín, Ambassador of Spain, Madrid: Siddharth Mehta Ediciones, 2011, p. 54. First edition in English: *Quaker service in modern war*, New York: Prentice Hall, [1950].

⁵⁷ Prince Hubertus Friedrich of Loewenstein, *A Catholic in Republican Spain*, London: Victor Gollancz, 1937, p. 79.

⁵⁸ Global pacifist association created in September 1936 from numerous national and international political organizations. Various groups played a key role, from liberals to communists, but dropped out after the Soviet-German pact. It could be considered "finalement plus à l'image de l'élite politique et sociale du Front populaire, et de ses divisions de plus en plus importantes, que du seul Parti communiste", see Rachel Mazuy, "Le Rassemblement Universel pour la Paix (1931–1939): une organisation de masse?", in: *Matériaux pour l'histoire de notre temps*, 1993, vol. 30, pp. 40–44, quoted after p. 44.

⁵⁹ "The first religious building set on fire, possibly unintentionally, was the Protestant Evangelical chapel situated in 'calle Internacional', numbers 24–26, with schools attached", see Gonzalo Redondo, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

Je certifie, – he said in a farewell speech, – pour l’avoir vu de mes propres yeux, je le répète, que, par exemple, le culte protestant est célébré ouvertement, publiquement, dans l’Espagne républicaine. [...] Par contre, il est vrai que le culte catholique n’a pas été célébré publiquement. A qui en incombe la responsabilité? Est-ce que, en grande partie, elle ne correspond pas à l’Eglise? Sur ce point, il serait intéressant d’ouvrir un large débat. Pour des raisons que tout le monde comprendra, je ne veux point l’entreprendre.⁶⁰

A similar approach appears in a report of the British interreligious committee – which included two Catholics – who visited Spain at the beginning of the war, invited by the Republican government. The record of this visit, published in London in 1937, and cited by the name that appears first in the list of authors – the Dean of Canterbury – was discussed widely in propaganda and civil war disputes. Again, inquisitorial Spain appears in this viewpoint, in this case to explain why the Basques sided with the Republic. An interview with Minister Manuel de Irujo⁶¹ confirmed “what the delegation had already discovered in Bilbao – that the Basque Church was never subjected to the Inquisition, and consequently has never been affected by the political tendencies of the rest of the Church in Spain”.⁶²

Although “the delegation in making its Report had no desire to issue what may in any sense be described as partisan propaganda”, when the report did broach the religious question (which was the true purpose of the report), the delegation had no problem in confirming that “probably no less than ninety per cent of the clergy was implicated in the rebellion, and, even if sufficient numbers of them could be found

⁶⁰ Claudio Gutiérrez Marín and Louis G. Reynaud, *Le Pasteur J. Jézéquel visite l’Espagne républicaine*, Barcelona: Forja, 1938, p. 25. The author is a Spanish Protestant who recorded, on the date indicated, a radio broadcast by Jules Jézéquel.

⁶¹ Manuel de Irujo, Minister representing the Basque Nationalist Party. He was Minister between September 1936 and August 1938. He was Minister throughout the different governments during these years, except between May and December of 1937, when he was Minister of Justice. He attempted, without success, to normalize the Catholic cult in the Republic zone.

⁶² *Report of a Recent Religious Delegation to Spain, April 1937*, eds. The Dean of Canterbury [et. al.], London: Victor Gollancz Ltd, 1937.

and could be induced to return to their parishes, there would be a considerable danger of the churches under their influence becoming once again the centers of disloyal intrigue”⁶³. Despite the delegation’s explicit declaration of neutrality, they accepted, without an overly critical spirit, the explanation that the authorities had given as to why the Catholic churches remained closed in the Republican territory. The “other” Catholic – in this case, the clergy – was seen not only as inquisitorial but as a born conspirator, radically opposed to freedom of conscience and, consequently, to the entire democratic regime. As Prince Loewenstein suggested, the Spanish Church was contrary even to Catholicism. The “other” Catholic, in Spain, ended up being a “unicum” hardly accepted by anybody, whether Catholic or Protestant, revolutionary or democrat. It was the “other” in an absolute sense, anachronistic, a historical relic that had survived inexplicably, but which was radically incompatible with the present time.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 30–32.

GAŠPER MITHANS

ON THE FIELD OF CONFLICT: POWER RELATIONS
AMONG CATHOLICS, SERBIAN ORTHODOX
CHRISTIANS, MUSLIMS AND STATE AUTHORITIES
IN THE KINGDOM OF YUGOSLAVIA

THEORETICAL INTRODUCTION

In the contribution, I would like to apply Bourdieu's account of modernity as a process of increasing differentiation of "fields"¹ to the context of interwar Yugoslavia. In the case study, I will analyse the relations among major Yugoslav religious communities, political parties and State authorities in the time of Concordat crisis. Therefore I will firstly define some of the main concepts which I will draw upon.

Due to modernization, economic, religious, political, artistic, bureaucratic, etc. fields separate and become increasingly monopolized by competing professional groups, each deploying its own forms of capital to maximize its material and symbolic interests². Each of these fields competes to impose its particular vision of the social world on society as a whole. Bourdieu posits that human existence is essentially conflictual; agents act strategically (unconsciously rather than consciously), since their social existence is bound up in the relational production of

¹ A field is according to Pierre Bourdieu a setting in which agents and their social positions are located, see Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: a Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, London: Routledge, 1984. In other words, it is a network, structure or set of relationships which may be intellectual, religious, educational, cultural, etc; see also Zander Navarro, "In Search of Cultural Interpretation of Power", in: *IDS Bulletin*, Brighton, 2006, vol. 37, no. 6, p. 18.

² Alan Scott, "We are the State. Pierre Bourdieu on the State and Political Field", in: *Rivista di Storia delle Idee*, Palermo, 2013, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 165–170.

difference. But this conflict can take many forms, depending on the kinds of “capital” that agents possess³. In the sphere of politics, this heightened differentiation takes the form of a shift from the “dynastic state”, in which the basic unit and organizing principle is the (royal) house, to the modern state, in which the house has been displaced by the bureau, and private interests of the monarch by the “reasons of state”⁴.

In the case of interwar Yugoslavia, one can observe the intertwining of the “dynastic” rule and the modern state apparatus, so the differentiation was still in process. The royal power had, over a decade that the new state had existed, even increased, when in the wake of a serious internal crisis King Aleksandar Karadjordjević introduced a dictatorship (1929-1934). However, over that period, religious laws and constitutions for most of the recognized religions were enacted and the concordat was initialed. Legislation for religious communities shows, on the one hand, differentiation from the State and, on the other, the will of the State to control religious communities and meddle in their affairs. Another important indicator of the ongoing differentiation was the overlapping of religious and political fields, which can also be identified as slow secularization of the State (e.g., registers were still maintained by religious communities) and clericalism (Catholic as well as Serbian Orthodox).

Further, I will analyse two fields in particular: political and religious. The political field is “a field where ‘political products’ are formed through the competition between political agents in creating political ideas, programs and concepts. The citizen then has to choose among these products, reducing the status of the citizen to that of a ‘consumer’”⁵. Wacquant points out that “the analysis of the functioning

³ Rodney Benson, “Shaping the Public Sphere: Habermas and Beyond”, in: *The American Sociologist*, 2009, vol. 40, Springer Science + Business Media, pp. 175–197, in: <https://steinhardt.nyu.edu/scmsAdmin/uploads/006/243/Benson%202009%20American%20Sociologist%20FINAL.pdf>.

⁴ Alan Scott, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

⁵ Pierre Bourdieu, “Political Representation: Elements for a Theory of the Political Field”, in: *Language and Symbolic Power*, ed. John B. Thompson, Cambridge, USA: Harvard University, 1991, pp. 171–202.

of parties and parliaments discloses that “the political field is one of the privileged sites for the exercise of the *power of representation or manifestation* [in the sense of public demonstration] that contributes to making what existed in a practical state, tacitly or implicitly, exist fully, that is, in the objectified state, in a form directly visible to all, public, published, official, and thus authorized”⁶. Whereas the religious field is a competitive arena, the structure of which determines both the form and the representation of religious dynamics⁷. While Bourdieu considers the competition between religious specialists for religious power to be the central principle informing the dynamics of the religious field⁸, it is important to point out the role of laypeople, members of religious communities who may accumulate and wield religious capital even though they do not produce it⁹.

A concept that is commonly used, but rarely reflected on in historiography, is *power*. While Foucault sees power as “ubiquitous” and beyond agency or structure, Bourdieu sees power as culturally and symbolically created, and constantly re-legitimised through an interplay of agency and structure. People often experience power differently, depending on which field they are in at a given moment¹⁰. However, the object of this study is, principally, institutions. But the way these institutions correspond to their “subjects”, how they maintain their power and control, is essential to comprehending their functioning and relations towards other institutions and communities. To analyze *power relations* between religious communities, I will point

⁶ Loïc Wacquant, “Pointers on Pierre Bourdieu and Democratic Politics”, in: *Constellations*, Oxford, 2004, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 4.

⁷ Pierre Bourdieu, “Legitimation and Structured Interests in Weber’s Sociology of Religion”, in: *Max Weber: Rationality and Modernity*, ed. Sam Whimster and Scott Lash, London: Allen and Unwin, 1987, p. 121.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ Cf. Bradford Verter, “Spiritual Capital: Theorizing Religion with Bourdieu against Bourdieu”, in: *Sociological Theory*, 2003, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 157–158.

¹⁰ John Gaventa, *Power after Lukes: An overview of power since Lukes and their application to development*, 2003, first draft, in: http://www.powercube.net/wp-content/uploads/2009/11/power_after_lukes.pdf [2013-09-05].

out conflictual interests and affinities, the interaction between one party and “the Other”¹¹.

POLITICAL BACKGROUND OF THE KINGDOM OF SERBS,
CROATS, AND SLOVENES/YUGOSLAVIA

In the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, known as the Kingdom of Yugoslavia since 1929, three major religious communities coexisted: Serbian Orthodox Christians (46.6%), Roman Catholics (39.4%; mostly Slovenes and Croats) and Muslims (11,2%)¹². In the nascent South Slav State, the relationships among religious institutions had been aggravated by unresolved national questions and past conflicts¹³.

As the state’s initial name suggests, only three “tribes”, which presumably formed one Yugoslav nation, were recognized: the Serbs, the Croats and the Slovenes. Even among the “naming” nations, differences formed political programs, especially regarding interactions between the Croats and the Serbs, consequently also the Roman Catholic Church (RCC) and the Serbian Orthodox Church (SOC). The Croats and the Slovenes expected the kingdom to be a federal state, but their representatives at the negotiations for the creation of the state left that question open. In practice, that meant that they agreed to a centralised system in which the biggest group prevailed. So the Serbs, in spite of having only a relative majority in terms of national composition of the kingdom¹⁴, controlled the state apparatus from beginning to

¹¹ Cf. Michel Foucault, “The Subject and Power”, in: *Critical Inquiry*, Chicago, 1982, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 777–795.

¹² According to the 1921 population census see Juraj Kolarić, *Ekumenska trilogija: istočni kršćani: pravoslavni: protestanti*, Zagreb: Prometej, 2005, p. 893.

¹³ As Radmila Radić states, the three religious institutions never in 70 years of the existence of Yugoslav state(s) established a genuine cooperation, see Radmila Radić, “Religion in the multinational state: the case study of Yugoslavia”, in: *Yugoslavism: Histories of a Failed idea*, ed. Dejan Djokić, London: Hurst&Company, p. 196; Paul Mojzes, *Yugoslavian Inferno: Ethnoreligious Warfare in the Balkans*, New York: Continuum Publishing Company.

¹⁴ The national composition of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes (1921) was: Serbs and Montenegrins 38,8 %, Croats 23,9 %, Slovenes 8.5 %, Muslims

end, i.e., they had a majority in the National Assembly, dominated the Government¹⁵ and the army.

Muslims from Bosnia and Herzegovina, being a part of the State of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs¹⁶, agreed to the unification with the Kingdom of Serbia and the Kingdom of Montenegro, but, as pre-1918 Yugoslavism was essentially a Serbo-Croat-Slovene idea, they were in many aspects overlooked. Besides, their autonomist movement (*neobošnjaštvo*) had not emerged before the 1930s¹⁷. Their party politics, however, had started to develop in the last years of Austria-Hungary and resumed in the 1920s as the Yugoslav Muslim Organisation, which was closely tied to the Islamic religious community¹⁸.

Much more injustice was done to the Macedonians, the Montenegrins and minorities like the Albanians which also caused more turmoil¹⁹. Macedonia (referred to only as Southern Serbia) and Kosovo (with an Albanian majority) were annexed by force. The Kingdom of Montenegro united with the Kingdom of Serbia, but not to form a confederation

6.3 %, Macedonians 5,3 % and minorities: Germans 4,3%, Albanians 4,0 %, Magyars 3,9 %, Romanians 1,6 %, Turks 1,2 %, Italians 0,1 %, other Slavs 1,6 %, others 0,3 %, see: Sabrina P. Ramet, *The three Yugoslavias: state building and legitimation, 1918–2005*, Washington: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006, p. 45; Juraj Kolarić, *op. cit.*, p. 893.

¹⁵ In 37 governments and 13 different prime ministers in the period of 1918–1941, there was only one non-Serb prime minister, a Slovenian politician and head of Slovene People's Party Anton Korošec (27. 7. 1928 – 6. 1. 1929), but even then the majority of the ministers in the government coalition were Serbs.

¹⁶ This formation, composed of the South Slavs territory of former Austria-Hungary, existed about a month, until 1st of December 1918.

¹⁷ See Xavier Bougarel, "Bosnian Muslims and the Yugoslav Idea", in: *Yugoslavism: Histories of a Failed idea*, ed. Dejan Djokić, London: Hurst & Company, pp. 100–105.

¹⁸ There existed also other less influential political parties, in mid-1930s however, *Muslim Organisation* emerged, a political party that defeated Yugoslav Muslim Organisation (then part of Yugoslav Radical Union) in 1938.

¹⁹ Several paramilitary formations broke out in the kingdom (1918–1941): some were separatist (e. g. Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organisation, Ustaša Movement in Croatia), other Yugoslav "unitarists" (e. g. Organization of Yugoslav Nationalists (ORJUNA), Chetniks) with a more or less all strong Serbian sentiment.

as it had been planned. Serbia had liberated Montenegro, occupied by the Axis Powers, and took control over the unification. The resolution by which Montenegrin King Nikola I Petrović-Njegoš was deposed and the decision to unite with the Kingdom of Serbia under the House of Karadjordjević and later join the state of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, was adopted while the assembly building was encircled by a detachment of the Serbian army. Soon afterwards, a civil war broke out between zeleniši (the Greens), who demanded a complete autonomy for Montenegro, and the pro-unification forces bjelaši (the Whites)²⁰.

In brief, expectations for what so culturally, ethnically and historically diverse country should bring were too high.

The “democratic chaos” in parliament in Belgrade²¹, which included shooting on Stjepan Radić, the leader of the biggest Croatian political party, the Croatian Peasant Party, in 1928 and the general political crisis were used as a pretext for King Aleksandar Karadjordjević to introduce the 6 January dictatorship in 1929. In this “traditional autocratic dictatorship”²², all political parties were dissolved, although it was possible to establish a political party without any religious, “tribal” or regional character nor opposition to national unity and integrity of the state²³. Ironically, the new regime brought all the main political parties together for the first time – the “clerical” Slovenian People’s Party²⁴, the Croatian Peasant Party, the Yugoslav Muslim Organization and two largest (mostly) Serbian parties: the National Radical Party and the Democratic Party – but in opposition. Within a short period of time, a large number of new laws was adopted in order to endorse

²⁰ See Sabrina P. Ramet, *op. cit.*

²¹ 11 governments changed in the period of approximately ten years (1918-12-01 – 1929-01-06).

²² See Eric J. Hobsbawm, *Nacije in nacionalizem po letu 1870*, Ljubljana: Založba, 2007, p. 107.

²³ See Jure Gašparič, *SLS pod kraljevo diktaturo. Diktatura kralja Aleksandra in politika Slovenske ljudske stranke v letih 1929–1935*, Ljubljana: Modrijan, 2007, p. 123.

²⁴ Former Slovene People’s Party had joined the dictatorial government (Yugoslav Radical Peasants’ Democracy) but moved to opposition in 1931 while they again adopted the autonomist program.

integral Yugoslavism as the official state ideology²⁵. As Troch states, “it is clear that it [Yugoslavism] was designed to be a synthesis of Croatian, Slovenian and Serbian symbolic resources into a Yugoslav whole. However, the particular way in which the regime applied this national ideology very much discredited the idea of Yugoslavism itself. Precisely because the regime proclaimed Yugoslavism as the cornerstone of its authoritarian politics, opposition against the regime was also expressed as opposition against Yugoslavism. The Yugoslav idea, which had previously been a progressive idea, popular among intellectual circles in all parts of Yugoslavia and certainly not incompatible with Slovenianism, Croatianism or Serbianism, was more and more interpreted as a conservative, authoritarian, anti-national idea.”²⁶ Bringing “order” to parliament²⁷ did not solve anything; on the contrary, it generated more problems and opposition had more support. The final “result” of violating human rights was the assassination of “the porcelain dictator”²⁸ in Marseille in 1934 by Ustaša – the Croatian Revolutionary Movement and the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization.

In the case study, I will focus on the period when Milan Stojadinović was the head of the government (1935–1939), while the regime to some extent liberalized. If this was a period of stability (as Stojadinović was the only prime minister who managed to last his entire term), it was surely the time of the gravest conflicts between the two major churches in Yugoslavia. Besides, it was also the time of the financial crisis and crucial “turnovers” in foreign policy with

²⁵ See Pieter Troch, “Yugoslavism Between the World Wars: Indecisive Nation-Building”, in: *Nationalities Papers*, Gent, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 227–244.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 235.

²⁷ In 1931 semi-parliamentary system was installed and elections were held but only parties that ran in all electoral districts and enjoyed the support of the new political elite could take part, plus new Constitution (decreed by the King in the same year) and election laws ensured that the winner party would surely dominate the parliament. Thus only governmental list Yugoslav Radical Peasants’ Democracy (in 1933 renamed to Yugoslav National Party) was participating at the elections.

²⁸ Mussolini called King Aleksandar Karadjordjević “the porcelain dictator”, see Jože Pirjevec, *Jugoslavija 1918–1992: nastanek, razvoj ter razpad Karadjordjevićeve in Titove Jugoslavije*, Koper: Založba Lipa, 1995.

significantly increased economic cooperation with the Third Reich and improved relations with Fascist Italy.

To summarize: “The kingdom functioned in its first decade as a non-consensual quasi-parliamentary system and subsequently first as a royal dictatorship (1929–1934), then as a police state (1934–1939), and eventually as a Serb-Croat condominium (1939–1941).”²⁹ That was the last attempt to improve relations between the Serbs and the Croats by giving the latter more autonomy. However, it was already too late and World War II was close.

YUGOSLAV CONCORDAT AND THE “OTHER”

Religion is based on “the Other”³⁰. The question of “the Other”, however, is not confined to relations between only two actors, such as Christians and non-Christians as is often the case; I will analyse relations among all most important religious and political actors in the context of the conflict over the ratification of the Concordat, where religious identity plays a crucial role.

While referring to “the One” and to “the Other”, it is essential to note that the concept is fluid: one can be seen as “the Other” in religious terms, but as an ally (“the One”) in political terms, he/she may be “the Other” in national terms but is a citizen of the same state (e. g. Croat as opposed to Serb, but both Yugoslavs). Therefore, I will analyse separate fields – religious and political – and their overlapping, as well as consider the national and the state level.

The climax of interreligious tensions in interwar Yugoslavia was the so-called Concordat crisis³¹ in 1937 (1936–1938), therefore it will be used as a case study. As nearly all bigger conflicts in the aftermath of

²⁹ Sabrina P. Ramet, “Vladko Maček and the Croatian Peasant Defence in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia”, in: *Contemporary European History*, Cambridge, 2007, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 215–231.

³⁰ Michel de Certeau, *Bela ekstaza: izbrani spisi o krščanski duhovnosti*, Ljubljana: KUD Logos, 2005, p. 18.

³¹ See Ivo Perica, *Balkan Idols: Religion in Yugoslav States*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 17–19.

the Great War, it was nationally, politically and religiously motivated. The protagonists in this struggle were the government of the Yugoslav Radical Union led by Stojadinović, the Catholic Church, the Serbian Orthodox Church and the Yugoslav National Party (“Free-Masons”), as well as the former Croatian Peasants’ Party and the Islamic religious community that were neutral.

The dictatorial government and the King introduced a number of laws that violated religious rights, however, it would be a shallow argument to say that their policies were anti-religious in general. They certainly wanted to limit political activities of religious institutions. For example, King Aleksandar demanded that an article be added to the Concordat proposal prohibiting the active clergy to engage in politics. He keenly insisted that this limitation be broadened to all recognized religions in Yugoslavia³². However, it was only after the death of King Aleksandar Karadjordjević that the relationship between the State and the Serbian Orthodox Church deteriorated³³, because the latter thought the government favoured the Catholic Church³⁴.

The King’s priority during his personal dictatorship was also to regulate relations among the religious communities themselves. Therefore, in 1929-1930 religion laws and religious constitutions were concluded with the Serbian Orthodox Church, the Christian Reformed Church, the Islamic religious community and the Jewish religious community. Only the legal status of the Roman Catholic Church, second largest religious institution in the kingdom, remained unresolved. Preparations for the Yugoslav concordat started already in 1922, and King Aleksandar was eager to finally close that chapter too. Therefore, to escape public pressure and the interference of the Yugoslav Catholic Church, the

³² Engelbert Besednjak at the audience by the King Aleksandar Karadjordjević [report], Belgrade, 1933-10-28, in: Slovenia, *The Private Archive of Engelbert Besednjak*, b. 120.

³³ Radmila Radić, *op. cit.*, p. 198.

³⁴ Annie Lacroix-Riz, *Vatikan, Evropa i rajh: od Prvog svetskog rata do hladnog rata*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik, 2006, pp. 121, 354–355; cf. Charles Loiseau, “Deux conversations avec le roi Alexandre sur le Concordat yougoslave”, in: *L’Europe nouvelle*, Paris, 1935, no. 903, p. 14.

King started secret negotiations for the concordat in 1933. On the Yugoslavian side, they were conducted by Nikola Moscatello, while the Holy See's representative was Cardinal Eugenio Pacelli, the Secretary of the State. After approximately two years of coordination of viewpoints, the treaty was finally signed on the 25 July 1935³⁵.

All Yugoslav governments wanted to conclude the concordat for several reasons, such as the need for regulation of the legislation of the Catholic Church (there were six different "acting" legislations for the Catholic Church), governmental intentions to enhance Yugoslav international reputation, political pressures of France³⁶, the strengthening of the Catholic Church in the fight against Communism³⁷ and its potential effect on the resolution of the national question; above all, they hoped the concordat would diminish the Croats' demands for broader autonomy³⁸. However, they had to face serious obstacles and interferences which resulted in prolonged negotiations. These were the consequences of tactical delaying by the Yugoslav government, of interventions and complaints by the Yugoslav episcopate, Italian opposition to the Yugoslav concordat, indifference towards the concordat

³⁵ See Gašper Mithans, "Vloga tajnega pogajalca pri sklepanju jugoslovanskega konkordata", in: *Acta Histriae*, Koper, 2013, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 1–16; Gašper Mithans, "Sklepanje jugoslovanskega konkordata in konkordatska kriza leta 1937", in: *Zgodovinski časopis*, Ljubljana, 2011, vol. 65, no. 1–2, pp. 120–151; Igor Salmič, *Le trattative per il concordato tra la Santa Sede e il Regno dei Serbi, Croati e Sloveni/Jugoslavia (1922–1935) e la mancata ratifica (1937–1938): Estratto della dissertazione per il dottorato nella Facoltà di Storia e Beni Culturali della Chiesa della Pontificia Università Gregoriana*, doctoral dissertation, Rome: Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2013.

³⁶ Peter C. Kent, *The Pope and the Duce: the international impact of the Lateran Agreements*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981, p. 157.

³⁷ Also Mussolini saw the Catholic Church as a defender against Communism, see Richard J. Wolff, "Italy, Catholics, clergy, and the Church", in: *Catholics, the State and the European Radical Right 1919–1945*, eds. Richard J. Wolff, Jörg K. Hoensch, New York: Columbia University Press, 1987, p. 142.

³⁸ Rhodes, *The Vatican in the Age of the Dictators 1922–1945*, London, Sydney, Auckland, Toronto: Hodder and Stoughton, 1973, p. 157; Stella Alexander, "Croatia: the Catholic Church", in: *Catholics, the State and the European Radical Right 1919–1945*, eds. Richard J. Wolff, Jörg K. Hoensch, New York: Columbia University Press, 1987, p. 37.

by the “political representative” of the biggest Catholic nation in the state – the former Croatian Peasant Party – and sluggish engagement of the former Slovene People’s Party³⁹.

So the first major task of the next government of the Yugoslav Radical Union (YRU) was the signing and then the ratification of the concordat in parliament and the senate. The “postdictatorial” government was called also the government of Stojadinović-Korošec-Spaho after its “founders”: the first (also the prime minister) represented the Serbs and Serbian Orthodox Christians; the second, the Slovenes and Catholics (as a leader of the former Catholic political party, the Slovene People’s Party); and the third, Muslims (as a president of the former Yugoslav Muslim Organization)⁴⁰. Also, this government roughly followed the political line of previous governments regarding the concordat as a means to strengthen their domestic and foreign political situation.

THE CONCORDAT ON RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL FIELD

Collaboration of the Serbs with small political parties such as the Slovene People’s Party or the Yugoslav Muslim Organization was nothing new, in fact it was of significant importance also regarding the Concordat and the “religious balance” in the state. It is significant, though, that both “smaller” partners in this coalition wanted changes in the religious legislation; one succeeded, the other not, but came close.

In the religious field, the coexistence of so many religions among peoples who were historically used to a system of a state religion or a religion that dominated was difficult to come to terms with. The more political capital religious institutions had, the better off they were. Thus

³⁹ See Gašper Mithans, *Urejanje odnosov med Rimskokatoliško cerkvijo in državnimi oblastmi v Kraljevini Jugoslaviji (1918–1941) in jugoslovanski konkordat*, doctoral dissertation, Koper: Univerza na Primorskem, 2012.

⁴⁰ Stojadinović had in the speech before the Committee for the assessment of the Concordat Proposal on July 8 1937, two weeks before the voting in the National Assembly, used Boccaccio’s Tale of the Three Rings to illustrate the relationship between the Serb Orthodox, the Catholics and the Muslims in Yugoslavia as three brothers, see Dragoljub R. Živojinović, Dejan V. Lučić, *Varvarstvo u ime Hristovo*, Beograd: Nova knjiga, 1988, pp. 426–436.

Catholics were disadvantaged because Yugoslav governments associated Catholics with the Habsburg Monarchy (and therefore considered them “latently separatist”) on the one hand and with the Croatian opposition to Yugoslavism on the other. The Serbian Orthodox Church had always legally⁴¹ and otherwise enjoyed the privileged position, with the exception of the concordat crisis when its relationship with the state was critical. As Banac highlights, the unitarists and Great Serbs viewed Orthodoxy as native and national, whereas Catholicism was condemned as anti-Slavic⁴². The “linkage” to the Vatican was considered suspicious by critics of the Concordat as well.

The situation of Muslims was very specific. The Islamic Religious Community, Muslims in Bosnia and Herzegovina, was deprived of vital religious rights by the religious law and the religious constitution of the Islamic Religious Community that the dictatorial government introduced in 1930⁴³. According to that legislation, all Muslims in Yugoslavia formed one religious community with a seat of *reis-ul-ulema* (Grand Mufti) in Belgrade. *Reis-ul-ulema*, members of *Ulema-medžlis* and muftiate were named by the king according to the proposal of the minister of justice and in consensus with the prime minister. The Islamic Religious Community could manage its religious property (*waqfs*), but only under state supervision. The dissatisfaction of Muslims grew so large that Stojadinović, trying to reconcile them, offered the former Yugoslav Muslim Organization a place in the government coalition. As signing the concordat approached, the conflict between the State and Muslims

⁴¹ Since the introduction of the Constitution in 1921 all acknowledged religions had an equal status, however, according to Perica, the Serbian Church in the mid-1920s obtained a special law by which it became the de facto state religion, see Ivo Perica, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

⁴² Ivo Banac, *The National in Yugoslavia: Origins, History, Politics*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984, p. 411.

⁴³ In 1909 Islamic community in Bosnia and Herzegovina after long struggle ensured religious autonomy in Austria-Hungary, the religious and *waqf* management were chosen democratically, the shariat courts were acknowledged. Reis-ul-ulema Čaušević didn't succeed in his fight against centralism and had resigned – retired in 1930, see Ivan Mužić, *Katoliška crkva u Kraljevini Jugoslaviji*, Split: Crkva u svijetu, 1978, pp. 33–36.

worsened. Mehmed Spaho, the leader of the former Yugoslav Muslim Organization, accepted the position of the minister of transportation under the condition of new legislation for the Islamic community⁴⁴. The new religious Constitution for the Islamic community was adopted in 1936 with assurances that Muslims would not interfere with the concordat ratification. The promise was kept and they remained the “loyal” coalition partner. Fehim Spaho, Mehmed Spaho’s brother, became the new *reis-ul-ulema* and, according to the new constitution, the seat of *reis-ul-ulema* moved back to Sarajevo and the system of muftiships was cancelled. Particularly important was one article, stating the equality of recognized religions and that should any other religion be granted more rights, the same rights would be granted also to the Islamic community. This article was added because conflicts over the concordat were escalating, but this way, the Islamic community had no reason to engage in the conflict⁴⁵.

For the concordat to come into force it had to be ratified in parliament and the senate. Following the signing of the concordat in July 1935, the process dragged on over more than two years of political tactics and, after November 1936, also open protests. Massive demonstrations erupted in 1937, led by the former government party – the Yugoslav National Party – and the Serbian Orthodox Church, joined by almost all political parties in the Serbian part of Yugoslavia, except the fascist Ljotić’s Zbor and the Communist Party. In the arena of conflicts fuelled by religious tensions, nationalism and lust for (political) power, mostly Serbian Orthodox public was mobilized into mass protests against the concordat.

The question of “the Other” is always linked to social boundaries, usually cultural, religious, national and political; it may be all of them together. The Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina were part of Austria-Hungary since 1878, they spoke “Serbo-Croatian” language, they were culturally fully integrated, but in Yugoslavia they lost important rights that they had succeeded to secure after a long battle. Their pragmatism,

⁴⁴ Mehmed Spaho should firstly become Minister of Justice but as that minister was assigned to go to sign the concordat in Rome, Spaho was substituted due to his religious affiliation with a Catholic Ljudevit Auer.

⁴⁵ Ivan Mužić, *op. cit.*, pp. 33–37; Radmila Radić, *op. cit.*, pp. 199–200.

demand for new legislation and later agreement to non-interference in the concordat “struggle” was to be expected. Meanwhile, the concordat opponents – the Serbian-Orthodox Church and political opposition – had different motives, all (poorly) disguised under “concerns” for the violation of constitutional and religious rights and presumed huge financial burden for the state.

If Catholics were to get the concordat as a way of compensation for the suppression of their rights – even though that was unlikely because Croats nearly rejected the concordat, calling it the “work of the Serbs” – the government did not offer any compensation to the Serbian-Orthodox Church as it had to Muslims. The Serbian Orthodox Church, obviously, was not satisfied with the position and despite its former approval of the concordat – the secret concordat proposal was shown to the patriarch several times⁴⁶, which was certainly a more than unusual practice – demanded the cancellation of the concordat proposal. To achieve that they were “prepared to use any means necessary”⁴⁷. As the government realized their mistake, it was already too late to establish a dialogue with representatives of the Serbian Orthodox Church. The feeling of the Serbian Orthodox Church that it was overlooked was exploited by opposition political parties that desired to overthrow the government.

A concordat deals with religious matters, it is a legal treaty concluded between the Holy See and the highest state authority for the Catholic community in that state. However, the Yugoslav concordat had politically and nationally divided even Catholics (Croats were indifferent) while the perception of the “greedy” Catholic Church and the Vatican as collaborators of the fascist Italy was a tool for inspiring anti-concordat protests among the masses⁴⁸.

The main field of the concordat struggle was political. It drew on religious and national antagonisms as well, but – in my hypothesis –

⁴⁶ Gavriilo Dožić, *Memoari patriarha srpskog Gavrila*, Beograd: Sfairos, 1990, p. 96.

⁴⁷ Orthodox New Year’s speech of Varnava, the patriarch of the Serbian Orthodox Church, 1937-01-13, in: *Archive of Yugoslavia*, f. 102: Krakov Stanislav, b. 7, fol. 18.

⁴⁸ See Olga Manojlović-Pintar, “Još jednom o konkordatskoj krizi”, in: *Tokovi istorije*, Beograd, 2006, no. 1–2, pp. 157–171.

if the struggle had shifted to the national level, the threat of a civil war would have become a reality (due to the overlappings of Croats-Catholics, Serbs-Orthodox). It is no anachronism to speak of this threat, also because the main protagonists of the time – for example, Stojadinović⁴⁹ – did mention it in their memoirs. Moreover, the engagement of the Serbian-Orthodox Church in the concordat crisis was political in character. A good example of that are the excommunications of the Orthodox members of parliament who voted for the concordat. The struggle was predominantly a political one also because a major defender of the concordat was in fact the government because of the decision of the Bishops' conference of Yugoslavia not to interfere. The appeal of the Archbishop of Zagreb Alojzije Stepinac to Catholics not to engage in the arguments⁵⁰ was a decision that probably prevented major mass conflicts. Indifference of the formerly biggest Croatian political party and relative distance of the former Slovene People's Party (the biggest "clerical" – Catholic party) towards the concordat put the government in an even worse position. Protests have even intensified after the confirmation of the concordat in the National Assembly in July 1937 and the death of the Serbian patriarch Varnava the next day. Consequently, ratification of the concordat in the Senate was dropped after a couple of postponements⁵¹. It could be argued that the government "had to fail" because they lacked symbolic capital – which they could have gotten from the Bishops' conference – and because of a new treaty with Italy which "shuttered" and diminished their political capital.

The political character of the conflict is evident in the case of the Yugoslav National Party. The governmental party in the time of dictatorship was known also by their members' allegiance to the Free-Masons. It can be roughly said that the "Free-Masonic" elements "erupted" in 1930, a matter that was also a subject of correspondence

⁴⁹ Milan M. Stojadinović, *Ni rat ni pakt: Jugoslavija između dva rata*, Rijeka: Otokar Keršovani, 1970, p. 477.

⁵⁰ "Pomirjevalen razglas nadškofa dr. Stepinca z ozirom na konkordat", in: *Slovenec*, 1938-02-15.

⁵¹ Gašper Mithans, *Urejanje odnosov med Rimskokatoliško cerkvijo*.

between Yugoslav nuncio Ermenegildo Pellegrinetti and the Holy See⁵². Most party members were free-masons or at least alleged free-masons⁵³. The lot also included one of the prime ministers (Milan Srškić) and the minister of justice (Božidar Maksimović), both of whom were responsible for the conclusion of the concordat. However, the same politicians who had successfully concluded the concordat negotiations, became its greatest opponents soon after Regent Pavle Karadjordjević replaced them following unsatisfactory electoral results in 1935; they had only one goal – to govern again.

This “two-faced” stance was criticized, interestingly enough, by the Communist Party. The Communists’ anti-concordat sentiments were to be anticipated, though their arguments drew from their distrust of the government and their “traditional” distrust of the Holy See, especially after 1929, when the Lateran treaty was signed, the act interpreted as “the Pope’s pact with Mussolini”⁵⁴. Of course, all political parties in the opposition saw this “crisis” as an opportunity to overthrow the government.

The rhetoric of the critics was noteworthy when they emphasized that they did not have anything against Catholics or the concordat *per se*, merely against the concordat proposal in question⁵⁵. Furthermore, they claimed it would not do any good for Catholics either. That is to say, the criticism was directed at the Catholic Church as an institution and the government that supported it, i.e., at politics and not religious belief.

Of course, there was some basis to the criticism. The concordat gave the Catholic Church certain privileges that no other or very few concordats had, but they were all comparable to the rights of the

⁵² The letter of Yugoslav nuncio Pellegrinetti to Pacelli, Secretary of the State, subject: Colloquio col Principe Reggente Paolo – Abissinia – Scuole Cattoliche – Concordato, Belgrade, 1935-11-14, in: *Archivio Segreto Vaticano*, f. Archivio Nunziatura Jugoslavia 1209, b. 6.

⁵³ Well known free-masons were M. Srškić, V. Marinković, S. Švrļjuga, D. Kojic, Z. Mazuranic, J. Demetrović, K. Kumanudi, O. Frangeš, M. Drinković, M. Kostrenčić, U. Krulj, A. Kramer and B. Maksimović.

⁵⁴ Dragoljub R. Živojinović, Dejan V. Lučić, *op. cit.*, pp. 471–473.

⁵⁵ See Manojlović-Pintar, *op. cit.*

Serbian-Orthodox Church⁵⁶. To name but one: Nothing in school textbooks was to offend religious feelings of Catholics⁵⁷. That was nearly the same article as the one in the Austrian concordat (1855) that started the *Kulturkampf* in Austria. The analogy was not missed, as the name Yugoslav *Kulturkampf* soon appeared in newspapers. One way or another, the Kingdom of Yugoslavia was still far from a secular state, as, for instance, the registers (of birth, marriage and death) were still maintained by the clergy, civil marriage was possible only in formerly Hungarian parts of Yugoslavia and religious courts had extensive judicial competencies. The “special” article in the Constitution of the Islamic Religious Community (1936) is a presupposition that the concordat included rights that at least Muslims did not enjoy. A similar article was added to the concordat, just reversed – that if there was a right in the concordat that other recognized religious communities did not have, they would get it. Whether the concordat really violated the equality of religious rights is somewhat uncertain, we could only say that Muslims would have probably been satisfied with the same rights as Catholics, while Serbian Orthodox Christians wanted a “deal” as well, to be granted right that would have likely exceeded the religious rights of Catholics, i. e. the rights of any other religious community in the state.

CONCLUSION

That is how the political game was played out, camouflaged in religion in order to mobilize the support of the masses and with a greater or lesser involvement of religious institutions. But, as it turned out, both sides lost; on the one hand, the government, regency and the Catholic Church did not manage to conclude the concordat and, on the other hand, the political opposition did not overthrow Stojadinović. All was over when the government reconciled with the Serbian Orthodox Church, the only actor who accomplished all that it wanted.

⁵⁶ See Gašper Mithans, *Urejanje odnosov med Rimskokatoliško cerkvijo*.

⁵⁷ That is the article 27 of the Concordat proposal (1935), see Rado Kušej, *Konkordat: ustava in verska ravnopravnost*, Ljubljana: J. Blasnika nasl., 1937.

What does that tell us about the differentiation of fields in modernity in the case of interwar Yugoslavia? The process of secularization of the state progressed, especially in the dictatorial period. But one conclusion that can be drawn from the concordat struggle is that the Yugoslav government could not function without the support of the Serbian Orthodox Church or, to put it more aptly, while in conflict with it. Still, the religious and political fields were separated but overlapped on many points, as the religious communities still kept much of the authority and competencies that would later be transferred to the state.

ANDERS JARLERT

THE APPLICATION OF THE NUREMBERG RACE
LAWS ON CHRISTIAN AND NON-CHRISTIAN JEWS
BY THE CHURCH OF SWEDEN, 1935–1945

In this paper, I will discuss the effect of the Nuremberg Laws on impediments of marriage in the Church of Sweden, 1935–1945, as an example of how the encounter and relations between Christians and the non-Christian other were problematized after Christians of Jewish descent had been defined as “others” by the National Socialist race laws. Consequently, when dealing with history, we must, at least sometimes, speak about the Christians, the others, and the “other” Christians.

THE NUREMBERG RACE LAWS
AND THE SWEDISH SITUATION

According to the Nuremberg Laws of September 1935, German citizens of so-called Aryan descent were prohibited from marrying Germans or foreigners of Jewish descent. This effect of German law in several European countries was in accordance with the Hague Convention of 1902, which had been in force in Sweden since 1904. Since the literal interest of the Nuremberg Laws was not to exclude Jews, but to protect “German blood”, Jewish refugees from Germany were allowed to marry foreign citizens, Jewish or non-Jewish alike. Formally, the limits were set not for them, but for the so-called Aryans.

Within Germany, the Nuremberg Laws affected approximately 502,000 “full Jews”, defined according to “race”. Of these, 450,000 were defined as Jews also according to religion, while 50,000 were Christian “full Jews”, and 2,000 Christian “three-quarterly Jews”. Further affected were between 195,000 and 205,000 *Mischlinge*, of

which 70–75 thousands were “half-Jews” and 125–130 thousands “quarterly Jews”¹. According to the implementation rules of November 1935, the definition of who was and who was not a Jew was to rely on annotations on religion in the records. This implies that a person’s race was judged not only according to the person’s own religion, but according to his or her grandparents’ religion as well.

Still, one cannot say that the National Socialist definition of “Jews” was based on religion and not on race. The religion of one’s grandparents was only one component, though often the most important one. Since no one had been registered according to “race”, the investigation was bound to rely on records of the religion of a person’s ancestors. This reveals that the very concept of blood-based race legislation was logically flawed². It could suffice to have paid taxes to an Israelite religious community or – for a *Mischling* – to be married to a Jew. This shows that the matter was not a religious one, but covered different forms of recorded extensions to the mythically-understood Jewry³. Historian Raul Hilberg has correctly stated that the Nuremberg Laws were “based on the descent: the religious status of the grandparents”, and that there was “a sizeable group of people who were Christian by religion and Jews by decree”, who became victims to the race laws⁴.

Not all European states were parties to the Hague Convention of 1902. In his great study of the Nuremberg Laws and the deprivation

¹ Saul Friedländer, *Nazi Germany and the Jews*, vol. 1, New York: Harper Collins, 1997, p. 151.

² Norbert Frei, “Die Juden im NS-Staat”, in: *Das Dritte Reich: Ursprünge, Ereignisse, Wirkungen*, Martin Broszat & Norbert Frei (Hg.), 1983, p. 188.

³ Cf. Michael Ley, “Zum Schutze des deutschen Blutes...”, In: “*Rassenschande*” – *Gesetze im Nationalsozialismus*, 1997, pp. 23, 77.

⁴ Ingvar Svanberg, Mattias Tydén, *Sverige och Förintelsen. Debatt och dokument om Europas judar 1933–1945*, 1997, p. 92; cf. Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, vol. 1, New York: Holmes & Meier, 1985, p. 73; Raul Hilberg, *Perpetrators, Victims, Bystanders: The Jewish Catastrophe 1933–1945*, New York, NY: Aaron Asher Books, 1993, p. 150. Hilberg writes about religion as the sole criteria for categorization in an “Aryan” or “Non-Aryan” group, though “not the religion of the person involved but the religion of his ancestors”. However, this did not concern the Nuremberg Laws, but the earlier race provision of 7 April, 1933.

of the rights of the Jews within civil law, Andreas Rethmeier has shown that, at the time the Nuremberg Laws were adopted, we may distinguish three groups of states. First, those that consequently applied the domicile principle, which means that impediments of marriage were always tested according to the law in power at the actual place of residence or stay. This principle was applied in the United Kingdom, the United States, Denmark, Norway, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Bulgaria, most South American states and for Germans in the Soviet Union.

In the second group, the impediments were tested according to the law in the homeland of the parties. This was the case in Finland, Estonia, Belgium, France, Spain, Portugal, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Romania. The home law was also applied in the third group of states, yet not because of the national principle, but as it was applied by the Hague Convention of 1902. This group included Germany, Sweden (from 1904), the Netherlands, Luxemburg, Switzerland, Italy, Hungary, Danzig, and Poland⁵.

It might seem that there was no difference in practice between the second and the third group: the result should have been identical. However, that was not the case. In the second group of states, based on citizenship only, it was possible to refuse to apply rules that contradicted the national *ordre public*. This did occur while applying the Nuremberg Laws. In the third group, on the other hand, no exceptions could be made because of a national *ordre public*, unless already made in the national legislation which incorporated the Hague Convention into legal systems of different states.

From 1935 to the end of the Second World War, the Lutheran Church of Sweden, in its state function as a civil authority on impediments of marriage, did consider the Nuremberg Laws when making decisions that involved German citizens in Sweden. The Church of Sweden was responsible for all such decisions until 1991. In the 1930s, judicial commentators even emphasized that in their civil

⁵ Andreas Rethmeier, “Nürnberger Rassegesetze” und Entrechtung der Juden im Zivilrecht (ser. *Rechtshistorische Reihe*, 126). Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1995, pp. 211–213.

administration, ministers had to follow civil law, even if it clashed with their understanding of the Church doctrine⁶.

From September 1937, Swedish citizens who wished to marry a German citizen of so-called Aryan descent were forced to sign a declaration stating that none of their grandparents had belonged to the Jewish race or religion. This practise followed a strong recommendation from the Swedish Foreign Office that had no historical or democratic legitimacy. Since 1863, Christian and Mosaic believers had been officially allowed to marry each other in Sweden, and no race legislation had even been proposed.

CLERICAL RESISTANCE

Not all ministers of the Church of Sweden followed the recommendations of the Foreign Office, but public criticism was as muted on this matter as on the effects of the Nuremberg Laws in Sweden in general. There was no debate in Parliament. Some clergymen actively recommended the use of these declarations as late as autumn 1942.

In connection with international discussions of resistance, I have extended Paul A. Levine's theoretical model of "bureaucratic resistance", sometimes nuanced as "reluctance", emphasizing also the "bureaucratic acceptance" shown by the majority of clergymen. This "bureaucratic acceptance" must be clearly distinguished from the "bureaucratic enthusiasm" shown by only a very small fraction of civil servants and clergymen. It is doubtful whether acceptance should be understood as a form of collaboration. Alf Lüdtke has defined *Mitläufer* as "just to follow along", which in Germany meant "accepting (if not sustaining) state-organized mass murder"⁷. This reveals the difficulties in applying German historical terminology on circumstances in a non-allied and non-occupied country like Sweden. In Germany, characterizing someone

⁶ Birger Ekeberg, "Giftermålsbalken", in: *Minnesskrift ägnad 1734 års lag. I*. Stockholm 1934, p. 205.

⁷ Alf Lüdtke, "The Appeal of Exterminating 'Others': German Workers and the Limits of Resistance", in: *Resistance against the Third Reich 1933–1990*, Michael Geyer and John W. Boyer (ed.), 1994, pp. 59, 61.

as a “Jew”, at least from 1941 onwards, could lead to quick death for the one so identified, but in Sweden, this never meant any life threat, at least not for individuals holding a Swedish permit of residence.

Oftentimes, bureaucratic resistance was quite inventive in finding ways around the law and the recommendations of the Foreign Office. I will give some examples.

One day in late July 1936, a young hopeful couple entered the Parish Office of St. Petri in Malmö to ask for the banns of marriage. Jakob Friedrich (Fritz) Mayer was 29; Emma Sara Schulmann was almost 24 years old. They were both German citizens. They met with Rector Albert Lysander, who identified them both as German citizens and the woman as a Mosaic believer. The banns were going to be read in church on Sundays, August 16, 23, and 30. All seemed hopeful. Sometime later, Lysander added: “The banns were signed by mistake and never published”⁸. This was due to a strong advice from the Foreign Office in Stockholm.

But the rector did not let the matter drop. He wrote a long article in protest, with the aim of changing the law or at least the consequences of Sweden’s acceptance of the Hague Convention. However, the national newspaper *Svenska Dagbladet* refused to run the article.

On December 17, 1936, the young couple was married at the Copenhagen Magistrate, probably on the advice of Lysander. Since Denmark had not accepted the Hague Convention of 1902 and marriages concluded in a foreign country according to that country’s law were valid in Sweden, the case was clear. One and a half years later, the woman was baptized by Lysander. The couple was not accepted as Swedish citizens until October 1946⁹. A German lawsuit aimed at annulling the marriage was initiated in 1940, but was never upheld. The German minister of justice had requested the chief prosecutor in Stuttgart to state an *Ehenichtigkeitsklage*. To avoid this, Mayer declared

⁸ In: Sweden, Malmö stadsarkiv, Malmö S:t Petri E I:14. 1936 nr 137, A II a:111 f. 225.

⁹ *Malmö stadsarkiv*, Malmö S:t Petri E I:14. 1936 nr 250, bil. H V b:45, A II a:111; Malmö S:t Pauli B I:14 f. 111, A II a:448 f. 165; *Västra Skrävlinge* A II a:83 f. 219, A II a:145 f. 170, C I:13 f. 115.

that he was going to divorce his wife. He was also falsely named a Swedish citizen. In February 1943, he was summoned to the German consulate about his military service, but in October of that same year he lost his German citizenship¹⁰. Germans of Jewish descent residing in foreign countries had lost their German passports back in 1941.

Lysander's conduct may be described as bureaucratic resistance. He also showed a continuing reluctance to have anything to do with the race declaration forms recommended by the Foreign office. Instead, he let the German consul handle the 'German' part of the impedimental process. In some cases, this was done simply with a telephone call. Here, Lysander acted independently, creating a new space of action.

In another case, Dean Svenæus in Karlstad actively tried to help a mixed couple to get married in Norway, though the outbreak of the war eventually prevented the marriage from happening. He had been advised to do so by Gösta Engzell, the new chief of the Law Department in the Foreign Office, who himself showed a good example of bureaucratic resistance. The contrahents were both baptized Christians, the man in the Roman Catholic Church and the woman in the Old Catholic Church. He was of so-called Aryan descent, whereas she was of Jewish ancestry. They got married later in Stockholm, on the false pretension that both were stateless, although only the bride had in fact lost her German nationality.

The bureaucratic resistance was not directly motivated by theological reasons. Still, one might say that theology was made visible in the actions of these clergymen before the application of the Nuremberg Laws. When facing the demands of bureaucracy, it was clear to them that the bureaucratic perspective was not the only one. Like almost everyone at the time, they shared the 'self-evident' assumptions of the racial

¹⁰ In: *Auswärtiges Amt Politisches Archiv*, Berlin, R99963, Inland II A/B: Ausbürgerungen, 300. Liste, 1943, Oct. 2 (Jagusch/Der Reichsführer-SS und Chef der Deutschen Polizei to Auswärtiges Amt 1940 Jan.18, also to Abteilung I des Reichsministeriums des Innern 1940 Jan.18, Kirchoff/Deutsches Konsulat Malmö to Der Reichsführer-SS und Chef der Deutschen Polizei 1940 Feb.6, Nolda/Deutsches Konsulat Malmö to Auswärtiges Amt 1943 March 27, Nischke/Der Reichsführer-SS and Chef der Deutschen Polizei to Auswärtiges Amt 1943 June 15, Deutsches Konsulat Malmö to Auswärtiges Amt 1943 July 15).

paradigm, but they were simultaneously motivated by the Christian interest and caring for every single human being and his situation, probably also supported by the theological understanding of their vocation as clergymen. Their resistance to the race laws is interesting as it shows that the prevailing racial paradigm did not dominate or determine entirely their understanding. They refused to adhere to foreign concepts of law that clashed with the teachings of the church and wellbeing of the individual.

BUREAUCRATIC ACCEPTANCE

In another case comparable to the one in Malmö, German activities proved much more effective. German citizen Erwin Mühl wanted to marry Swedish citizen Rico Gordin, a woman of Mosaic faith. Since they could not marry in Sweden, the couple got married on April 15, 1937, in St. Pancras in England¹¹. The German legation in Stockholm started an investigation. In March 1938, the findings were sent to Germany and on August 1, 1938, the chief prosecutor at the Landgericht Berlin wrote to the German minister of justice about the annulment of that marriage. The National Socialist machinery of law worked for several days to ensure a legally correct application of this perverted legislation. In a psychological sense, this intense work served to legitimize the “legal injustice” of the Nuremberg Laws¹². The case was sent to the German Foreign Office, which returned it to the German legation in Stockholm, sending it to Erwin Mühl himself, who openly declared that his wife was of Jewish descent. On December 22, 1938, the Gestapo asked for further information about Mühl. The German legation wanted to confirm that Mrs. Mühl’s parents had been married according to

¹¹ Certified Copy of an Entry of Marriage. Given at the General Register Office, Application Number R 402137, 25 April 2002.

¹² Rainer Faupel, Klaus Eschen, *Gesetzliches Unrecht in der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus. Vor 60 Jahren: Erlaß der Nürnberger Gesetze*, Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1997, p. 46, “nicht als legalistische Camouflage von Unrecht, das man selber als solches bewertet, sondern als den gewollten Höhe und Schlußpunkt für das Recht des neuen Staates des Nationalsozialismus, der ja bewußt mit allen gebrochen hatte, was es vorher gab”.

Jewish rite and even asked the Mosaic community in Stockholm for a certificate. In November, 1939, the case was reclassified to one of loss of German citizenship. On September 30, 1939, Landgericht Berlin declared the marriage invalid, and the verdict was valid since November 22, 1939¹³.

Now the Swedish Foreign Office contacted the Parish Office of Solna and six more months later, the Foreign Office wrote to the Parish Office in a rather undecided way that the German verdict should probably be entered into the Swedish church records. This meant also that the couple's child was to be retroactively made illegitimate. There is no sign whatsoever of any reluctance in the handling of the case at the Parish Office. First, the marriage was registered as having been dissolved, which did not alter the status of the child. Later this was changed into a notation about the the marriage having been annulled, rendering the child illegitimate¹⁴.

The Swedish Foreign Office could have refused the notation, since 'Jew' according to Swedish legal understanding was a matter of religion only. However, this possibility had been excluded by the race declaration introduced by the very same office in September 1937. The Foreign Office could also have objected on the grounds that the Jewish party was born as a Swedish citizen and that the verdict had been passed without any possibility for the plaintive to defend their case.

A more practical way would have been simply not to enter the verdict, since the couple had lost their German citizenship. Because of that, they now had a full right to marry according to the Swedish law. As well as letting them marry again, the notation could have been ignored. Still, such notations are not legally constitutive. The correct, legal way would have been to let a Swedish court examine the foreign verdict's legality in Sweden. Instead, the Law Department in the Foreign Office examined the case and made a decision, acting totally against its

¹³ Akten der Gesandtschaft Stockholm 497, D Pol 3 Nr. 3, Dr. Janz t. Büro R; Schumburg to Reichsministerium des Innern 1939, Dec.18, in: *Auswärtiges Amt, Politisches Archiv*, Berlin; Auswärtiges Amt to Deutsche Gesandtschaft in Stockholm 1940, Feb. 9; Verbalnote 1940, March 27, also in UDA R 34 Ct IX, 1939, Oct.-1940, Dec.

¹⁴ *Stockholms stadsarkiv*, Stockholm. Solna A II a:92.

own statements that it had no right to interpret the law. When the war was over, this marriage had not been considered legitimate until 1955. Furthermore, this example reveals the complex nature of the effects of the Nuremberg Laws, since the personal situation in these cases could have been even worse for Swedish citizens of Jewish descent than for foreigners.

However, in another parallel case, a local pastor simply did not note the German annulment of marriage, so it did not affect any legal consequences in Sweden – a clear example of bureaucratic resistance.

A COMPARISON WITH THE NETHERLANDS AND SWITZERLAND

A comparison with the situation in the Netherlands, where the 1902 Hague Convention was in force, shows that mixed marriages between German citizens were rejected there as well. However, Dutch authorities refused to use “Jewish” or “Aryan” as descriptions of Dutch citizens and sometimes rejected all use of German definitions of “Jewish”. The public climate was completely different, with debates in Parliament immediately after the publication of the Nuremberg Laws. When the Dutch envoy to Stockholm, in November 1935, asked the Swedish foreign minister how the new German law was applied in Sweden, the answer he received was that the Swedish authorities had not taken any stance on this law but accepted it in practice.

In 1938, Sweden – with a delay of four days – followed Switzerland in introducing the so-called J-stamp in German Jewish passports. Both states wanted to strictly limit the number of Jewish refugees, Christian or non-Christian, without accepting the National Socialist racist ideology, with the consequence that several persons were treated in a special way only because of their Jewish descent. Switzerland had introduced two different J-stamps as early as 1936 within the civil service, to mark personal documents of foreign Jews¹⁵. By introducing the J-stamp,

¹⁵ *Die Schweiz und die Flüchtlinge zur Zeit des Nationalsozialismus*, Zürich: Chronos, 2001, p. 97.

the Nuremberg Laws were accepted in practice as a base for bilateral agreement¹⁶.

Officially, the Swiss government showed even more acceptance than the Swedish Foreign Office, but the federal constitution of the state made for different decisions in practice. In one case of 1938, the government of Basel referred to the Swiss *ordre public* as grounds not to consider impediments of a religious or political character. In another statement, a national authority in 1940 declared that the Swiss *ordre public* was to be applied when one of the parties was a Swiss citizen, but not when both were German refugees¹⁷.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

For many Swedish citizens, their everyday contacts with the Church of Sweden in matters of civil registration and impediments of marriage were what shaped their perceptions of the Church. Thus, as an example of ecclesiastical history of everyday life (*Alltagsgeschichte*), my study is of great interest from the point of view of Church history. It illustrates how the performance of its civil duties by the Church of Sweden was shaped by Swedish government policies, often applied from an administrative level only, and without theological considerations. The application of the Nuremberg Laws according to the Hague Convention of 1902 created a new group of people, besides the Christians and “the others”, a group that was recognized as Christians but because of their descent treated differently in matters of marriage, if they wanted to marry a

¹⁶ Georg Kreis, “Anhang. Amtlicher Antisemitismus? Zu den zivilstandsamtlichen ‘Arierbescheinigungen’ in den Jahren 1936–1945”, in: Georg Kreis, *Die Rückkehr des J-Stempels. Zur Geschichte einer schwierigen Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, Zürich 2000, p. 127; see *Die Schweiz und die Flüchtlinge zur Zeit des Nationalsozialismus*, Zürich: Chronos, pp. 97–113, see also Uriel Gast, “Aspekte schweizerischer Fremden und Flüchtlingspolitik vor und während des Zweiten Weltkrieges”, in: Irène Lindgren, Renate Walder, *Schweden, die Schweiz und der Zweite Weltkrieg. Beiträge zum interdisziplinären Symposium des Zentrums für Schweizerstudien an der Universität Örebro, 30.09–02.10.1999*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lan, 2001, pp. 212–215.

¹⁷ *Die Schweiz, der Nationalsozialismus und der Zweite Weltkrieg: Schlussbericht*, Zürich: Pendo, 2002, p. 430.

German citizen. To this, the Christian clergy and laymen reacted with different attitudes, ranging from bureaucratic resistance, reluctance to acceptance.

To conclude with, the German authorities defined “the other” by race, not by religion, but in order to determine who was Jewish and who was Aryan, they had to rely on registrations of religion, both in Germany and abroad. In Nazi Germany, Jewish Christians were to a large extent excluded from the Christian community. This was not the case in Sweden, but the dichotomy of Christians and the non-Christian other was supplemented with another one, that of Christians and “the Christian other”, since in one important area, some Jewish Christians were excluded from the social community.

BERNARD ARDURA

EFFECTS OF THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL:
POPE JOHN PAUL II'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS
NON-BELIEVERS

Recalling Pope John Paul II's attitude towards non-believers as a consequence of the Second Vatican Council – whose fiftieth anniversary we celebrate – requires going back to WW II, when communism set its full roots in Poland.

In his work *Memory and Identity*, the Pope recalls the commitment of Polish bishops and their strong concerns for the future of youth, as communism intended to embrace the sensitive field of education as well. Let me quote the Pope's reflections on this challenge: "For me, at that time, it was clear that their domination would last for a long time, much longer than the Nazis'. How long? That was difficult to predict¹."

On its part, the Polish Communist Party had identified the Catholic Church and its cultural and spiritual heritage, as well as its missionary zeal, as a major opposing force: the Church "is the great material obstacle, since it hosts the philosophical pillars of ideological reaction, which it constantly disseminates to the masses"².

In his recent biography of John Paul II³, Andrea Riccardi tells how the young Bishop Karol Wojtyła – in his tenure as a vicar at the Chapter of Kraków – engages in negotiations with the regional committee of the Communist Party to save the premises of the seminary, which was intended to be transformed into a pedagogical school. Without mincing

¹ Andrea Riccardi, *Giovanni Paolo II: La Biografia*, Cinisello Balsamo: San Paolo Edizioni, 2011, p. 81.

² "Osservazioni sulla Chiesa cattolica in Polonia", quoted in: Andrea Riccardi, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

³ Andrea Riccardi, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

his words, he wanted to oppose the project and occupied the seminary with the canons of the cathedral⁴. Then unexpectedly, Karol Wojtyła reached the office of Lucjan Mohyka, the Secretary of the Party, and started tough negotiations with a senior Party official, namely Zenon Kliszko, also a member of the Central Committee. In the end, the bishop surrendered one floor to the pedagogical school and saved the Seminary of Kraków. This case can be considered as the first known sign of Karol Wojtyła's skill for dialogue. In fact, his natural temperament for conversation will manifest itself throughout his life: "generally, he issues no orders; rather he talks, and imposes his personality and his reasons⁵."

During the proceedings for the beatification and canonization of John Paul II, Cardinal Alfonso López Trujillo stated: "He was a man of dialogue who never imposed his opinion and did all he could to put people at ease and also to avoid hurting them⁶." Indeed, Karol Wojtyła was looking for the "meanings of life" and therefore was eager to listen to others; he felt great satisfaction in learning from people he interacted with. Since he was a young boy, Karol Wojtyła had been interested in establishing contacts and relationships with men of culture, to the point that the archbishop's palace in Kraków became a place of cultural meetings and a privileged space for discussions with scholars from various disciplines, ranging from literature to astronomy, bioethics to physics.

A profound humanist, the future Pope was open to meeting others who did not share his views or, especially, his faith. Philosopher Paul Ricoeur, alluding to the famous interreligious meeting in Assisi, spoke before John Paul II in 2000: "Now, this spirit of openness lies solid on the very strong beliefs of the Man of Church that you are⁷."

The life he lived under the iron fist of the Polish communist regime did not induce a sense of struggle or revenge in Karol Wojtyła. Rather, it confirmed his innermost belief: the country needed a community of

⁴ Bernard Lecompte, *Jean-Paul II*, Paris: Folio, 2003, pp. 173–174.

⁵ Andrea Riccardi, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ "Discorso di Paul Ricoeur", in: *Notiziario Istituto Paolo VI*, 2003, vol. 45, pp. 43–46.

free souls, a united community within the society that no longer enjoyed either individual or collective freedom.

When Karol Wojtyła attended the Second Vatican Council, he worked diligently on the text that would become the Pastoral Constitution, i.e. *Gaudium et Spes*. He submitted a report about the Communist world, spoke of religious freedom and suggested that this very freedom should not be based only on philosophical principles, but rather on the human person and his/her dignity, thus providing a broader basis for dialogue⁸.

His concept of dialogue within the contemporary world relied on the idea that the Christian faith was the bearer of true freedom and made people more fully human.

When, in early 1965, Karol Wojtyła took part in the works of the Council between sessions, he starred as a true protagonist. He showed no doubt nor hesitation: atheism is not a marginal factor and it is relevant not only to countries under the yoke of communism. For him, atheism was a decisive factor in the whole contemporary world. In fact, not only does he refer to Marxist atheism, but also to the kind of atheism that too much material wealth can generate, as it spreads the illusion that consumer goods and stocks of wealth create happiness and fill both the human heart and understanding, satisfy the mankind's aspirations. Problems of the modern man, according to Karol Wojtyła, will be solved by neither atheism nor consumerism, but only by the true answers Christianity has to offer⁹.

In his concept of dialogue with non-believers, Pope John Paul II preferred focusing on the logic of topics and not on questions of authority. Of course, in the case of the last session of the Council, Karol Wojtyła – together with the Archbishop of Vienna Cardinal Franz König, the Ukrainian Metropolitane Josyf Slipyj and the Polish Primate Stefan Wyszyński – did not hesitate to state that the world should be told frankly that the imposition of atheism by states was against natural law.

Karol Wojtyła's disposition for dialogue received further momentum

⁸ Andrea Riccardi, *op. cit.*, p. 144.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 145.

with the teachings of the new Pope Paul VI, who took over from John XXIII between the first and the second session of the Second Vatican Council. Thus, in the third part of his programmatic encyclical *Ecclesiam Suam*, Paul VI states: “The Church must enter into dialogue with the world in which it lives. The Church has something to say, the Church becomes the message, the Church becomes the talk¹⁰.”

For Paul VI, dialogue characterized the doctrinal heritage of the Church, which was formed in order to unite the divine and human thoughts expressed in the language of the modern man. As a matter of fact, Paul VI reaffirmed the permanent validity of the mission Christ entrusted to the Church, i.e. bringing the Good News to the whole world until the end of time, but stressed the need to enter into dialogue with it. If the dialogue between man and God is essential for the believer, he must also talk with his brethren in the faith, to later bring his love to believers who do not share the same faith and to people of good will who do not believe in God.

Then, just before the end of the Second Vatican Council, Pope Paul VI established a new body of the Roman Curia – namely the Secretariat for Non-Believers – on April 9, 1965. It was tasked with studying the phenomenon of atheism in order to investigate the fundamental motivations and establish a dialogue with non-believers.

The Second Vatican Council did not shun from elaborating a completely new vision of non-belief. In fact, in the Pastoral Constitution *Gaudium et Spes*, it stated: “Believers themselves frequently bear some responsibility for this situation. For, taken as a whole, atheism is not a spontaneous development but stems from a variety of causes, including a critical reaction against religious beliefs, and in some places against the Christian religion in particular. Hence believers can have more than a little to do with the birth of atheism. To the extent that they neglect their own training in the faith, or teach erroneous doctrine, or are deficient in their religious, moral or social life, they must be said to conceal rather than reveal the authentic face of God and religion¹¹.”

¹⁰ Paul VI, Encyclical Letter *Ecclesiam Suam*, 1964-08-06, no. 67.

¹¹ Council Vatican II, Constitution *Gaudium et spes*, no. 19.

Not being able to do without reaffirming the doctrines and actions that do not account, in the proper manner, of the greatness of man as the image of God, the Council stresses that the Church must undertake a serious and thorough examination of the causes of non-belief. Moreover, the Church must – as a community and through each and every member – offer the testimony of its faith lived in love. Faith and charity must show their fertility and penetrate the entire life of believers.

With this in mind, the Council recognizes the need for every man to build an upright society in this world, which calls for a sincere and thoughtful dialogue with everyone.

The foundation of dialogue and cooperation between Christians and non-believers is love for the whole of humanity and service to every human being, because, for the believer, the first and second commandments are similar: love your God and your neighbour.

In the years following the Council, Cardinal Wojtyła and Primate Wyszyński shared a sense of anxiety about the unity of the Polish Church. They feared a division between liberal and conservative Catholics¹²; they were convinced that the regime would exploit it to alienate bishops from the people and intellectuals. It was a split that Eastern pro-government Catholic movements had worked on, supported by the communist power.

This is why Cardinal Wojtyła kept close contacts with groups in the Catholic intellectual world. In 1977, following a seminar on “Christians in the face of human rights”, he wrote: “The rights of the person meet in an almost organic manner the rights of the Nation and the rights of the Church, the human person is in fact rooted in the Nation and, in a different manner, is rooted in the Church. For this we are witnesses of a growing alliance between the Nation, the Church, the man and the human person¹³.”

John Paul II was characterized by his commitment to human rights, freedom and social issues, but he did not see any possibility for collaboration, let alone identification, with Marxist forces. As a matter

¹² Andrea Riccardi, *op. cit.*, p. 161.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 162.

of fact, he represents what we call “the dialogue of everyday life”, i.e. a dialogue focused on cooperation for the good of the human person and of the Nation. It is towards such a Nation that believers and non-believers can channel their efforts for the common good, refusing any compromise that can undermine the faith of believers.

John Paul II had a vision of atheism as it was in the 1980s which embraced the phenomenon as a whole. It would be simplistic, however, to assume that the Polish Pope reduced atheism to Marxism. Non-belief is not the prerogative of officially atheist regimes; it also grows within the so-called consumerist societies. At the moment, as John Paul II remarked, even in these societies can we observe an undeniable religious awakening. Therefore non-belief did not trigger defensive attitudes in him; rather, he saw it as a challenge the Church should accept, “a gigantic commitment it needs to fulfil, and for which it needs the cooperation of all its children: making the new culture of faith reincarnate again the values of Christian humanism in all the cultural venues of our time”¹⁴.

In considering the complex relationship between faith and non-belief, John Paul II referred to the “long history of salvation” and noted the complexity of the situation: “In the countries of long-established Christianity, the latter cannot be measured by surveys and statistics: it is often buried in conscience, and we have to wake it up. In countries with declared atheism, it survives despite oppression, and inspires new generations of believers, witnesses and sometimes martyrs¹⁵.”

The presence of non-believers and the environment of non-belief imposed by various political regimes or even by the growing race for profits are something that bears on the very idea of the human person, John Paul II believed. Noting that, in many cases, they lived as if God did not exist – as if they had lost sight of the “City of God”, thus limiting the human horizon in this world – the Pope concluded by

¹⁴ John Paul II, “To the participants in the Congress ‘Evangelization and atheism’”, 1980-10-10, in: *Pontificio Consiglio della Cultura, Fede e Cultura. Antologia di testi del Magistero Pontificio da Leone XIII a Giovanni Paolo II*, Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2003, no. 1174.

¹⁵ John Paul II, “To the Secretariat for Non-Believers”, Vatican, 1985-03-22, in: *ibid.*, no. 1572.

saying: "The theoretical or practical atheism necessarily reflects onto the anthropological conception." Moreover, he asked himself: "Should a man not be the image of God and not refer to anything beyond himself, what is his value, and why does he work and live¹⁶?"

Non-belief is itself a challenge to believers who have a duty to give account of their faith and provide clear testimonies of their lives. The validity and credibility of these testimonies depend on whether religion is intended or not as a sort of "idealistic illusion" to be removed from the society and the heart of men.

While we should rejoice in the progress of human knowledge, science and technology, in man becoming more and more the master of the Universe, John Paul II saw ideological and practical atheism as threatening the mankind itself. To students who assembled in the Vatican in 1986, the Pope said: "You will find yourself in front of a scientific and technological progress of shocking magnitude, but not rarely it is ambiguous; while the number of achievements in every field grows, it seems the dignity of man is getting lost¹⁷."

The year 1989 marked a moment of immense historical achievement whose main symbol is the fall of the Berlin Wall. The collapse of political and economic system that embraced a denial of God and saw disbelief as one of its patent symbols did not go without anthropological consequences. In his Encyclical *Centesimus Annus*, John Paul II stated: "Marxism had promised to uproot the need for God from the human heart, but the results have shown that it is not possible to succeed in this without throwing the heart into turmoil¹⁸."

Once Marxist regimes in Europe had fallen, the official bodies where avowedly atheist men traditionally gathered disappeared as well. John Paul II then realized that an epoch-making change had taken place: non-belief, which stood as the symbol of a failed political and

¹⁶ John Paul II, "To the Sixth Symposium of the Council of European Bishops' Conferences", Vatican, 1985-10-11, in: *ibid.*, no. 1639.

¹⁷ John Paul II, "At the Pontifical Universities", Vatican, 1986-10-24, in: *ibid.*, no. 1761.

¹⁸ John Paul II, Encyclical Letter *Centesimus Annus*, 1991-05-01, in: *ibid.*, no. 2264.

economic system, was now transformed, yet no less dangerous to men. The Pope noted that non-belief “becomes cultural in nature, or rather it penetrates the immense field of culture, in particular the set of principles and values that constitute the ethos of a population”¹⁹.

So on May 25, 1993, Pope John Paul II published an important decision through the *Motu Proprio* “*Inde a Pontificatus*”. It opens with the expression of such beliefs: “Since the beginning of my Pontificate, accepting the wealth of stimulating ideas offered by the Second Vatican Council, I have wanted to develop the church’s dialogue with the contemporary world. In particular, I have sought to foster the encounter with non-believers in the privileged area of culture, a fundamental dimension of the spirit, which places people in a relationship with one another and unites them in what is most truly theirs, namely, their common humanity²⁰.”

Without breaking the mission entrusted to Peter and the Apostles to bring the Gospel to the edges of Earth and until the end of the world, John Paul II insisted on starting and nurturing a fruitful dialogue with all men of good will, followers of other religions and with individuals or groups that do not refer to any religion. In fact, the Pope was convinced that dialogue in the cultural field is, first and foremost, a service to men, because they become fully human through culture.

Therefore, with this *motu proprio*, Pope John Paul II decided to merge the Pontifical Council for Culture and the Pontifical Council for Dialogue with Non-Believers under a single name, i.e., the Pontifical Council for Culture. The latter has the task of promoting dialogue with “the cultures of our time, often marked by disbelief or religious indifference” and a “study of the problem of unbelief and religious indifference found in various forms indifferent cultural milieus, inquiring into the causes and the consequences”²¹. Finally, Article 4 of

¹⁹ John Paul II, “Letter to Secretary of State, Cardinal Agostino Casaroli”, 1982-05-20, in: *ibid.*, no. 1309.

²⁰ John Paul II, *Motu Proprio Inde a Pontificatus*, 1993-03-25, in: *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 85 (1993), pp. 549–552.

²¹ *Ibid.*

the same *motu proprio* states: "The council also establishes dialogue with those who do not believe in God or who profess no religion, provided these are open to sincere cooperation. It organizes and participates in study congresses in this field by means of experts²²." Experiences in communist Poland might have left indelible scars for the future Pope John Paul II and definitely changed his attitudes towards disbelief and non-believers.

Despite difficult challenges posed by the communist era in Europe, Karol Wójtýła did not develop any signs of hostility toward non-believers.

Conversely, he knew how to make a clear distinction between a mistake and the person who makes the mistake²³. Although exhibited extraordinary vigour and firmness in terms of faith and principles, he remained open to dialogue with those who disagreed with his ideas or his faith. For him, personal conscience and freedom were in fact fundamental factors.

These are the two courses of action that reason moves along, reason which makes dialogue between believers and non-believers possible. Throughout his entire pontificate, John Paul II was never tired of implementing the directives of the Second Vatican Council and did not hesitate to write the following in his testament: "I am convinced that it will long be granted to the new generations to draw from the treasures that this 20th-century Council has lavished upon us²⁴."

The profession of faith, strong and enthusiastic as it is, is not a step backwards, but a taking over. It takes in its hands the two thousand years of the faith of the Church, of martyrs and of great witnesses of the tireless love of God. Therefore John Paul II had a clear perception of a world whose culture was in transformation, a world in which being a Christian meant to be a witness to the truth of faith. He was the builder of peace and dialogue between believers and non-believers, with a view to helping build a society in which all men and women had the

²² *Ibid.*

²³ John XXIII, Encyclical Letter *Pacem in Terris*, 1963-04-11, no. 82.

²⁴ John Paul II, *Testament*, Vatican City, 2005, p. 13.

opportunity to fully realize themselves and work for a society worthy of mankind.

Let me paraphrase Blessed John Paul II when he addressed representatives of the Christian Churches, Ecclesial Communities and world religions gathered in Assisi on October 27, 1986: We can say that the deeper the sense of one's own identity, the stronger the desire to meet the other.

MARIA PETROVA

RELIGIOUS SITUATION
IN POST-COMMUNIST RUSSIA

This paper aims to provide insights into the situation of mainstream and non-mainstream religions in post-communist Russia. A keen interest in religion in Russia after *perestroika* and especially after the adoption of the democratic law “On the Freedom of Conscience”, passed in 1990, has been noted by many Russian and foreign scholars of religion.

A number of sociological surveys have confirmed a growing interest in religion and revealed a marked increase in declared belief in God¹. According to several surveys, the number of people who identify themselves as Orthodox has grown continuously since the early 1990s². One explanation for the rise of declared belief in God, which has been offered by many scholars, is that it reflected a general identity crisis in post-communist society. Espousing the mainstream religion which was traditionally adhered to by one’s ethnic group was a way of overcoming this crisis and became an important part of Russian citizens’ self-identification. Thus individuals now identified themselves as Orthodox, Buddhist or Muslim because their ethnic groups had traditionally espoused these religions³.

¹ *Desiat’ Let po Puti Svobody Sovesti*, eds. A. Pchelintsev, T. Tomaeva, Moscow: Institut religii i prava, 2002, pp. 23–24; *Religion and Identity in Modern Russia: the Revival of Orthodoxy and Islam*, eds. Benjamin Forrest, Juliet Johnson and Marietta Stepaniants, Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2005, p. 13; Zoe Knox, *Russian Society and the Orthodox Church: Religion in Russia after Communism*, New York: Routledge Curzon, 2005.

² *Religiia i Politika v Postkommunisticheskoj Rossii*, ed. L. N. Mitrokhin, Moscow: Izdatel’stvo Instituta filosofii RAN, 1994; *Starye Tserkvi, Novye Veruiushchie*, eds. Kimmo Kaariainen, D. Furman, St. Petersburg: Letnii sad, 2000, pp. 7–48.

³ *Religion and Identity*, pp. 18–20.

TWO TRENDS IN POST-COMMUNIST RELIGIOUS LIFE OF RUSSIA

In describing the religious situation in post-communist Russia, it is necessary to say that it can be studied via two different approaches. The first one concerns religion *per se*, that is, the variety of beliefs and faiths that are often intertwined and merged with one another in public consciousness. The second one concerns religion as a political force and covers those aspects of religious traditions that are used by nationalist ideologies and play an important role in the processes of shaping identity. The two aspects can be closely intertwined and are not easy to separate. Scholars of religion have pointed out that it is difficult to analyze the post-communist Russian religious worldview. On the whole, it is characterized by extreme eclecticism and instability. In fact, a growing influence of Eastern religions (originally, rather simplistic adoptions of Hinduism, Buddhism, Yoga and Tantra), Occultism and magic, as well as belief in UFOs, the yeti and reincarnation, have been observed in Russia since the 1970s⁴.

In the periods of *perestroika* and *post-perestroika*, religious consciousness has been characterized by an intricate mixture of different beliefs which include fragmentary elements of Orthodox Christianity, Occultism and Eastern religions, various New Age concepts (astrology, reincarnation, a belief in aliens and the approaching era of Aquarius) and magic. There have also been numerous systems concerned with health: various healing methods, yoga diets, acupuncture and so on. Theories related to science, parapsychology and extrasensory perception have also become an important element of contemporary Russian non-mainstream religiosity. As we can see from the summary above, in the period since the Soviet times and onwards, much of non-mainstream religiosity has contained Eastern elements or demonstrated influences of Eastern beliefs and ideas. It can be explained by the desire to escape the realities of the Soviet way of life – with its egalitarianism and oppressive control

⁴ *Religiia i Obschestvo: Ocherki Religioznoi Zhizni Sovremennoi Rossii*, ed. S. Filatov, Moscow, St. Petersburg: Letnii sad, 2002, p. 447.

over spiritual and religious spheres – into some bright exotic “faraway elsewhere”⁵.

Amidst those non-mainstream groups inspired by Eastern spirituality, it is worth marking out Hare Krishna followers and various Roerich groups as the most popular and populous movements in Russia. While Hare Krishnas are well-known all over the world and do not need to be introduced minutely, the Roerich movement is something more indigenous and peculiar. It is based on philosophical teachings of a well-known painter, philosopher, traveler and public figure Nicholas Roerich and his wife Helena Roerich, called Agni Yoga or the “Living Ethics”, and contains elements borrowed from Buddhism, Hinduism, Helena Blavatsky’s Theosophy, Christianity and others in a quite arbitrary interpretation. The books on Agni Yoga had been available in the Soviet Union and, after the *perestroika*, the movement enjoyed an astonishing rise in popularity, especially among intellectuals and educated people. There is hardly a city in Russia where a Roerich group would not exist. The central headquarters of the organization, The International Roerich Centre, is in Moscow.

Moreover, in the late 1980s and the early 1990s, numerous lectures and seminars offering intensive training in various Eastern religious practices enjoyed wide popularity in Russia. Among bestselling books was Sergei Lazarev’s series *Diagnostika karma* (The Diagnostics of *karma*), which was concerned with “methods of correcting one’s *karma*”. Since the time of the *perestroika*, the landscape of Russian religiosity, already complicated as it was, has been supplemented with the concept of Russian Vedism, various notions of Russia being the motherland of the ancient Vedic culture, which allegedly predates the Vedic cultures of India and Iran and is the source from which the latter originated. Hence the ideas that Sanskrit, for example, developed from some form of an ancient language which, in fact, was Russian, etc.

It is against this background that the restoration of Orthodox Christianity and other mainstream religions has been taking place.

⁵ Alexei Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006, pp. 150, 160.

It could be argued that Orthodox Christianity has been planted in a soil already fertile with various non-mainstream religious beliefs. These beliefs do not prevent people from turning to Christianity as well. Selected interviews and conversations with a number of newly-converted Orthodox Christians reveal that some of them have not given up their Oriental, pagan and New Age beliefs. Some of the interviewees, for example, admit that they meditate or do yoga exercises from time to time, read horoscopes, believe in “signs” “the evil eye” or entertain ideas about karmic retribution for bad deeds⁶.

RUSSIAN LEGISLATION ON RELIGION

The 1990 law “On Freedom of Conscience” codified the changes that had been introduced gradually in practice over the previous four years and, to use the words of Russian scholar of religion Marat Shterin, “reflected the early liberalizing aspects of post-communism”⁷. The law proclaimed the freedom of religion as an “inalienable right” of all citizens of Russia; they would now enjoy the right to practice any religion they wanted and to establish religious organizations. All religions and religious associations were proclaimed “equal before the law”. The law also abolished executive and administrative bodies that used to control the sphere of religion. All religious organizations were granted a full legal status from the moment of their registration. These changes resulted in an immediate growth in numbers of religious organizations. The new law was initially welcomed with enthusiasm by both the Russian society and various religious confessions and institutions, including the Moscow Patriarchate.

⁶ Selective interviews were conducted by me among the parish of three churches of St. Petersburg and its suburbs in June–August, 2008; Petr Pavlovskii, “O ‘sglaze,’ ‘porche’ i prochikh sueveriiakh,” in: *Pravoslavnyi Peterburg*, St. Petersburg, 1997, no. 2 (56), p. 8.

⁷ *New Religious Movements of the Twenty-First Century: Legal, Political, and Social Challenges in Global Perspective*, eds. Philip Charles Lukas and Thomas Robbins, New York: Routledge, 2004, pp. 101, 102.

THE ROC AND THE RUSSIAN SOCIETY

As it has been mentioned, the Orthodox Church has become highly visible in post-communist Russia. In the pre-revolutionary period, the Church was widely regarded as the protector of nationalist interests and the defender of national traditions. When the collapse of communism resulted in identity crisis and left an ideological vacuum, Orthodox Christianity and the Moscow Patriarchate, which had been closely linked to Russian spiritual and cultural tradition in the past, appealed to many people. Indeed, for many Russians, Orthodox Christianity became a symbol of their cultural and national identity. Surveys demonstrated that around 65 percent of the population of Russia, both believers and non-believers, recognized the Orthodox Church as the bearer of spiritual and moral principles, and wanted these principles to be introduced into the political sphere⁸. Hundreds of prominent cultural and public figures declared that they belonged to the Orthodox Church.

The growing authority of the ROC coincided with the strengthening of the Church's position within the state. Numerous old church buildings were given back to believers and new ones were built. This process has been accompanied by the Moscow Patriarchate penetrating into different state institutions. In particular, the Church signed cooperation agreements with the Ministry of Culture, the Ministry of Defense and the Ministry of Health which guaranteed its presence in the army, the police, hospitals and prisons⁹. From 1992 onwards, the Church has received wide access to the system of education through Orthodox gymnasiums, Sunday schools and courses on "The Fundamentals of the Orthodox Culture" in mainstream educational institutions. The possibility of introducing religious education into the compulsory school curriculum has been discussed for years and has many advocates. In September 2012, a new subject called "The Foundation of Religious Culture and Secular Ethics" was introduced in Russian secondary

⁸ *Desiat' Let po Puti Svobody Sovesti*, pp. 25–26.

⁹ Aleksandr Glagolev, "K simfonii gosudarstva i tserkvi v Rossii", in: *Radonezh*, Moscow, 1997, no. 16–17 (61), p. 18.

schools¹⁰. It offers six elective modules and the Orthodox culture is one of them. So religion is actually taught at schools. Attitudes of the authorities towards the Church depend to a great extent on public opinion. Thus Sergei Filatov, a scholar of religion, has stated:

Orthodox Christianity became a national and cultural symbol for the majority of the Russian population: people were pleased with the restoration of churches and monasteries, national holidays and traditions. The state, in turn, picked up these ideas and sentiments and tried to make good use of them. One of the obvious reasons for this is that the level of confidence in the authorities in Russia is very low and they try to use all possible means to raise it.¹¹

Both the authorities and prominent politicians routinely emphasize their friendly relationship with representatives of the Church hierarchy in various ways. Therefore political leaders regularly make television appearances where they stand humbly and hold lit candles during Eastertide or Christmas.

Alongside the association of the ROC with ecclesiastical, national, state and political issues, it is necessary to mention its social and moral influence on the people of Russia. By conducting numerous social activities, the Church has become involved in many areas which, in one way or another, contribute to the shaping of identity and nation-building: culture, civic education, ecology, charity, family life and relationships, the upbringing of children, struggle against “pernicious Western pop-culture”, homosexuality, pornography, alcoholism, prostitution, corruption, drug addiction, etc¹². Orthodox clergymen advise the audience on what books, TV programmes, films and music are more appropriate for Orthodox believers, how they should raise their children, etc¹³. One can therefore

¹⁰ “Ezhegodnoe eparhial’noe sobranie goroda Moskvj”, in: *Zhurnal Moskovskoi Patriarkhii*, Moscow, 2006, no. 1, pp. 40–41; Irina Rubtsova, “Isaakii – shkole”, in: *Pravoslavnyi Sankt-Peterburg*, St. Petersburg, 2008, no. 10 (202), p. 2.

¹¹ *Religiia i Obshchestvo*, p. 473.

¹² “Natsionalnaia sfera otvetstvennosti: vlast’, tserkov’, biznes, obshchestvo – protiv narkomanii”, in: *Zhurnal Moskovskoi Patriarkhii*, Moscow, 2006, no. 1, pp. 78–86.

¹³ A. Aleksandrov, “Ostorozhno: NTV! Iskushenie khristian. Ocherednoe, no ne

state that the Church has become quite a powerful force in the shaping of identity and, under the circumstances, has put effort into maintaining its superior position. So it comes as little surprise that it has treated successful non-mainstream movements as dangerous competitors, whose supposedly pernicious influence on the souls of Russian people has to be eliminated. Therefore the period of religious freedom referred to above was rather short. From the mid-1990s, concerns about new “cults” posing a threat to the society and the state and destroying the “historically established ethno-religious balance of Russia” began to be voiced increasingly often¹⁴. In this context, the topic of cults threatening to destroy the “national identity of the Russian people” has also come to the fore¹⁵. Among the first objectors to new religious movements (NRMs) were parents and families of NRM members. They were mostly worried about the psychological state of the converts and the supposedly negative impact of new religions on their lives, careers and family relations¹⁶. In absence of any official information about the problem or access to professional help, desperate parents turned for support to the ROC, which had its own reasons to oppose NRMs.

In 1992, the classification of religions in Russia was supplemented with a new term, “totalitarian sect”, which had never been applied to religious communities before. The authorship of this term can be attributed to one of Russia’s main anti-cult ideologists and the founder of the Russia’s principal anti-cult organization, “Tsentr Sviashchennomuchenika Irineia

poslednee”, in: *Pravoslavnaia Moskva*, Moscow, 1997, no. 34 (130), pp. 1, 6; Nataliia Stavitskaia, “Kurinaia slepota gospodina Kiseleva, ili o masterakh nazyvat’ beloe chernym”, in: *Pravoslavnaia Moskva*, Moscow, 1997, no. 34 (130), p. 7; Aleksandr Shargunov, “Zachem eto nado NTV”, in: *Radonezh*, Moscow, 1997, no. 19 (63), p. 1; “V Ostankino molilos’ dvadtsat’ tysiach”, in: *Radonezh*, Moscow, 1997, no. 19 (63), pp. 2, 15.

¹⁴ *New Religious Movements*, pp. 102–103.

¹⁵ “Doklad Patriarkha Moskovskogo i vseia Rusi Aleksiiia II na Arkhiereiskom Sobore Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi 18 fevralia 1997”, in: *Zhurnal Moskovskoi Patriarkhii*, Moscow, 1997, no. 3, pp. 58–68.

¹⁶ “Yekaterinburge proshel seminar vrachei-psikhiatorov, posviashchennyi deiatel’nosti religioznykh kul’tov”, in: *Radonezh*, Moscow, 1997, no. 19 (63), p. 8; Fedor Kondratiev, “Kak eto delaetsia”, in: *Radonezh*, Moscow, 1997, no. 16–17 (61), p. 7.

Lionskogo” (The St. Irenaeus of Lyons Information Centre or SILIC), Aleksandr Dvorkin, who claimed that he could not even imagine that he had introduced the new term, as “it seemed so self-evident”¹⁷. However, the significance of the term “totalitarian cult” lies not in its self-evidence, but rather in its sinister connotations, associated with words like “sect” and “totalitarian”. On the whole, it can be argued that the introduction of the terms “totalitarian sect” and “destructive sect”, which are never used in academic discourse because of their vagueness, has contributed to constructing the image of an enemy, a threatening “other”, represented by non-mainstream religious movements¹⁸. Against this background, the new law “On the Freedom of Conscience and Religious Associations” was being drafted. It was finally adopted in September 1997. The law distinguishes between the so-called “traditional” and “non-traditional” religions, emphasizing the superiority of Orthodox Christianity and imposing severe restrictions on the interests of those religions that had existed in Russia for less than 15 years.

The adoption of the law encouraged anti-cult activities all over the country. In 1998, Dvorkin published a book called “Introduction to the Study of the Cults”, based on a series of lectures he was giving at the Orthodox Sviato-Tikhvinskii Theological Institute. The book gives an account of so-called totalitarian cults. The list includes a large number of religious denominations, from Jehovah Witnesses, Mormons and Scientology to Hare Krishnas, Brahma Kumaris, Theosophy and various New Age groups. The book singles out religions with “alien” Eastern elements as the most dangerous ones.

The author dedicates much attention to Hare Krishnas, whom he stigmatizes as a satanic movement. Several events contributed to this view. The murder of Orthodox celibate priest Father Grigorii Iakovlev, committed by a mentally unstable self-proclaimed Krishna follower in 2000, and a number of high-profile cases of pedophilia in Hare Krishna circles in Moscow and Novosibirsk in 2010 and 2011 aroused

¹⁷ Aleksandr Dvorkin, *Sektovedenie*, Nizhnii Novgorod: Izdatel'stvo bratstva vo imia sviatogo kniazia Aleksandra Nevskogo, 2000, p. 35.

¹⁸ *Desiat' Let po Puti Svobody Sovesti*, pp. 30–36.

justified indignation among the public¹⁹. Predictably, the ROC used these cases to claim about the criminal and destructive character of the movement in general. However, there is no official evidence to confirm that the number of criminal offenses committed by members of the International Society for Krishna Consciousness (ISKCON) is any higher than in other religious denominations or groups.

Another serious clash between ISKCON on the one hand and the ROC and anti-cult activists on the other can be traced back to the mid-2000s when Hare Krishnas planned to build a big temple near Khodynskoe field and were granted a plot of land to do so. The project of the 38-metre spacious “pagan shrine”, supposedly desecrating the city, provoked outrage on the part of Orthodox believers and representatives of other traditional religions. Under the severe pressure of the Orthodox public, backed by some State Duma deputies, educational organizations and public figures, Moscow officials had to cancel the construction and take back the land under the pretense that it was located in an environmentally sensitive area. The Krishna followers’ attempts to seek justice in arbitration court proved ineffective²⁰.

The latest scandalous incident associated with the movement was the *cause célèbre* against *Bhagavat-Gita As It Is*, a translation with commentary of the sacred Hindu text *Bhagavat-Gita*, written by the founder of ISKCON Bhaktivedanta Svami Prabhupada. The trial was initiated by the public prosecutor’s office of the Siberian city of Tomsk and lasted from August 2011 until March 2012. Its main purpose was to ban *Bhagavat-Gita As It Is* and to stigmatize it as an extremist book, since it allegedly “contained elements of instigating religious hatred and discrimination on the basis of gender, race, nationality, origins, language and religious affiliation”²¹. The trial caused mass protests in India and

¹⁹ “Dva goda deistvoval nasilnik-pedofil v moskovsom khrame Krishny”, in: http://www.k-istine.ru/sects/mosk/mosk_pedophilia.htm

²⁰ “Moskva: Spory vokrug Khrama”, in: <http://iriney.ru/sects/krishna/news024.htm>; Moskovskie krishnaity ne poluchat zemliu. Tak reshil arbitrazhnyi sud; in: <http://iriney.ru/sects/krishna/news047.htm>

²¹ “Sudebnyi protsess nad ‘Bhagavad-gitoy kak ona est’”, in: <http://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/>

sharp criticism of Russian oriental scholars and human rights activists. Some scholars of religion, invited as experts, expressed opinions that the Tomsk public prosecutor's office was actually protecting the interests of the ROC, who claimed "spiritual monopoly over the minds of the Russian people" and wanted to eliminate dangerous competitors²². According to a scholar of India, the head of religious movement Tantra Sangha Sergei Lobanov, the trial against Hare Krishnas "was conducted in the best tradition of the Soviet anti-cultist shows". Due to efforts of Hare Krishna followers, scholars and human rights advocates, the action was turned down and charges against the book dropped²³.

Another leading critic and opponent of NRMs, Orthodox Deacon Andrei Kuraev, mostly focuses on the widespread Roerich movement, which he presents as an anti-Christian cult, extremely dangerous for the souls of the Russian people. He has published numerous articles and two books attacking it. One of the books is titled *Satanism for Intelligentsia* and it also suggests the devilish character of the teaching which mostly targets educated people (intelligentsia). Kuraev has also expressed concern about the growing influence of the Roerich movement in both the ideological and economic spheres of life and especially about the Roerich followers extending their influence into schools and other educational establishments. It is necessary to note that Kuraev's views of the Roerichs and their present-day followers are rather representative of those shared by the majority of the Orthodox clergy in Russia, including the main church body Moscow Patriarchate. It is also necessary to mention that the founders of the movement and their followers were excommunicated from the Church by the decision of the Highest Clerical Council as early as in December 1994.

Quite instructive was an incident that caused controversy in the Russian parliament (State Duma), related to the Roerich followers and their symbol, the so-called Banner of Peace (a red circle with three red dots on white background) which was originally designed by Nicholas

²² *Ibid.*

²³ "O Tomskom protsesse, krishnaitakh i grazhdansom obshchestve", in: <http://iriney.ru/sects/krishna/news098.html>

Roerich as a symbol of the Pact of Roerich, adopted in 1935. It was the first international treaty aimed at protecting cultural and historical values. The banner appeared in the parliament building in 1994 thanks to the efforts of a deputy from the Chuvash Republic and Roerich follower, Nadezhda Bikalova.

The banner, which was presented to the deputies as a “gift of good will from the women of the Chuvash Republic and a symbol of peace, cooperation and unity of all people, irrespective of their nationality, faith and political views”, was in due course put on a wall in the parliament building next to the Russian flag without any formal procedures²⁴. Three years later, one of the deputies, Nina Krivel’skaia, expressed her opinion that the Banner of Peace was an occult symbol and that it was insulting to the Church and even illegal to have in the Duma. She also mentioned the excommunication of the Roerichs and their followers by the Highest Clerical Council and questioned the scholarly and philosophical heritage of the Roerichs. It is noteworthy that the arguments put forward by the deputy were highly influenced or even borrowed from Kuraev’s above-mentioned book, *Satanism for Intelligentsia*. Krivel’skaia’s speech provoked heated debate among other deputies. Many of them defended the principle of freedom of conscience and claimed “that among the deputies, there were people with different worldviews and religious beliefs and the opinion of one deputy should not be decisive”. Krivel’skaia objected, saying that it was not only her opinion but one shared by a group of colleagues and that the banner was imposed on the deputies against the law²⁵.

However, despite all the efforts of the Orthodox Church, Krivel’skaia and her associates failed to force Roerich followers out of the Duma. The banner, which had many protectors, remained in the building for six more years. In 2004, though, another deputy put an end to this long saga after having expressed views about the “satanic” and anti-Christian nature of the Roerich movement and their “occult flag”, which

²⁴ *Gosudarstvennaia Duma, Stenogramma Zasedanii, Vesenniaia Sessia*, Moscow: Respublika, 1994-05-01, pp. 61–63.

²⁵ *Gosudarstvennaia Duma, Stenogramma Zasedanii, biulleten*, Moscow: Izdanie Gosudarstvennoi Dumy, 1998, no. 167 (309), pp. 30–32.

allegedly desecrated the State Duma and separated the deputies from the Church. The request of this deputy was satisfied and the Banner of Peace finally disappeared from the State Duma²⁶. The story of the Banner of Peace in the State Duma demonstrates the change in attitudes towards religious diversity in the Russian society. What the Church failed to do in 1998, at the time of greater religious pluralism and tolerance, was easily achieved in 2004, when opinions of the Church became far more dominant and shared by the majority of the deputies. The struggle against “cults”, initiated by the Church and “anti-cult” circles, had a great impact on the formation of public opinion. An opinion poll, conducted by VTsIOM in 2006, the absolute majority of respondents declared that they regarded Satanists and *sektanty* (cultists) as the main enemies of Orthodox Christianity.

Summing up the material used in this article, it is possible to conclude that, with the exception of a rather short period of religious tolerance and even permissiveness after the *perestroika*, attitudes towards non-mainstream religious groups in Russia have remained quite suspicious and negative. The Church spares no effort in order to defend its “indigenous territory” from intruders and to maintain spiritual superiority over other religious denominations. In this matter, the ROC relies on anti-cult circles, state officials, public figures, writers, scholars, journalists and psychiatrists. Moreover, over the recent years, there has formed an obvious tendency towards the fusion of the state and the Church, which reveals itself in their mutual support, protection of each other’s interests and prosecution of common enemies. The best example is, in our opinion, the case of the well-known feminist punk band whose activists were imprisoned under the pretext of hooliganism in a temple, although their action was mostly anti-government and targeted, in particular, president Putin. Bearing in mind that the Church is officially separated from the state and educational establishments in Russia, such a tendency causes concern.

²⁶ *Gosudarstvennaia Duma, Stenogramma Zasedanii*, Moscow: Izdanie Gosudarstvennoi Dumy, 2004, no. 71 (785), pp. 16–17.

SANTRAUKOS

KAIP VĒLYVŪJŲ VIDURAMŽIŲ LIETUVOJE KRIKŠČIONYS PATOBULINO SAVO TEOLOGINES ŽINIAS, BENDRAUDAMI SU NEKRIKŠČIONIMIS

S. C. ROWELL

XV–XVI a. sandūroje Lietuvos krikščionių santykiai su „svetimaisiais“ (žydais, musulmonais) kartais liudija jų pasiruošimą ramiai aptarti teologines temas net su nekrikščionimis, gyvenančiais atskirose kategorijų / tradicijų ribose. Tokios ribos buvo saugomos abiejų pusių, o jų negerbiant (pvz., žydai teisėtai apsikrikštijus) kildavo visuomeninis nepasitenkinimas. Priede publikuojami dokumentai apie Kazimiero Jogailaičio dvare įvykusius teologinius ginčus tarp katalikų, žydo (veikiausiai karaimo) bei musulmono.



PAGONIŲ ATVERTIMAS IR *IUS GENTIUM* SAMPRATA KROKUVOS PROFESORIŲ DARBUOSE XV A. PIRMOJOJE PUSĖJE: APŽVALGA

PAWEŁ KRAS

Straipsnyje nagrinėjama *ius gentium* samprata, svarstyta Krokuvos universitete XV a. pirmojoje pusėje ir taikyta politinėje ir teisinėje polemikoje tarp Lenkijos Karalystės ir Vokiečių ordino. Pirmajame XV a. ketvirtyje Vladislovas Jogaila (1386–1434) įdarbino grupę išsimokslinusių Krokuvos profesorių savo patarėjais, įgaliotiniams ir diplomatais. Jų svarbiausias tikslas buvo atsverti Vokiečių ordino diplomatinis veiksmus, nutaikytus į Lenkijos karalių ir į Lenkijos valstybę apskritai. Krokuvos intelektualai pradėjo bendrą kovą su šventojo karo prieš pagonis samprata, kuria Vokiečių ordinas grindė savo karinius veiksmus

prieš pagonis prūsus ir lietuvius, argumentuodami, jog pagonių konversija naudojant jėgą pažeidžia tiek prigimtine, tiek dievišką teisę ir todėl turi būti uždrausta. Jų argumentai buvo dėstomi įvairia forma ir pristatomi įvairiuose forumuose: popiežiaus ir jo legatų akivaizdoje, Konstanco susirinkime ir Europos monarchų dvaruose.

Įvairiems veiksams prieš Vokiečių ordiną vadovavo grupė Krokuvos intelektualų, įgijusių teisės ir teologijos mokslu laipsnius Prahos, Bolonijos ir Paduvos universitetuose. Pirmą kartą tiek daug išsilavinusių Lenkijos mokslininkų dalyvavo tarptautinėse diskusijose, siekdami įrodyti, jog Vokiečių ordino veiksmai prieš Lenkiją ir Lietuvą pažeidžia Dievo įstatymus ir bet kokios tautos teises. Šiame straipsnyje ypač nuodugnai nagrinėjama *ius gentium* doktrina ir teisėto karo samprata, pristatytos trijų žymių Krokuvos profesorių – Andriejaus Laskažico, Stanislovo iš Skarbimiežo ir Pauliaus Vladimiri – darbuose. Jie yra laikomi geriausiais Lenkijos teisės mokslu atstovais, prisidėjusiais prie tarptautinės teisės raidos. Jie visi nagrinėjo *ius gentium* doktriną, paremtą prigimtinę ir dievišką teisę bei sėkmingai pritaikytą teisiniuose ir diplomatiniuose Lenkijos veiksniuose prieš Vokiečių ordiną.



AR GALIME NEŠTI EVANGELIJĄ TIEMS,
KURIE JOS NEGIRDĖJO? REFORMATŲ
TEOLOGINIS DISKURSAS APIE PAGONIŲ
IŠGANYMĄ ANKSTYVAISIAIS NAUJAISIAIS LAIKAIS

YVES KRUMENACKER

Gerai žinoma, jog XVI–XVII a. protestantų Bažnyčioms nepavyko evangelizuoti Naujojo pasaulio. Straipsnyje analizuojami teologiniai tekstai, nagrinėjantys pagonių evangelizacijos klausimą, ir siekiama nustatyti, ar naujųjų Bažnyčių vadovai skyrė dėmesio misijų klausimui. Kalvino ekleziologijoje jo laikais nebuvo numatyta jokios tarnystės pagonių evangelizacijai, kiekvienas pastorius buvo susijęs su konkrečia bažnyčia. Protestantai laikėsi nuostatos, jog pagonių evangelizacija buvo atlikta dar apaštalų laikais: jei šiais laikais pagonys

netiki Dievu, tai rodo Dievo valią, todėl pagonių konversija yra dieviškojo plano pažeidimas.

Antroje straipsnio dalyje atskleidžiama, jog kalvinistų pasaulyje būta galimybės misijoms: manyta, jog visur galima skelbti evangeliją, jei pasitaiko palanki galimybė. Kai kurie protestantai net apgailėstavo dėl misionieriškų pastangų trūkumo lyginant su Katalikų Bažnyčia. Straipsnio pabaigoje nagrinėjamos Adriano Saravios, olandų teologo, episkopalinės ekleziologijos išpažinėjo, misijinės idėjos.



MARTYNAS LIUTERIS IR TURKAI

HARTMUT LEHMANN

Nuo tada, kai nacionalsocialistai savo propagandoje ėmė naudoti Liuterio tekstus, nukreiptus prieš žydus, jais grįsdami savo rasinę naikinimo politiką, ši tema prikaustė Reformacijos tyrinėtojų bei plačiosios visuomenės dėmesį. Tuo tarpu ne mažiau kontroversiški Liuterio tekstai apie turkus panašaus dėmesio nesulaukė. 1529 m. traktate „Apie karą prieš turkus“ Liuteris teigė, jog islamas atnešė labai pavojingą tikėjimų sistemą, giliai persmelktą demoniškų jėgų. 1530 m. „Pamoksle su turkais kovojantiems kariams“ Liuteris aiškino, jog mūšiai su turkais – ne kas kita kaip mūšiai tarp Kristaus ir Gogo bei Magogo, tai yra tarp Šėtono vedamų tautų ir Dievo Karalystės. Abu šie traktatai padiktuoti pykčio, jie kupini fantazijų apie griovimą ir naikinimą. Artėjant Reformacijos pradžios jubiliejui 2017 metais liuteronai ir, tiesą sakant, visi protestantai yra raginami peržvelgti šiuos tekstus ir pasiūlyti interpretaciją, kuri nekurstytų musulmonų mažumų, gyvenančių daugelyje Vakarų valstybių.



KATALIKAI IR ŽYDAI VILNIAUS VYSKUPIJOJE XVII A. KATALIKŲ BAŽNYČIOS VIZITACIJŲ DUOMENIMIS

VAIDA KAMUNTAVIČIENĖ

1660–1662 m. Gardino dekanato, 1668–1669 m. Kauno, Simno, Alvito,

Ružanų, Valkavisko ir Slanimo dekanatų Katalikų bažnyčių vizitacijos pateikia duomenų apie Katalikų bažnyčios požiūrį į žydus ir jų gyvenimo sąlygas Vilniaus vyskupijoje. Straipsnyje, remiantis šių vizitacijų bei atskirų parapijų inventorių medžiaga, Vilniaus vyskupijos 1669 m. ir 1685 m. sinodų nutarimais, atskleidžiamas katalikų santykis su žydais minėtų septynių Vilniaus vyskupijos dekanatų parapijose. Katalikų vizitatoriai neturėjo tikslo suregistruoti visų žydų bendruomenių, todėl jų pateikiama informacija ganėtinai fragmentiška. Tirta medžiaga daugiausia informacijos suteikė apie Gardino dekanato žydus, o mažiausiai joje buvo matyti Kauno dekanato žydų gyvenimas. Nepaisant šių trūkumų, vis dėlto vizitacijos bei inventoriai užfiksavo svarbiausius žydų gyvenimo aspektus, kuriuos ateityje būtų galima plėtoti į pagalbą pasitelkiant kitokius šaltinius.

Atliktas tyrimas parodė, kad žydai buvo svarbi LDK visuomenės dalis, užėmusi savitą nišą valstybės bei visuomenės gyvenime. Katalikų bažnyčios požiūriu jie kėlė tam tikrus pavojus katalikams, todėl buvo stengiamasi nustatyti, kokių atstumu iki katalikų bažnyčios žydai galėjo gyventi, apibrėžti žydų gyvenamojo arealo ribas (pateikti Gardino, Sokulkos, Punsko parapijų pavyzdžiai). Be vyskupo žinios žydai negalėjo statyti sinagogų (aptarti Induros, Balbieriškio atvejai), vyskupai specialiomis privilegijomis garantuodavo atskirų žydų bendruomenių mokesčius (Naujadvario pavyzdys). Ypač daug problemų kėlė žydams tarnaujantys katalikai, nes iškildavo pavojus jų religingumui, Katalikų bažnyčios papročių laikymuisi (Induros, Balbieriškio, Mastų parapijų pavyzdžiai). Tačiau ekonomine prasme žydai buvo naudingi katalikams, pasitikėta jų ekonominiu pajėgumu. Nepaisant naudos, ekstremaliomis aplinkybėmis žydai buvo pirmieji, kuriems buvo metami kaltinimai dėl kenkimo krikščionims (sudegus Induros bažnyčiai, apkaltintas žydas). Vizitacijų duomenys parodė, kad iš esmės žydai galėjo laisvai gyventi Vilniaus vyskupijos teritorijoje pagal Katalikų bažnyčios nustatytas sąlygas, kurios jiems buvo gan palankios. LDK visuomenė buvo adaptavusis prie žydų kaimynystės, kai kurie valstiečiai buvo įgiję Žydo ar Žydelio pravardes, laikui bėgant tapusias jų pavardėmis.



VILNIAUS KATEDROS KAPITULA IR ŽYDAI XVI–XVII A.:
KATEDROS KAPITULOS AKTUOSE FIKSUOTI ATVEJAI

WIOLETTA PAWLIKOWSKA-BUTTERWICK

Abiejų Tautų Respublikos žydų bendruomenių ir katalikų dvasininkijos santykiai mokslinėje literatūroje plačiai nagrinėti. Vis dėlto tyrimų gausa ne visuomet reiškia, kad šie platūs ir sudėtingi klausimai išnagrinėti išsamiai. Geriausiai istoriografijoje iki šiol atskleisti konfesiniai konfliktai, ir tai suprantama, kadangi veikdami prieš senosios Sandomos išpažinėjus katalikai dažniausiai rėmėsi religijos skirtingumu. Be to, šie išpuoliai turėjo toli siekiančių pasekmių. Vis dėlto abipusiai santykiai jokiū būdu neapsiribojo konfliktais. Be abejonės, svarbiausią bendravimo dalį sudarė įvairaus plauko ekonominiai santykiai tarp katalikų dvasininkijos ir žydų. Straipsnyje atskleidžiami įvairūs Vilniaus katedros kapitulos ir žydų bendruomenės ryšiai XVI–XVII a. remiantis Vilniaus kapitulos posėdžių protokolais. Tiek Katalikų Bažnyčios, tiek žydų religiniai vadovai siekė sugriežtinti krikščionių ir žydų bendravimą, oficialiai prieštaraudami mišrioms santuokoms. Tačiau praktikoje ribos galėjo būti peržengiamos. Santuokos tarp kataliko(-ės) ir nekrikščionės(-io) sąlyga buvo pastarosios(-ojo) konversija, o tai kėlė didelį rabinų susirūpinimą. Neformalius seksualinius santykius tarp žydų ir pagonių jie savo ruožtu traktavo kaip stabmeldystę. Formalūs civilinės ir kanonų teisės draudimai sugriežtino, tačiau negalėjo visiškai užkirsti kelio tiek atskiriems dvasininkams, tiek visai kapitulai palaikyti santykių, kuriuos galėtume apibūdinti kaip korektiškus, su žydais.



ŽYDŲ POŽIŪRIS Į BIZANTIJOS ŽLUGIMĄ?
ŽODŽIO *kaftor* DEFINICIJA KIRILINIAME HEBRAJŲ
KALBOS VADOVĖLYJE (XVI A. NUORAŠAS)

SERGEJUS TEMČINAS

Straipsnyje aptariama hebrajiško žodžio *kaftor* definicija ('prieš priemenės duris esantis nedidelis pakilimas laiptų viršuje') iš kiriliniame rankraštiniame

hebrajų kalbos vadovėlyje surašyto hebrajų–rusėnų kalbų žodynėlio (Maskva, Rusijos valstybinis senųjų aktų archyvas, F. Mazurino fondas (f. 196), invent. 1, Nr. 616, fol. 124–130; XVI a. trečiojo ketvirčio nuorašas).

Šiaip hebrajų *kaftor* reiškia ‘(kolonos) kapitelis’ ir vietovę, interpretuojamą kaip Kreta arba netoli Dumjato buvęs Egipto miestas. Vietovė *Kaftor* tradiciškai laikyta dviejų tautų – kaftoritų ir filistinų – kilmės vieta. Kiriliniame šaltinyje žodis *kaftor* pateiktas su Egiptu temiškai susijusių žodžių grupėje, o tai atitinka egiptietišką vietovės *Kaftor* lokalizaciją. Tačiau aptariamojo žodžio definicija rankraštiniame vadovėlyje prasilenkia su realia šio žodžio semantika ir tikriausiai yra jo suvokimo kaip kompozito *kaf-tor* (plg. hebrajų *kaf* ‘delnas; padas’ ir *tor* ‘(plaukų) kasa; posūkis’) rezultatas su rekonstruota reikšme *‘pado posūkis’ = hebrajų *miftān* ‘slenkstis’.

Šis aiškinimas sietinas su Biblijos pasakojimu apie filistinų dievo Dagono mirtį, ištikusią jį prieš Viešpaties Skrynią, ant jo paties šventovės slenkščio (1 Sam 5.1–5). Rankraštinio vadovėlio sudarymo laikais šis pasakojimas galėjo būti aktualus dėl to, kad vietovė *Kaftor* sieta su Kreta ir graikais, Dagonas – su Jėzumi Kristumi, tad Biblijoje aprašyta Dagono mirtis galėjo žydams simboliizuoti stačiatikių graikų sostinės – Konstantinopolio žlugimą (1453 m.).



KĄ TURI ŽINOTI KATALIKAS?

ELENA KEIDOŠIŪTĖ

Žydo katechumeno paruošimas priimti katalikišką krikštą be privalomų tikėjimo tiesų išmokimo ir apsisprendimo nuoširdumo įrodymo apimdavo ir sudėtingesnių naujakrikšto integracijos problemų sprendimus. Straipsnyje apžvelgiami žydų paruošimas krikštui Katalikų bažnyčioje XIX a. – XX a. pirmos pusės Lietuvos teritorijoje bei analizuojama, kaip šio proceso pokyčius lėmė įvairūs politiniai bei sociokultūriniai kontekstai. Nagrinėjant konversijos procedūros komponentus tyrime nustatoma, kokie konkretūs pasikeitimai vyko ruošiant judėją katalikiškam gyvenimui ir kokios žinios bei įgūdžiai buvo laikomi esminiais ar pakankamais tapti kataliku. Tuo pačiu vertinama, kaip

šios katalikų dvasininkijos žydams katechumenams perduodamos žinios buvo potencialiai adekvačios ir išsamios bei kaip ir dėl kokių priežasčių jų turinys keitėsi Rusijos imperijos ir tarpukario Lietuvos teritorijoje. Šis tyrimas taip pat kvestionuoja pačią visapusiškos ir sklandžios žydo konvertito integracijos katalikiškoje visuomenėje galimybę. Atsižvelgiant į neretai nominalias ir / ar paviršutiniškas praktikas ruošiant asmenį religijos keitimui, išryškėja pagrindiniai probleminiai klausimai, kildavę tiek besiruošiantiems krikščytis, tiek pastaruošius globojantiems, ypatingą dėmesį skiriant bandymams ir kliūtims formuoti bei įgyvendinti veiksmingas konvertitų integracijos idėjas ir programas.



MISIJA, CIVILIZACIJA IR PRIEVARTA KOLONIJINIAME
NATALYJE. ABATAS FRANTZAS PFANNERIS IR AFRIKOS
„KITI“ MARIANHILYJE (1882–1909)

PHILIPPE DENIS

Straipsnyje pristatoma Frantzo Pfannerio (1825–1909), trapistų vienuolyno Marianhilyje, Pietų Afrikoje, įkūrėjo ir pirmojo abato veikla. Ypatingas dėmesys straipsnyje skiriamas pirmųjų susitikimų su afrikiečiais metams (1883–1884), vietinių kunigų klausimui ir „Vietinio klausimo“ memorandumui, publikuotam 1893 m. Pfannerio požiūris į rasę ir kultūrą buvo neįprastas savam laikui, tačiau kartu ir prieštaringas. Jis susidūrė su ta pačia dilema kaip ir dauguma misionierių: kaip gerbti kitokius nei tu pats žmones, kuomet esi įsitikinęs savo kultūros ir religijos įgimtu pranašumu? Priešingai nei didžioji dalis kolonistų ir nemaža dalis misionierių, Pfanneris tikėjo pamatine žmonių lygybe ir kritikavo įsigalėjusį kolonijinės bendruomenės rasizmą. Tačiau širdies gilumoje jis pats buvo kolonistas. Jo svajonė, sąmoninga ar ne, buvo paversti savo afrikiečius konvertitus žmonėmis, viskuo, išskyrus odos spalvą, išreikšiančiais europietišką gyvenimo būdą. Nors ir būdamas dideliu fizinio darbo šalininku, jis rėmė profesinį ugdymą ir neprieštaravo tam tikram prievartos prieš afrikiečius panaudojimo laipsniui.



KRIKŠČIONYS NEKRIKŠČIONIŠKŲ TIKROVIŲ
PAIEŠKOSE: NATŪRALIZMAS, SPIRITUALIZMAS,
TEOSOFIJA. NUO KATALONIJOS IKI AZIJOS
KULTŪRŲ (1917–1930)

JOSÉ ANDRÉS-GALLEGO

Straipsnyje analizuojama vieno konkretaus ispano biografija formuluojant hipotezę, jog joje aprašyta patirtis būdinga visam Vakarų – ir visam vesternizuotam – pasauliui XIX–XX a. sandūroje. Ispanų socialinio aktyvisto Guillemo Roviroso biografija atskleidžia, kaip jis jaunystėje prarado tikėjimą būdamas kataliku ir pradėjo ieškoti tiesos labai skirtingose religijose ir net ezoterikoje, pradedant esperanto ir natūralizmu, pereinant prie spiritualizmo ir baigiant teosofija. Keli jo draugai ėjo panašių ieškojimų keliu. Keliama hipotezė, jog šis idėjinis maršrutas atskleidžia ne kultūrų maišymosi situaciją, tačiau pristato kontrkultūrą, atsiradusią Vakaruose XIX a. pabaigoje ir pradėtą eksportuoti į likusį pasaulį, kur atvykstantys vakariečiai stengėsi būti suprasti.



„KITO“ VAIZDINYS IŠ KATALIKŲ, KRIKŠČIONIŲ
IR NEKRIKŠČIONIŠKŲ PERSPEKTYVOS ISPANIJOS
PILIETINIO KARO (1936–1939) METAIS

ANTÓN M. PAZOS

XX a. pradžioje, po Pirmojo pasaulinio, karo Vakaruose „kito“ suvokimui buvo būdingas ypatingas antagonizmas. Ideologinei priešpriešai peraugus į tiesioginį konfliktą „kitas“ tapo priešu, kuris turi būti sunaikintas, radosi nesutaikomos kairiųjų–dešiniųjų, raudonųjų–baltųjų, fašistų–komunistų priešpriešos. Ispanijoje tokia priešprieša pasiekė kulminaciją pilietinio karo metais (1936–1939).

Žvelgiant iš religinės perspektyvos, Ispanija buvo pasidalinusi į katalikus ir ne katalikus. Respublikos šalininkų akimis Katalikų Bažnyčia įkūnijo hierarchiją, dvasininkų luomą, religinius įstatymus bei katalikišką buržuaziją. Tačiau

jos gretose pasitaikydavo ir teigiamų „kitų“, pavyzdžiui, kunigas revoliucionierius arba Respublikos armijai padedanti vienuolė.

Katalikai taip pat matė du „kitų“ tipus. Vienas buvo Bažnyčios sūnus, apnuodytas antikrikščioniška propaganda. Greta šio klystkeliuose pasimetusio brolio ar sūnaus egzistavo „kitas“, kaip radikalus priešas, išdavęs Ispanijos žmones. Katalikų Bažnyčios akimis šis „kitas“ buvo visiškai svetimas Ispanijai ir Vakarų civilizacijai – materialistas, necivilizuotas laukinis.

Straipsnyje analizuojami šie dvigubi „kitų“ tipai ir jų sampynos Ispanijoje pilietinio karo metais.



APIE KONFLIKTO LAUKĄ – GALIOS SANTYKIAI TARP KATALIKŲ, SERBŲ STAČIATIKIŲ, MUSULMONŲ IR VALSTYBĖS JUGOSLAVIJOS KARALYSTĖJE

GAŠPER MITHANS

Naujai sukurtoje Serbų, kroatų ir slovėnų karalystėje, vėliau pavadintoje Jugoslavija, religinės bendruomenės turėjo prisitaikyti prie visiškai naujų religinių, politinių ir tautinių sąlygų. Religinių-politinių konfliktų kulminacija tapo konkordato krizė. Ilgai brendusi religinių reikalų plotmėje – derybų dėl konkordato metu (1922–1935), – ji tapo politinių žaidimų dalimi. Politinėje plotmėje pagrindiniais žaidėjais tapo valdančioji Jugoslavijos radikalų sąjunga iš vienos pusės ir Serbijos Stačiatikių Bažnyčios remiama politinė opozicija (ypač „masoninė“ Jugoslavijos nacionalistų partija) iš kitos pusės. Nei Jugoslavijos katalikų vyskupai, nei musulmonai, laikydamiesi susitarimų su valdžia, neįsitraukė į šią kovą, pagrindinė politinė kroatų partija (buvusi Kroatų valstiečių partija) liko neutrali. Konkordato ratifikacija žlugo, valstybė įtvirtino vienos religinės bendruomenės (serbų Stačiatikių Bažnyčios) interesus kitos (Katalikų Bažnyčios) sąskaita, taip užsitikrindama sau galios pozicijas.



NIURNBERGO RASINIŲ ĮSTATYMŲ
 TAIKYMAS PAKRIKŠTYTIEMS IR
 NEKRIKŠTYTIEMS ŽYDAMS ŠVEDIJOS
 BAŽNYČIOJE (1935–1945)

ANDERS JARLERT

Daugelio Švedijos piliečių turėtą Bažnyčios įvaizdį daugiausia formavo jų kasdieniai kontaktai dėl civilinės santuokos registracijos ir čia išskylantys sunkumai. Dėl to šis straipsnis kaip kasdienybės istorijos pavyzdys, pristatantis, kaip Švedijos Bažnyčia taikė Niurnbergo rasinius įstatymus, skirtus pakrikštytiems ir nekrikštytiems žydams (1935–1945), yra labai aktualus iš Bažnyčios istorijos perspektyvos. Straipsnyje atskleidžiama, kaip Švedijos Bažnyčia, vykdydama civilines prievoles, pasidavė Švedijos vyriausybės įtakai, dažnai laikydamosi tik administracinių reikalavimų, nederinamų su teologine refleksija. Niurnbergo įstatymų taikymas laikantis 1902 m. Hagos konvencijos greta krikščionių ir nekrikščionių sukūrė naują asmenų grupę, kuri buvo pripažįstama kaip krikščionys, tačiau dėl savo žydiškos kilmės registruojant santuoką – jei šie žmonės norėdavo tuoktis su „arijų“ kilmės vokiečių pilietybės asmeniu – su jais buvo elgiamasi kitaip. Šioje situacijoje krikščionių dvasininkų veiksmai buvo skirtinigi, varijavo nuo biurokratinio pasipriešinimo, iki visiško pritarimo.

Vokiečių valdžia apibrėždavo „kitą“ per rasę, ne tikėjimą, tačiau nustatinėdami, kas yra žydas, o kas – arijas, vokiečiai turėdavo pasikliauti dokumentų įrašais apie religinę priklausomybę tiek pačioje Vokietijoje, tiek už jos ribų. Nacistinėje Vokietijoje žydai krikščionys didele dalimi buvo išstumti iš krikščionių bendruomenės. Švedijoje taip nebuvo, tačiau krikščionių ir nekrikščionių klausimas tapo krikščionių ir „kitų krikščionių“ klausimu, kadangi kai kurie žydai svarbioje sferoje buvo išstumti iš sociumo.



II VATIKANO SUSIRINKIMO PADARINIAI: POPIEŽIAUS JONO PAULIAUS II POŽIŪRIS Į NETIKINČIUOSIUS

BERNARD ARDURA

Remiantis naujausiomis popiežiaus Jono Pauliaus II biografinėmis studijomis ir oficialiais jo pontifikato dokumentais, straipsnyje atskleidžiamos istorinės bei intelektualinės prielaidos, lėmusios Bažnyčios santykio su netikinčiaisiais kaitą, prasidėjusią po II Vatikano Susirinkimo ir išibėgėjusią XX a. pabaigoje. Jono Pauliaus II palankumas dialogui su netikinčiaisiais pirmiausia kilo iš jo asmenybės charizmatiškumo, padėjusio dar ganytojiško darbo komunistinėje Lenkijoje laikais pasiekti pozityvių rezultatų ne bekompromisės priešpriešos, bet derybų keliu. Jonas Paulius II taip pat svariai prisidėjo rengiant II Vatikano Susirinkimo dokumentus, nubrėžusius kitokio Bažnyčios santykio su moderniu pasauliu kontūrus. Jo pontifikato metais praktiškai mėginta realizuoti esminę šių dokumentų nuostatą, kad dėl netikėjimo plėtros šiuolaikiniame pasaulyje yra bent iš dalies kalti ir patys krikščionys, nesugebėję Evangelijos šviesoje rasti įtikinamų atsakymų modernybės iššūkams. Jono Pauliaus II pontifikato metais buvo ypač pabrėžiama dialogo su netikinčiaisiais kultūros srityje svarba.



RELIGINĖ PADĖTIS POKOMUNISTINĖJE RUSIJOJE

MARIA PETROVA

Straipsnyje aptariama religijos situacija pokomunistinėje Rusijoje nuo *perestroikos* iki dabartinių laikų. Nagrinėjami santykiai tarp dominuojančių religijų ir mažumų religinių bendruomenių besikeičiančių Rusijos religinių įstatymų bei dėl glaudaus bendradarbiavimo su valdžia stiprėjančios Stačiatikių Bažnyčios padėties kontekste. Didžiausias dėmesys skiriamas „rytų“ religinėms bendruomenėms (Hare Krišnos ir įvairios Rericho grupės pasitelkiamos kaip ryškiausi pavyzdžiai). Toks pasirinkimas grindžiamas, viena vertus, tuo, kad Rusijoje visuomet būta „rytų“ dvasingumo tradicijos, užgimusios dar carinėje Rusijoje, kuri per sovietinius laikus pasiekė dabartį, bei, kita vertus, tuo, jog šios grupės

yra suvokiamos kaip keliantys ypatingą grėsmę Rusijos Stačiatikių Bažnyčiai. Straipsnyje taip pat pristatoma įvairių sektantiškų grupių ir jų vadovų veikla, ypač nuodugniai analizuojama diakono Andriejaus Kurajevo ir Aleksandro Dvorkino kritika ISCKON (International Society for Krishna Consciousness) ir Rericho judėjimo atžvilgiu. Tyrimas grindžiamas pirminių dokumentinių šaltinių analize, apimant aukščiau minėtų religinių grupių vadovų, antisektantiškų grupių vadovų tekstus, periodinių žurnalų, konferencijų medžiagą, laikraščių ir atitinkamų interneto svetainių tekstus.

ASMENVARDŽIŲ RODYKLĖ

- Abreu Mauricio A. 64
Achiezer Golda 11
Acosta José de 65
Adam 10
Adamska Anna 29
Agursky Mikhail 116
Aleksandar Karadjordjević, king 190,
194, 195, 197
Aleksandravičius Egidijus 93
Aleksandrov A. 234
Alexander de Nevo 19
Alexander IV, pope 23
Alexander Stella 198
Alexander, Grand Duke of Lithuania 10,
19
Al-Ghazali 17
Ališauskas Vytautas 2, 89
Anastase Estienne 63
Anderson Gerald H. 55
Andreas 21
Andrés-Gallego José 4, 155, 176, 179,
180, 182, 248
Andrzej of Kokorzyn 52
d'Annunzio [Gabriele] 170
Anužytė Lina 14
Ardura Bernard 4, 251
Arnold Matthew 135
Arnold von Köln 19
Ashforth Adam 146
Auer Ljudevit 201
Augeron Mickaël 64
Augustine of Pisa 52
Augustine, St 33, 40, 46
Avilés Juan 161
Ángel David Martín Rubio 175
Babicki W. 98
Ballester José 172, 173
Balling Adalbert Ludwig 136
Bałaban Majer 94
Banac Ivo 200
Bardach Juliusz 98
Baronas Darius 2
Bataillon Marcel 65
Bautista Vilar Juan 165
Beck C. H. 71
Belda Carbonell Agustín 162
Bełch Stanisław (Stanislaus Bełch) 21,
28, 44, 46, 47
Benedict Philip 57
Benedict XIV, pope 118
Benjamin of Tudela 108
Benoit Jean-Daniel 57
Benson Rodney 190
Benzoni Girolamo 65
Berenbaum Michael 108, 112
Bergamín José 175
Bermejo Marín Pedro 184
Bernard of Clairvaux, St 32
Bernardino de Sahagun 65
Bèze Thèodore de 60, 61, 66, 67
Bishop G. 60, 67
Blätter Joseph 138
Blavatsky Helen 164
Błaszczyk Grzegorz 93
Bobzin Hartmut 71
Bohdanowicz Bazyli 99
Bolado Alfonso Álvarez 178
Bond Afrikaner 149
Bonne-Foy Jean 59
Boockmann Hartmut 49, 53

- Borm Jan 56
 Borkowska Małgorzata OSB 118
 Boruta Jonas SJ 2
 Bots Hans 66
 Bougarel Xavier 193
 Bourdieu Pierre 189–191
 Boyer John W. 210
 Bracha K. 12
 Brain J. B. 134, 135
 Brand Justin 62
 Bratt John H. 63
 Brecht Martin 71
 Bredenkamp Henry 134
 Brinton Henry 181
 Bryant David 142, 144
 Buchwald-Pelcowa Paulina 13
 Buckler Andrew 56, 58, 63
 Budny Simon 16
 Bujak Grzegorz 77
 Bula Clotilde 169
 Bumblauskas Alfredas 16, 18, 77
 Burgos Manuel M. 161
 Buschgerd Annette 136

 Calvin Jean 56–61, 63, 68
 Cambra Bassols Jordi de 161
 Caperan Louis 61
 Capistrano Juan 11
 las Casas, Bartolomé de 56
 Casas Ramón 158
 Casimir IV, king 11, 13, 15, 21
 Casimir III the Great, king 30
 Casimir, St 97
 Casper of Perugia 52
 Centassi René 157
 Certeau Michel de 196
 Charlemagne, emperor 46, 47
 Charles V, emperor 72
 Chauffier Louis-Martin 175
 Chauveton Urbain 65
 Chidester David 133
 Chmielewski Maciej 100

 Chodkiewicz Aleksander Krzysztof 94
 Clement IV, pope 23, 60
 Colenso John William 135, 148
 Comby Jean 65
 Cottret Bernard 56
 Czacki Tadeusz 11
 Czaja Roman 31
 Czartoryska 83
 Czyżewicz Piotr 20

 Dagon (Dagonas) 110–113, 246
 Dahm Joseph 138
 Danek Wincenty 117, 128
 Daniel 17
 David 16, 37
 Deichert A. 55
 Delval Michel 61
 Denis Philippe 4, 5, 7, 133, 134, 142–
 144, 247
 Desbordes Isaac 58
 Dischl Marcel 138
 Djokić Dejan 192, 193
 Długosz Jan 11
 Dobratycki Maciej 96
 Dožić Gavriilo 202
 Drelincourt Charles 61, 62, 66
 Dréma Vladas 92
 Dubonis Artūras 93
 Dvorkin Aleksandr 236, 252
 Dygo Marian 33

 Edwards Jonathan 69
 Eerdmans William B. 63
 Ehmann Johannes 71
 Ehrlich Ludwik 28, 40, 47, 49
 Eijo Garay Leopoldo 180
 Ekeberg Birger 210
 Eliot John 69
 Elphick Richard 146
 Endelman Todd M. 116
 Epus Simon, bishop 143
 Eschen Klaus 213

- d'Esplugues Miguel 165
 Esther 17
 Estienne H. 60
 Eve 10
 Even-Shoshan Abraham 107
 Ezechiel Poznań 15, 22
- Falkenberg Johannes 49, 53
 Fattorini Emma 170
 Faupel Rainer 213
 Feigelmanas Nojus 19
 Fennell John L. I. 15
 Ferrán Alsina 165
 Ferrer i Guardia Francisco 160
 Filatov Sergei 230, 234
 Firkovičius Romualdas 90
 Flammarion Camille 162
 Fornerod Nicolas 57
 Forrest Benjamin 229
 Foucault Michel 192
 Francis Xavier, St 64
 Franco Francisco 171
 Frederick of Betygala 20
 Fredericus 21
 Freeze Chaeran 116
 Frei Norbert 208
 Frick David 90, 91, 102
 Friede Juan 56
 Friedrich Hubertus 185
 Friedrich Jakob 211
 Frontczyk Marian 28
 Furman D. 229
 Fux Vitalis 142
- Gale Thomson 108, 112
 Ganoczy Alexandre 57
 Gaon Saadiah 108
 García Morales Juan 173
 García Soler María Isabel 158
 García Xavier 155, 160, 164
 Garnsey Peter D. A. 112
 Gasa Enock 148
- Gaspar J. 162
 Gašparič Jure 194
 Gast Uriel 216
 Gaventa John 191
 Gašiorowski Stefan 87
 Gensichen Hans-Werner 55
 Geraci Robert P. 116
 Gerhard Johann 60, 62, 66
 Gesenius William 107, 110
 Gesner Konrad 60
 Getkant Friedrich 91
 Geyer Michael 210
 Giménez Fernández Manuel 56
 Giner de los Ríos Francisco 173
 Gintyllo Jan Chryzostom 117, 122, 123
 Glagolev Aleksandr 233
 Gloger Zygmunt 98
 Gog 73, 243
 Golb Norman 108
 Goldberg Jacob 94, 96, 99, 101, 116
 Gollancz Victor 185
 Gomá y Tomás Isidro, cardinal 175–177,
 179, 182, 274
 Gordin Rico 213
 Gösta Engzell 212
 Goštautas Albertas 18
 Goulart Simon 65
 Granados Anastasio 177
 Grau Jaume 156, 159, 168
 Grau Josep 155, 156, 159, 165, 166, 168
 Gregory the Great, St 46
 Gregory X, pope 14
 Grey Glen 148
 Griffith Patrick, bishop 134
 Griggs T. W. 135
 Grotius Hugo 60
 Gual Villalbí Pedro 165
 Guardiola Antonio 165
 Gudavičius Edvardas 77
 Gudmantas Kęstutis 18
 Gudytė Kristina 11
 Güell Eusebio 165

- Güell López-Bacigalupi 165
 Guldon Zenon 87, 95
 Gutiérrez Claudio Marín 186
 Guy Jeff 135
 Góralski Wojciech 93
- Haitinger Ludwig 137
 Hardeland Otto 55
 Hatchard J. 97
 Heim Marc-André 136
 Herburt Mamert 92, 99, 100
 Hemann von Salza 36
 Hermann Adelgisa 135
 Heurnius Justus 67
 Heves Beaulieu 65
 Hilberg Raul 208
 Hoensch Jörg K. 198
 Hogg William 55
 Holsten Walter 55
 Holszański Paweł 96
 Hoorbeek Johannes 68
 Hugues Philip 63
 d'Huisseau Isaac 58
 Hütisau Berchtold 145, 150
- Ichelevna Chaia 122
 Ilinicz Jakub 100
 Innocent IV, pope 23, 25, 26, 42, 45
 Irenaeus of Lyon (Irinei Lionski), St 235, 236
 Irujo Manuel de 186
 Isaac ben Abraham of Trakai (Izaokas ben Abraomas Trakiškis) 11, 14, 16
 Ivan the Great, tsar 15
 Ivanov Vyacheslav V. 16
- Jadwiga of Anjou, queen 30, 39
 Jagiełło *see* Ladislaus II
 Jagodzińska Agnieszka 117
 Jakub of Kurdwanów 51
 Jakubowicz Idel 101
 Jan, brother of Stanisław of Skarbimierz 38
- Jan, father of Stanisław of Skarbimierz 38
 Janonienė Rūta 15
 Jarlert Anders 4, 207, 250
 Jastrow Marcus 109
 Jastrzębiec Wojciech 40
 Jatulis Paulius, 18
 Jeremias (Jeremiah) 17, 21
 Jerome 111
 Jinarājadā Curuppumullagē 164
 Job 17
 Jogaila *see* Ladislaus II
 John Albert, king 19
 John Duns Scotus, Bl 33
 John of Damascus St 111
 John of Holywood 17
 John of Vercelli 14
 John Paul II (Karol Wojtyła), pope 4, 219–228, 251
 John XXIII, antipope 37, 38
 John XXIII, pope 222, 227
 John, St 125
 Johnson Juliet 229
 Joseph, St 14, 15
 Jovaiša Liudas 2
 Józefowicz Józef 96
 Junghans Helmar 71
 Jurkowlaniec Grażyna 15
 Jurkutė Mingailė 2
- Kaariainen Kimmo 229
 Kaczmarczyk Zdzisław 98
 Kakareko Andrzej, 83
 Kalik Judith 93, 94, 100
 Kamuntavičienė Vaida 3, 77, 80, 243
 Kaufmann Thomas 71
 Kawerau Gustav 55
 Kazimieras Jogailaitis *see* Casimir IV 241
 Kazimierz Wielki *see* Casimir III the Great
 Kazimirus, rex *see* Casimir IV
 Kaźmierczyk Adam 94, 98
 Keen Benjamin 56
 Keidošiūtė Elena 3, 115, 119, 246

- Kempf Timotheus 135, 141–145, 149, 150
 Kent Peter C. 198
 Kershner Howard E. 184
 Kęsgaila Stanislovas 20
 Kiaupa Zigmantas 93
 Kimchi David 111
 Kiška Stanislovas 20
 Kittelson James M. 29
 Klier John D. 116
 Kliszko Zenon 220
 Knoll Paul W. 29, 30
 Knowles David 92
 Knox Zoe 229
 Koczerska Maria 13
 Kolaric Juraj 192, 193
 Končius Juozas (slap. Koncevičius) 124
 König Franz 221
 Kopernik Mikołaj 23, 33–35, 119
 Korolko Mirosław 40
 Korošec Anton 193
 Kotovičius Aleksandras 78, 82, 83
 Kowalczyk Maria 38
 Kowalski Waldemar 87
 Kras Paweł 3, 23, 35, 241
 Krause Karl Christian Friedrich 173
 Kreis Georg 216
 Krochmal Jacek 93, 94
 Krumenacker Yves 3, 55–57, 60, 64, 242
 Krupavičius Mykolas 129, 130
 Krzycka Anna 84
 Kuraev Andrei 238, 252
 Kurczewski Jan 12, 81, 90, 94
 Kurtyka Janusz 30
 Kušej Rado 205
 Kwiatkowski Stefan 34

 Labuda Gerard 23
 Lacerda de Moura Maria 169, 170
 Lacroix-Riz Annie 197
 Ladislaus II Jagiełło, king 23, 26–31, 36, 38, 40, 43, 52, 53, 241
 Lange Nicholas Robert Michael de 112
 Lappo Ivan Ivanovič 96
 Lash Scott 191
 Laskauere P. 98
 Lazarev Sergei 231
 Lazarte Juan 169
 Lecompte Bernard 220
 Lehmann Hartmut 3, 71, 243
 Leontovich F. I. 14
 Léry Jean de 64, 68
 Lestringant Franck 64
 Leszczyński Anatol 96
 Leśnodorski Bogusław 98
 Levine Paul A. 210
 Lewalski Krzysztof 119
 Lewek Jan Krzysztof 117, 118
 Ley Michael 208
 Lezcano Ricardo 158
 Lightfoot John 108
 Lippomano Aloisius 101
 Lobanov Sergei 238
 Loič Wacquant 191
 Loiseau Charles 197
 Lopez de Carvajal Bernardino, bishop 16
 Lossius Lucas 60
 Louis Anjou of Hungary, king 30
 López Trujillo Alfonso 220
 Lossius Lucas 62
 Lubrański Jan 15, 22
 Lučić Dejan V. 199, 204
 Lüdtke Alf 210
 Lukas Philip Charles 232
 Lukauskaitė-Jasaitienė Sofija 129
 Luther Martin 3, 71, 58, 59, 71–73, 75, 243
 Lysander Albert 211
 Łapicz Czesław 10
 Łaskarzyc Andrzej, bishop 5, 23–27, 37, 38, 48, 51, 52, 242
 Łowmiańska Maria 91, 92

 Macalister Robert Alexander Stewart 111

- Maclean John 135
 Maffei Giovanni Pietro 65
 Magdelaine Michelle 58
 Magog 73, 243
 Maimonides 17
 Makrai Benedict 23, 28
 Maksimović Božidar 204
 Małachowski 82
 Malaspina Germanico 95
 Manikowska Halina 12
 Manojlović-Pintar Olga 202, 204
 Marcinowski A. 119
 Marian, bishop 23, 31
 Marín Dolors 161
 Marinetti [Filippo Tommaso] 170
 Markowski Artur 116
 Markowski Mieczysław 29, 39
 Marlorat Augustin 59, 61
 Maroszek Józef 89, 91, 92
 Martin III (II), bishop 18, 19
 Mary, St (Mother of God) 15, 20, 33
 Marzec Andrzej 41
 Masson Henri 157
 Matthew, apostle 59, 64
 Mau Rudolf 71
 Mayer Jakob Friedrich 211
 Mayhew Whitaker 69
 Mazurin F. 105, 246
 Mazuy Rachel 185
 Mažvydas Martynas 10, 11
 McCully Marilyn 158
 McKenna Antony 58
 Meiliūnaitė Violeta 105
 Meilus Elmantas 93
 Meyer Karl Heinrich 16
 Meyrueis Ch. 61
 Michałowska Teresa 10, 29
 Michta Jerzy 19
 Mickiewicz Adam 15, 93
 Migne Jacques Paul 111
 Miknys Rimantas 93
 Mills Wallace 134
 Miłkowski Stanislaw 125
 Minois Georges 33
 Mithans Gašper 4, 189, 198, 199, 203,
 205, 249
 Mitrokhin L. N. 229
 Młyński Jakub 99
 Mncadi Malukati 143
 Mnganga Edward Müller Kece, OP
 142–144
 Möbius Georg 62
 Mohyka Lucjan 220
 Mojzes Paul 192
 Moliner Prada Antonio 163
 Montero Moreno Antonio 175
 Montoliú Francisco 165
 Montseny Federica 183
 Moreira Leite Miriam 169
 Morozova Nadieżda 105
 Mortier Pierre 62
 Moscatello Nikola 198
 Moses 62, 126
 Moses ben Jacob II 17
 Mostert Marco 29
 Moszkiewicz Abraham 97
 Moszkowicz Izaak 96, 97
 Mouche Henry 65
 Muhammad 72, 74, 75
 Mühl Erwin 213
 Mukuka George 142, 143
 Müller Johannes 60, 66
 Muniz de Pablos Tomás 178
 Mussolini Benito 195
 Mužić Ivan 200, 201
 Newberie R. 60, 67
 Ngidi William 135
 Nicholls B. M. 149
 Nicolai Philipp 60, 66
 Nicolaus Gallus 60
 Niedźwiedź Jakub 102
 Nijenhuis Willem 67
 Nowak Zenon Hubert 23, 33

- Nowicki Tomasz 77
- Obolensky Dimitri 92
- Oborski Wojciech, priest 97, 98
- Ochmański Jerzy 14, 91
- Oded Bustanay 108
- Olczakow Stanisław 77
- Olelkovich Mikhail 15, 17, 18
- Oleśnicki [Zbigniew] 11
- Osorio Jeronimo 65
- Ostrogsky Konstantin 20
- Ozheiko Stanislav 19
- Ožóg Krzysztof 26, 27, 29, 38, 41, 49, 52, 53
- Pac Stanisław 99, 100
- Pacelli Eugenio *see* Pius XII
- Pacevičius Arvydas 122, 123
- Paknys Mindaugas 2, 91
- Paliušytė Aistė 95
- Pancras, St 213
- Pankowski Seweryn 99
- Papini [Giovanni] 170
- Passini José 157
- Paul VI, pope 222
- Paul, apostle 63, 59, 60, 63
- Paulus Vladimiri (Włodkowic Paweł) 28, 44–53, 242
- Pavle Karadjordjević 204
- Pavlovskii Petr 232
- Pawlikowska-Butterwick Wioletta 3, 87, 89, 245
- Pazos Antón M. 4, 169, 176, 179, 182, 248
- Pchelintsev A. 229
- Pelc Janusz 13
- Pellegrinetti Ermenegildo 204
- Perica Ivo 196, 200
- Perujo Niceto Alonso 162
- Peter of Dusburg 33, 34
- Peter of Ornetá 51, 211
- Peter, apostle 226
- Petrauskas Rimvydas 77
- Petrova Maria 4, 229, 251
- Pfanner Franz 133–154, 247
- Pfanner Wendelin 136
- Picasso Pablo 158
- Piech Zenon 20
- Piotr z Miłosławia 12
- Piotrowicz Karol 28
- Pirandello [Luigi] 170
- Pirjevec Jože 195
- Pistol Frederik 117, 125, 126, 128
- Pitassi Maria-Cristina 58
- Pius XI, pope 170
- Pius XII, pope 198, 204
- Planck Max 49
- Plitt Gustav 55
- Poblet i Feijoo Francesc 157, 160
- Podlecki Hieronim 100
- Polonsky Antony 87, 94
- Poncell Nicolau 165
- Posthumus Meyjes Guillaume H. M. 66
- Potašenko Grigorijus 18
- Poton Didier 64
- Prochaska Antoni 53
- Przeclawski Andrzej 84
- Przeclawski Krzysztof 100
- Pseudo-Aristotle 18
- Puig María Teresa 158
- Puig y Cadafalch Josep 158
- Pujulà i Vallès Frederic 156, 158–160, 167, 168
- Pussman Krzysztof 10
- Quentell Heinrich 19
- Radić Radmila 192, 197, 201
- Radić Stjepan 194
- Ramet Sabrina P. 193, 194, 196
- Rand Parish Helen 56
- Rashi 111
- Raudeliūnas Vytautas 90
- Raupp Werner 60, 66
- Raven Charles E. 180, 181

ASMENVARDŽIŲ RODYKLĖ

- Rawlins William 108
 Redondo Gonzalo 183, 185
 Reitz Francis William 147, 148
 Renner de Heilbronn Franciscus 19
 Respondek Thomas 142
 Rethmeier Andreas 209
 Reverdin Olivier 59
 Rey Fernando del 171
 Reynaud Louis G. 186
 Rhodes Cecil 149
 Ricards James 137
 Riccardi Andrea 219, 221, 223
 Richet Charles Robert 163
 Ricoeur Paul 220
 Riedke Eva 143
 Riley-Smith Jonathan 33
 Rimša Edmundas 93
 Ripe Christoph 136
 Robbins Thomas 232
 Rok Bogdan 118
 Romero-Maura Joaquín 158
 Roos Anton 135
 Rose-Innes Richard 149
 Roselló Josep María 162
 Ross Robert 134
 Rousseau François 55
 Roussel Bernard 57
 Roviralta José 165
 Rovirosa Guillem 155–168
 Rowell S. C. 3, 9, 10–12, 21, 22, 241
 Rubtsova Irina 234
 Ruiz Julius 184
 Ruprecht 71
 Rusiñol Santiago 158
 Ruszkowski Janusz 33
 Ruth 17
 Ruymbeke Bertrand Van 64
 Rykaczewski Erazm 95

 Said Edward 133
 Saint-Lu André 65
 Sakran Jan 20

 Sallent Joan 164
 Salmič Igor 198
 Samuel, rabi 19
 Sánchez José M. 175
 Sanguszko Hieronim 101
 Santolaria Torres Francesc 159
 Sapiiega Aleksandras 77, 82
 Sapieha Lew 100
 Saravia Adrian (Hadriano Saravia Belga)
 60, 66, 67, 243
 Sardá y Salvany Félix 163
 Saul Friedländer 208
 Sawicki Piotr 77
 Sayaka Kaji 11
 Schilling Heinz 71
 Schimlek Francis 143
 Schmidt Erich F. 108
 Schölzig Amandus 145
 Schulmann Emma Sara 211
 Scott Alan 189, 190
 Sebastian, St 174
 Semkowicz Aleksander 12
 Serrano Sonia 158
 Sharf Andrew 112
 Shargunov Aleksandr 235
 Shepstone Theophilus 148, 153
 Shози Jamkofi 143
 Shterin Marat 232
 Sigismund III, king 91
 Sigismund of Luxembourg, king 23
 Simon of Teramo 52
 Skhakhane Jerome 142
 Skolnik Fred 108, 112
 Skorina Franciscus 18
 Slipyj Josif 221
 Slupskis Mikalojus 77, 81
 Smythe Dion C. 112
 Sofia Alšėniškė (Holszańska), queen 17
 Soga Tiyo 142
 Spaho Fehim 201
 Spaho Mehmed 201
 Srškić Milan 204

- Stalin Josif 159
 Stanislawski Michael 116
 Stanislovas of Žemaitija 21
 Stanisław Gawęda 13
 Stanisław of Skarbimierz 38–45, 48, 53, 242
 Stanisław, canon 13
 Stankovič Vitko 18
 Stavitskaia Nataliia 235
 Stepaniants Marietta 229
 Stojadinović Milan 195, 203, 205
 Strang John 108
 Streicher Nivard 145
 Streikus Arūnas 2, 5, 7, 102
 Strype John 108
 Subačius Paulius 2
 Suleiman, sultan 71
 Surdokaitė Gabija 15
 Svanberg Ingvar 208
 Svenæus, dean 212
 Szczur Stanisław 27
 Szulc Alicja 15
 Szymanowski Adam 33
 Świeboda Wojciech 27, 30, 46, 53
 Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė Jurgita 11, 81, 89, 90, 91, 117
 Šmigelskytė-Stukienė Ramunė 9
 Šenavičienė Ieva 123

 Tabor Wojciech, bishop 20
 Tacchi Venturi Pietro 170
 Talbot Francis 184
 Taube Moshe 16, 17
 Teller Adam 94
 Temčinas Sergejus 3, 16, 18, 105–107, 109, 245
 Teter Magda 92, 94, 116, 117
 Theiner Augustinus 96
 Thomas Aquinas, St 25, 26, 45
 Thomas Wunsch 29
 Thompson John B. 190
 Thompson R. J. 149

 Timothy, St 59
 Titus, St 63
 Tomaeva T. 229
 Transue Pamela J. 29
 Trąba Mikołaj 51, 52
 Trigault Nicolas 65
 Troch Pieter 195
 Truchsess Erhardt 62
 Trupinda Janusz 33
 Turczynowicz Józef Stefan 118
 Tydén Mattias 208
 Tymyrza, tatar 13, 21
 Tyszkiewicz Jan 91

 Utrillo Miguel 158

 Vaišnoravičius Jonas Kazimieras 78
 Valavičius Eustachijus 83
 Vandenhoeck 71
 Verdier Jean 167
 Verkholantseva Julia 16, 18
 Verter Bradford 191
 Villegagnon Nicolas Durand de 59, 64
 Vladko Maček 196
 Voetius Gisbertus 68
 Vytautas Didysis, Grand Duke of Lithuania 37, 52, 53, 77, 81, 90

 Wagner Henry Raup 56
 Waleus Antoine 67
 Wanegffelen Thierry 64
 Warneck Gustav 55
 Warner J. R. 135
 Waysblum Marek 11
 Wąsowicz Michał 99
 Weiswurm Alcuin 136
 Wenta Jarosław 34
 Whelan Ruth 58
 Whimster Sam 191
 Whittaker Charles Richard 112
 Wijaczka Jacek 95
 Wilamowski Maciej 41

ASMENVARDŽIŲ RODYKLĖ

- Wilczewski Waldemar Franciszek 77
 Winowski Leszek 26, 93
 Winska Morzyna Teresa 84
 Wizimirska Barbara 87
 Władysław Łokietka 30
 Włodek Zofia 29
 Włodkowiec Paweł *see* Paulus Vladimiri
 Wojtyła Karol *see* John Paul II
 Wolff Richard J. 198
 Wolfram Piotr 52
 Wolski Wawrzyniec 99
 Wood Diana 112
 Wüst Balthasar 60
 Wyrozumska Bożena 13
 Wyszomirski Sławomir 34
 Wyszyński Stefan 221, 223
 Xifré Hamel José 164, 165
 Yurchak Alexei 231
 Yves of Chartres 46
 Zabantu Izindaba 143
 Zabarella Francesco 44, 45
 Zacharias ben Aaron ha-Cohen 17, 18
 Zakrzewski Andrzej B. 91, 93, 94
 Zakrzewski Ignacy 24
 Zamenhof Ludwik Lazarus 157
 Zaremska Hanna 12
 Zawadzki Józef 12
 Zawadzki Roman Maria 39
 Zeno Antonio 39, 45
 Zgliński Marcin 95
 Zidelis Nicolaus 84
 Zienkowicz Michał 118
 Zorn Jean-François 56
 Zub 13, 21
 Zyglewski Zbigniew 15
 Živojinović Dragoljub R. 199, 204
 Žuchorskis Benediktas 78
 Żydowicz Matthias 84
 Аляксандраўна Мажэйка Марына 106
 Темчин Сергей Юрьевич *see* Temčinas
 Sergejus

VIETOVARDŽIŲ RODYKLĖ

- Aachen 137
Abyssinia (Abissinia) 204
Adelsk (Odelsk) 79
Africa (Afrika) 55, 247, South Africa 5,
7, 133–137, 141, 142, 144–147, 247
Albuquerque 56
Alcoy 162
Alvitas (Olwita) 78–80, 82–84, 243
Alytus (Olitensis) 79
America (América, Amérique) 55, 64,
271, 274, South America 209
Anjou 27, 39
Anykščiai 20
Argelès 159
Asia (Azija) 55, 274, 248
Asia Minor 106, 108
Assisi 228
Auckland 198
Aukštadvaris (Wysokidwor) 79
Austria 136, 205, 209
Austria-Hungary 193, 200, 201
Azija *see* Asia
Aziory (Jeziora) 78
- Babilonia 101
Bakałarzewo 79
Balbieriškis (Balwierzyszki) 79, 83, 244
Balkans, the 31, 192, 196
Balwierzyszki *see* Balbieriškis 79
Barbastro 175
Barcelona 155–160, 162–166, 183, 185,
186
Bartninkai (Bartniki) 79
Basel 216, 272
Basque country 177
- Belarus 78
Belgium 209, 270
Belgrade (Beograd) 194, 197, 199, 200,
202, 204
Berkeley 272
Berlin 16, 55, 68, 95, 212–214, 225
Bersztany *see* Birštonas
Beržniki 79
Betygala 20
Białystok 83
Birštonas (Bersztany) 79
Biržai 90, 97
Bizantija *see* Byzantium
Bloomington 193
Bologna (Bolonija) 27, 242
Bordeaux 56
Bosnia and Herzegovina 137, 193, 200,
201
Boston 68
Bram 159
Brazil (Brésil) 59, 64
Bregenz 136
Brésil *see* Brazil
Breslau *see* Wrocław
Brighton 112, 189
Brixen 143
Brzostowica Mała *see* Byerastavitsa Ma-
laya
Brzostowica Wielka *see* Byerastavitsa Vya-
likaya
Buda 28
Buenos Aires 183
Bulgaria 209
Byerastavitsa Malaya (Brzostowica Mała)
78, 79

- Byerastavitsa Vyalikaya (Brzostowica Wielka) 79
 Byzantium (Bizantija, Byzantine Empire) 3, 105, 112, 113, 245
 Calw 71
 Cambridge 92, 112, 274
 Campinas 157
 Canberra 272
 Cape Province 136
 Cape Town 143
 Cappadocia (Caphutkia, Capotakia, Kapotakia) 106, 108, 111
 Castrum Cassinum *see* Ivanava
 Catalonia (Catalunya, Katalonija) 4, 156, 157, 159, 160, 163, 165, 168, 183, 184, 248
 Cėsis 94
 Ceylon 67
 Charlottesville 133, 146
 Chicago 192, 272
 China (Chine) 65
 Cilicia 108
 Clairvaux 32
 Columbia 198
 Constance 28, 44, 45, 47, 51–53
 Constantinople *see* Istanbul
 Cracow (Kraków, Krokuva, Cracovia) 3, 11–13, 20, 21, 23, 26–29, 34, 36, 38–41, 43, 44, 52, 53, 77, 82, 87, 89, 91, 92, 94, 98, 102, 118, 219, 220, 241, 242, 275
 Crete 106, 108, 109, 246
 Croatia 137, 193, 196, 197, 198, 199, 203
 Cuba 165
 Cyprus 106, 108
 Czechoslovakia 209
 Dąbrówka 79
 Damascus 111
 Danzig *see* Gdańsk
 Dareva (Darewo) 79
 Darsūniškis (Dorsuniszki) 79
 Dartmouth 272
 Deltuva 20
 Denmark 209, 211
 Dereczyn *see* Dziarečyn
 Dorsuniszki *see* Darsūniškis
 Drohiczyn 20
 Dumjato 246
 Durban 143
 Dusburg 34
 Dvarec (Dworzec) 79
 Dziallava (Zdziecioł) 79
 Dzisna 125
 Dziarečyn (Dereczyn) 79
 Eastern Cape 134, 137
 Eben-Ezer 110
 Ebuhleni 144
 Egypt (Egiptas, Mizraim) 107–110, 246
 Emaus 145
 England 60, 66, 67, 213
 Espagne *see* Spain
 Espaca 173, 175, 178, 179, 183, 184, 270, 271
 Estonia 209
 Ethiopia 66
 Europe (Europa) 7, 5, 11, 19, 36, 37, 42, 71, 80, 89, 138, 144, 169, 225, 227, 242, 270, 271; Central Europe 10, 91, 102, 275; Eastern Europe 33, 36, 102, 116; Western Europe 36, 80
 Eysmanty (Eyśmonty) 78, 79
 Farnham 274
 Ferrara 21
 Filipów 79
 Finland 209
 Florence 21
 France (Francia, Prancūzija) 55, 57, 58, 64, 158, 159, 178, 184, 167, 209, 270, 272
 Frankfurt (Francfort) 62
 Frankfurt am Main 209, 216

- Galicia 178
 Gardinas *see* Hrodna
 Gdańsk (Danzig) 32, 209
 Gegužinė 79
 Geneva (Genève) 55, 57–60, 64, 66, 67
 Gent *see* Ghent
 Germany (Vokietija) 75, 137, 138, 207,
 209, 210, 212, 213, 217, 250
 Ghent (Gent) 66, 195
 Giegužyn *see* Gegužinė
 Gniezno (Hniezna) 20, 51, 79
 Gomorra 94
 Gorodyszczce *see* Haradzišča
 Göttingen 49, 71, 272, 273
 Grand Rapids 63
 Gražiškiai (Gražyski) 79
 Great Britain (Gran Bretanija) 178, 180
 Greece 209
 Grünwald 40
 Guernsey 66
 Gütersloh 71

 Haradzišča (Gorodyszczce) 79
 Harvard 92
 Hniezna *see* Gniezno
 Holland 67
 Holy Roman Empire 73
 Hoža (Oža) 78
 Hrodna (Gardinas) 20, 77–84, 243, 244
 Hungary 209

 Iceland 209
 India 237, 274
 Indiana 193
 Indura 79, 83, 84, 244
 Innsbruck 135
 Ispanija *see* Spain
 Israel 125
 Istanbul (Constantinople, Konstantino-
 polis) 111–113, 246
 Italy 176, 196, 198, 200, 209
 Ithaca 200

 Ivanava (Janów, Castrum Cassinum) 79
 Ivyanets (Iwieniec) 97

 Jałówka 79
 Janów (Castrum Cassinum) *see* Ivanava
 Janówka 79
 Java 67
 Jelna 79, 80
 Jerusalem 33, 107
 Jeziora *see* Aziorj
 Jieznas (Jezno) 79
 Johannesburg 134
 Jugoslavia *see* Yugoslavia

 Kaliningrad (Königsberg) 34
 Kapotakia *see* Cappadocia
 Karlstad 212
 Karmélava (Kormiałowo) 79
 Karpilaūka (Karpiłówka) 89
 Katalonija *see* Catalonia
 Kaunas (Kowno) 13, 77–84, 96, 130,
 243, 244, 271
 Kiel 272
 Kiev 16
 Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes
see Yugoslavia
 Kingdom of Yugoslavia *see* Yugoslavia
 Köln 19
 Kundzin (Kondžyn) 79
 Königsberg *see* Kaliningrad
 Konstantinopolis *see* Istanbul
 Koper 195, 198, 199
 Kormiałowo *see* Karmélava
 Kosava (Kossów) 79, 84
 Kosovo 193
 Kossów *see* Kosava
 Kowno *see* Kaunas
 Kraków *see* Cracow
 Kramyanitsa (Krzemienica) 79
 Krasnybór 79
 Karkaziškės 128
 Kreta *see* Crete

- Krokuva *see* Cracow
 Krynki 79
 Krzemienica *see* Kramyanitsa
 Kuźnica 79
 Kvasouka (Kwasowka) 78
 KwaZulu-Natal 5, 7, 270
- Liachavičy (Lachowicze) 79
 Lahišyn (Łahiszyn) 79
 Langen 136
 Lankeliškiai (Łankieliszki) 79
 Lapės (Łopie) 79
 Lateran 92, 93
 Latvia 209
 Lazdijai (Łozdzieie) 79
 Leiden 60, 66–68, 136
 Leipzig 19, 62, 273
 Lenkija *see* Poland
 Lesotho 135, 142
 Leipalingis (Leypuny) 79
 Lietuva *see* Lithuania
 Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštystė (LDK)
 see Lithuania, Grand Duchy
 Lipse *see* Leipzig 62
 Lipsk 79
 Lithuania (Lietuva, Litwa) 5, 7, 11–117,
 124, 128, 129, 209, 246, 273, 274,
 284; Grand Duchy of Lithuania 3, 9,
 10–12, 16, 18, 20, 24–26, 32, 36, 37,
 43, 44, 48, 50, 52, 53, 78, 80, 81, 85,
 89, 91, 95, 100–102, 105, 106, 241,
 242, 244, 271, 274, 275
 Ljubljana 194, 196, 198, 205
 London (Londres) 15, 55, 60, 66, 67, 97,
 111, 158, 181, 185, 186, 189, 191,
 193, 198, 273
 Łopie *see* Lapės
 Lourdes 145
 Łozdzieie *see* Lazdijai
 Lublin 29, 77, 273
 Lukiškės (Łukiszki) 91
 Lukonitsa (Łukonica) 79
- Lund 271
 Lunna (Łunna) 79
 Luxembourg (Luxemburg) 23, 209
 Lviv (Lwów) 52, 94
 Lyon 14, 56, 63, 270, 272
 Lyskava (Łyszków) 79
- Macedonia 193
 Madrid 161, 162, 164, 171, 175–179,
 183, 184, 270, 271, 274
 Malayan archipelag 67, 68
 Mallorca 177
 Malmö 211–213
 Mariannahill 4, 134–136, 138–146, 247
 Mariawald 137
 Marne-la-Vallée 58
 Marseille 195
 Maskva *see* Moscow
 Masty 79
 Medininkai 18, 19
 Mediterranean region 112
 Meteliai (Metele) 79
 Miedźirzyc *see* Miżeryčy
 Minsk 97, 98
 Mizraim *see* Egypt
 Miżeryčy (Miedźirzyc) 79
 Mołczadź *see* Moučadz
 Moluccas 67
 Montenegro 193, 194
 Morea 112
 Moscow (Maskva) 15, 16, 105, 181,
 229–240, 246
 Moučadz (Mołczadź) 79
 Mount Coke 135
 München 29, 71
 Murcia 165
 Muscovy 10, 17, 18
 Mysz *see* Novaya Mysh
- Natal 4, 5, 7, 135, 137, 138, 145, 147,
 148, 153, 247
 Naujadvaris *see* Novy Dvor

- Navarre (Navarra) 174, 177, 270
 Netherlands (Nederland, Pays-Bas) 60, 66, 136, 209, 215, 272
 New York 182, 184, 185, 192, 198, 208, 229, 232
 Nexon 159
 Norway 209, 212
 Novaya Mysh (Mysz) 79
 Novosibirsk 236
 Novy Dvor (Nowy Dwór, Naujadvaris) 79, 83, 244
 Nuremberg 4

 Odelsk *see* Adelsk 79
 Ohio 29
 Olitensis *see* Alytus
 Olszewo 79
 Olwita *see* Alvitas
 Oregon 94
 Orléans 64
 Ornetā 51
 Oxford 58, 87, 94, 111, 112, 146, 191, 196
 Oža *see* Hoža

 Padua (Paduva) 27, 44, 51, 52, 242
 Pajevonys (Poiewonie) 79
 Palermo 189
 Pamplona 177, 179, 270
 Paris 56, 57, 64, 65, 157, 160, 166, 167, 183, 197, 220, 272
 Pasvalys (Poswol) 96
 Pays-Bas *see* Netherlands
 Peloponnese 112
 Pelusium 108
 Pennsylvania 272
 Perugia 52
 Pietermaritzburg 135, 142, 270
 Piltene (Piltyņ) 97
 Pinetown 137
 Pisa 52
 Podlasie 90, 101

 Poiewonie *see* Pajevonys
 Poland (Polska, Lenkija, Polonia) 10–13, 17, 19, 27–29, 30, 33, 39, 43–45, 53, 78, 87, 92, 94, 96, 118, 124, 127, 209, 219, 273, 241, 242, 251; Little Poland 38; Polish Kingdom (Kingdom of Poland, Polish Crown, Królestwo Polskie, Lenkijos Karalystė) 78, 79, 91, 95, 101, 102, 116, 241, 274
 Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth 21, 87, 94, 100, 275
 Polonka (Połonca) 79
 Polonia, Polska *see* Poland
 Pomerania 32
 Paparčiai (Poporćie) 79
 Porazava (Porozow) 79
 Portland 94
 Portugal 209
 Poswol *see* Pasvalys
 Poszyrwinty *see* Alvitas
 Potsdam 119
 Poznań 15, 22, 24, 28, 89, 93, 95
 Prague (Praha) 27, 38, 44, 242
 Preny, Prenensis *see* Prienai
 Pretoria 148
 Prienai (Preny, Prenensis) 79
 Primorska 273
 Princeton 158, 231, 272
 Prussia 10, 23, 32, 34–36, 44, 48, 53; Royal Prussia 102
 Pryvalki (Przewałka) 78, 79
 Przerośl 79
 Przewałka *see* Pryvalki
 Puńsk 79, 244

 Raczki 79
 Rahotna (Rohotna) 79
 Raków 101
 Ramsay 157
 Ražiai 84
 Récédebou 159
 Remlingen 136

- Rennes 272
 Repla 79
 Rijeka 203
 River Valley 136
 Rohotna *see* Rahotna 79
 Roman Empire 73, 112
 Romania 209
 Rome 9, 18, 37, 96, 101, 134, 135, 143, 144, 198, 201
 Ros‘(Roš) 79
 Rožana *see* Ruzhany
 Rózanystok 79
 Rudamina (Urdomina) 79
 Rumšiškės (Rumszyszki) 79
 Rus 17, 19
 Russia (Rusija) 4, 79, 84, 87, 105, 116, 120, 122, 179, 229–236, 240, 246, 251, 252, 274; Russian Empire 120, 124
 Ruzhany (Ružanai, Rožana) 78, 79, 83, 84, 244
 Rzeczpospolita *see* Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth

 Saint-Etienne 270
 Sambia 34
 Samogitia *see* Žemaitija
 Santa Coloma de Cervelly 165
 Santiago de Compostela 178, 274
 Sarajevo 201
 Saumur 58
 Seirijai (Sereie) 79
 Sejny (Seyny) 79
 Semeliškės (Sumiliszki) 79
 Serbia 193, 194, 201, 249
 Serbų, kroatų ir slovėnų karalystė *see* Yugoslavia
 Sereie *see* Seirijai
 Séreilhac 159
 Seville 164
 Seyny *see* Sejny 79
 Shidlovets 79
 Siegen 143

 Simnas (Siemno) 78, 79, 82–84, 243
 Skarbimierz 38, 43, 44, 45
 Skaruliai (Skorule) 79
 Slanimas *see* Slonim
 Sloboda *see* Viliampolė
 Slonim (Słonim, Slanimas) 78–80, 84, 244
 Slovenia 197
 Smolensk 101
 Sodom 94
 Sokolany 79
 Sokółka (Sokulka) 79, 81, 82, 244
 Solna 214
 Southampton 66
 Soviet Union 209, 231
 Spain (Espagne, Ispanija) 66, 162, 165, 168–171, 173, 174, 176, 178, 179, 181–187, 209, 248, 249, 274
 Split 200
 St. Petersburg 229, 230, 232, 234, 274
 Stakliškės (Stokliszki, Stokliscensis) 79
 Stalovichy (Stwołowicze) 79
 Stockholm 210, 212–215
 Stokliszki, Stokliscensis *see* Stakliškės
 Strasbourg 270
 Strubnica 79
 Stuttgart 71
 Stwołowicze *see* Stalovichy
 Sudziałowo *see* Szudziałowo
 Sumiliszki *see* Semeliškės 79
 Sussex 112
 Sweden (Švedija) 4, 207, 209–211, 213, 215, 216, 250
 Šventežeris (Swietcieżioro) 79
 Svislach (Swisłocz) 79
 Switzerland 209, 215
 Sydney 198
 Szudziałowo (Sudziałowo) 79
 Szydłowiec *see* Shidlovets

 Tarnów 38
 Tatenhill 66

- Teramo 52
 Tokyo 11
 Tombebouc 159
 Tomsk 237
 Toronto 198
 Toruń 23, 34, 37
 Toulouse 159
 Trakai (Troki) 11, 13, 16, 19, 20, 97
 Trent 77, 80, 93
 Troas 63
 Troki *see* Trakai

 Ūdrija (Udryia) 79
 Ukmergė (Wiłkomierz) 122
 United Kingdom 209
 United States of America (USA) 180, 190, 209
 Urdomina *see* Rudamina
 Usielub (Wśielub) 79
 Užuguostis (Uzugoście) 79

 Valencia 161, 162, 168, 172, 174, 271
 Vaūkavysk (Wołkowisk, Valkaviskas) 78–80, 84, 244
 Vandžiogala (Wadziogąla) 79
 Västra Skrävlinge 211
 Vatican (Vatikanas) 4, 96, 170, 202, 204, 219, 221, 222, 224–227, 251
 Veisiejai (Wieysieie) 79
 Veliuona 23
 Venice 19
 Vienna (Wien) 29, 73, 136
 Vilijampolė (Sloboda) 81
 Vilkaviškis (Wiłkowiszki) 79
 Villanueva y Geltrú 156, 166, 167
 Vilnius (Wilna, Vilne, Wilna, Wilno) 2, 3, 9, 11–15, 18–20, 52, 77–83, 85, 87–93, 95, 102, 106, 118, 119, 122–128, 129, 130, 244, 245, 273, 275, 284
 Virginia 133, 146
 Vitsebsk 99, 100

 Vitoria 177
 Vokietija *see* Germany
 Voūpa (Wołpa) 79

 Wadziogąla *see* Vandžiogala
 Warsaw (Warszawa) 10, 12, 28, 29, 31, 39, 47, 91, 92, 98, 102, 116
 Washington 272
 Weimar 72, 74
 Wenden 94
 Wien *see* Vienna
 Wieysieie *see* Veisiejai
 Wiłkomierz *see* Ukmergė
 Wiłkowiszki *see* Vilkaviškis
 Wilna, Wilno *see* Vilnius
 Wittenberg 62
 Witwatersrand 134
 Wizajny (Wizayny) 79
 Wołkowisk *see* Vaūkavysk
 Wołpa *see* Voūpa
 Worms 39
 Wrocław (Breslau) 26, 55, 117–119
 Wśielub *see* Usielub
 Würzburg 136
 Wysokidwor *see* Aukštadvaris

 Yekaterinburg 235
 Yugoslavia (Jugoslavia, Kingdom of Yugoslavia, Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes) 189, 190, 192, 193, 195–203, 205, 206, 209, 249

 Zadzwieja (Zadzwieie) 79
 Zagreb 192, 203
 Zalesie 79
 Žasliai (Zosle) 79
 Zdzieciol *see* Działtława
 Zelva (Zelwia) 79
 Žemaičių Kalvarija 123
 Žemaitija (Samogitia) 9, 21, 24, 32, 52
 Žiežmariai (Zyžmory) 79
 Zosle *see* Žasliai

VIETOVARDŽIŲ RODYKLĖ

Zürich 29, 215, 216

Zyžmory *see* Žiežmariai

Вильна, Вильня *see* Vilnius

Віцебск *see* Vitebsk

Івянец *see* Ivuonets

Карпілаўка *see* Karpiłauka

Менск, Минск, Мінск *see* Minsk

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

BERNARD ARDURA, PhD in theology from the Catholic Institute of Lyon and PhD in religious history from the State University of Saint-Etienne in France. He was Professor of dogmatic theology and spiritual theology. He was the Holy See's Representative to the Committee for Culture of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg. He has also served as the Undersecretary and Secretary of the Pontifical Council for Culture. He has authored many books and articles. Consultant of the Congregation for the Cause of Saints, at present he is the President of the Pontifical Committee for Historical Sciences.

e-mail: *presidente@historia.va*



PHILIPPE DENIS PhD, Professor of History of Christianity at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg, South Africa. He is currently the chairperson of the Church History Society of Southern Africa. Since 2006 he is an associate member of the Royal Academy of Belgium.

e-mail: *Denis@ukzn.ac.za*



JOSÉ ANDRÉS-GALLEGO PhD, research Professor in the Spanish National Research Council, Madrid. His main field of research is political, religious, intellectual and cultural history of Modern and Contemporary period with a very strong interdisciplinary concern. His last article about this is: "Are Humanism and Mixed Methods Related? Leibniz's Universal (Chinese) Dream", in: *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 2013. Main publications: co-author with Antón M. Pazos of *La Iglesia en la España contemporánea*, Madrid: Ediciones Encuentro; 1999; *La Iglesia y la esclavitud de los negros*, Pamplona: Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, 2002; *Historia general de la*

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

gente poco importante: América y Europa hacia 1789, Madrid: Gredos, 1991; editor of *Diez años de reflexión sobre el nacionalismo: el estado, la nación, la soberanía y lo hispánico*, Valencia: Tirant lo Blanch, 2008; editor of *Historia general de España y América*, 23 vols., 1981–1992 and *Mapfre Collections*, 240 vols., 1992–1996.



ANDERS JARLERT PhD, since 1999 Professor at Lund University. He is head of the Centre for Theology and Religious Studies in Lund, and Chief Editor of the Swedish yearbook of Ecclesiastical History (*Kyrkohistorisk årskrift*, Upsala [i.e. Uppsala]: Kyrkohistoriska föreninge). He is an Honorary Doctor at the Åbo Akademi University in Finland, and member of the Royal Swedish Academy of Literature, History and Antiquities. He specializes in Early Modern and Modern Swedish and European Church history, also writing on literature and music.

e-mail: anders.jarlert@teol.lu.se



VAIDA KAMUNTAVIČIENĖ PhD, since 2012 Professor at the History Department, Vytautas Magnus University, Kaunas. Her main fields of research are: Church history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, microhistory. Main publications: *Katalikų bažnyčios ir valstybės santykiai Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje XVII a. antrojoje pusėje*, Kaunas, 2008; co-author of *Kauno šv. Apaštaly Petro ir Pauliaus Arkikatedra bazilika*, Kaunas, 2008; co-author of *Apytalaukio parapija. Mikorbendruomenės istorija*, Kaunas, 2012.

e-mail: v.kamuntaviciene@hmf.vdu.lt



ELENA KEIDOŠIŪTĖ, doctoral candidate at Vilnius University, Faculty of History. Her thesis deals with the history of Jewish conversions to Catholicism and Catholic missionary initiatives to the Jews in Lithuanian territory in Modern period. Her research attends to the issues of sociocultural implications of Jewish conversions to Catholicism in relation to political and sociocultural

changes as well as transformations of perception of a Jew as a potential neophyte by the clergy.

e-mail: *elena.keidosiute@gmail.com*



YVES KRUMENACKER PhD, Professor in Early Modern History at the University of Lyon and at the Institut Universitaire de France. His research covers the Reformation and the Early Modern Protestantism. He is co-author of *Des Protestants au Siècle des Lumières. Le modèle lyonnais*, Paris: H. Champion, 2002 and *Calvin. Au-delà des légendes*, Paris: Bayard, 2009, the editor of numerous books, of which *Entre Calvinistes et Catholiques. Les relations religieuses entre la France et les Pays-Bas du Nord (XVIe–XVIIIe siècle)*, Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2010.

e-mail: *yves.krumenacker@univ-lyon3.fr*



HARTMUT LEHMANN PhD, full Professor of modern history at the University of Kiel. 1987–1993 Founding Director of the German Historical Institute in Washington, D.C. 1993–2004 Director at the Max-Planck-Institut für Geschichte in Göttingen. Research Fellow at the University of Chicago, at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, at Princeton University, at the Australian National University in Canberra and at Harvard. Visiting Professor of History at UCLA, Emory University, Dartmouth College, Berkeley and the Pennsylvania State University. Since 1999 Dr. theol. h. c. University of Basel. Current memberships in academic associations include the American Academy of Arts & Sciences and the Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Presently Adjunct Professor of Church history at the University of Kiel. Main publications: *Säkularisierung. Der europäische Sonderweg in Sachen Religion*, Göttingen: Wallstein, 2004; *Transformationen der Religion in der Neuzeit*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007; *Die Entzauberung der Welt. Studien zu Themen von Max Weber*, Göttingen: Wallstein-Verl., 2009; *Religiöse Erweckung in gottferner Zeit. Studien zur Pietismusforschung*,

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Göttingen: Wallstein-Verl., 2010; *Luthergedächtnis 1817–2017*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012; *Christentum im 20. Jahrhundert. Fragen, Probleme, Perspektiven*, Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2012.

e-mail: hrw.lehmann@t-online.de



GAŠPER MITHANS PhD, assistant Professor at the University of Primorska Faculty of Humanities. He has worked as a Research Assistant at the Science and Research Centre of the University of Primorska (2007–2012). His main field of research is Contemporary History of Religions and Historical Anthropology.

e-mail: mithans@gmail.com



PAWEŁ KRAS PhD, Professor of Medieval History at the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland. His research is focused on the history of Christianity in the Middle Ages and Early Modern period, with a particular interest in the religious movements, repression of religious dissent and toleration, as well as education models and social communication. He is Vice-President of the Polish Commission of CIHEC. Main publications: *Husyci w piętnastowiecznej Polsce*, Lublin: Catholic University of Lublin Press, 1998; *Ad abolendam diversarum haeresium pravitatem. System inkwizycyjny w średniowiecznej Europie*, Lublin: Catholic University of Lublin Press, 2006.

e-mail: palks@kul.pl



WIOLETTA PAWLIKOWSKA-BUTTERWICK, PhD is an independent scholar based in London. Her research field is the Roman Catholic Church in late-medieval and early-modern Lithuania and Poland. Her doctoral thesis on the Cathedral Chapter of Vilnius in the second half of the 16th century deals with its subject both as an ecclesiastical corporation and as a group of individual prelates and canons, who are researched prosopographically.

e-mail: wiolettap@tlen.pl



ANTÓN M. PAZOS PhD, deputy director of the Instituto de Estudios Gallegos at Santiago de Compostela. His main field of research is contemporary religious history of Spain and America. Co-editor with José Andrés-Gallego of *Archivo Gomá*, Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 13 vols. He is the President of the CIHEC and the editor of the series *Compostela International Studies in Pilgrimage History and Culture*. His last book is *Pilgrims and Pilgrimages as Peacemakers in Christianity, Judaism and Islam*, Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Ltd, 2013.

e-mail: apazos@cesga.es



MARIA PETROVA has been working as a full time Lecturer in Oriental Studies at St. Petersburg State University since 2010, delivering lectures on religion and philosophy of India and other countries of Asia and the history of the development of these religions in the Russian territory. Her main fields of research are: Russian intellectual history, Hindu and Buddhist-inspired religious movements in the Soviet and post-Soviet Russia. Currently conducts research in non-mainstream religiosity in contemporary Russia and the influence of “Eastern” oriented groups and movements on the construction of post-communist national and cultural identities.

e-mail: maria.desnitsky@yahoo.co.uk



S. C. ROWELL PhD, Professor, senior research associate at the Department of History of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Lithuanian Institute of History. His main scholarly interests are late medieval history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Kingdom of Poland. Main publications include the monograph *Lithuania Ascending: A Pagan Empire Within East-Central Europe, 1295–1345* (ser. *Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought. Fourth series*), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994; the source edition *Chartularium Lithuaniae res gestas magni ducis Gedemi ne*

illustrans. Gedimino lai kai, Vilnius: Vaga, 2003. Recent publications: “Was Fifteenth-Century Lithuanian Catholicism as Lukewarm as Reformers and Commentators Would Have Us Believe?”, in: *Central Europe*, 2010, vol. 8, Nr. 2; “1386: The Marriage of Jogaila and Jadwiga Embodies the Union of Lithuania and Poland”, in: *Lithuanian Historical Studies*, 2007, vol. 11; “The Joyous Entry of Casimir I and IV into Lithuanian and Polish Cities”, in: *Lithuanian Historical Studies*, 2007, vol. 11, p. 89–106; “Nolite confidere in principibus: Mikhail Glinsky, Sigismund the Old and the Council of Lords”, in: *Faworycyi opozycjoniści: król a elity polityczne w Rzeczypospolitej XV–XVII wieku*, Kraków: Zamek Królewski na Wawelu, 2006.

e-mail: karunakalv@yahoo.co.uk



SERGEJUS TEMČINAS PhD, senior researcher at the Institute of Lithuanian Language. His main fields of research are: Old Church Slavonic language and literature, the Cyrillic manuscript tradition of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and Medieval Jewish-Slavic cultural relations. He is the author of the book *Исследования по кирилло-методиевистике и палеославистике* [Papers in Cyrillo-Methodian and Paleoslavonic Studies], Kraków: Scriptum, 2010 (Krakowsko-Wileńskie studia slawistyczne: Seria poświęcona starożytnościom słowiańskim, t. 5).

e-mail: sergejus.temcinas@ff.vu.lt



GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSIONS

The Boards of Editors of the *Lithuanian Catholic Academy of Science Annals* and the *Studies in Church History* maintain that the authors should not be limited by the formal requirements in their choice of methodology, aims, individual style, attitude towards the types of discourse that suits the purposes of scholarly publications (the structure of their papers, the model of argumentation). However, one way or another, the scholarly article must state the aims of the study, indicate the goals, the object, the method, discuss the previous research on the problem at hand. It is usual for the scholarly publications to provide the sources, be careful in the citations, present and support the results, make conclusions.

The texts and their appendices are only accepted electronically (via email or by presenting the file in person; any exceptions must be agreed upon with the Editor in Chief); it is desirable to also present one printed copy. The files are prepared using *Microsoft Office* or compatible programmes (formats: *.doc, *.rtf, *.xls, *.vsd; the *Word 2007-13* *.docx files are saved in *.doc etc. format), and the illustrations are processed using the programmes that allow to save the material in formats: *.gif, *.jpg (*.jpeg), *.tif, the latter without compression. The text is prepared according to the coding standards of Lithuanian characters supported by *Microsoft Office 2000* and later versions, in fonts *Times New Roman* or *Palemonas*, size 12 pt, line spacing 1.5.

If the offered material (articles and source publications) exceeds 40 000 characters, the possibility of publishing it must be discussed with the Editor in Chief in advance. The indicated size includes the body text of the article, the appendices (sources, tables, figures, maps, etc.), the illustrations, the summary. A publication includes the faximile or the transcription of the original, supported by the systemical principles presented in a separate section in the comments, if required, also by the translation into the

Lithuanian language and textual and scholarly (historical, linguistic, etc.) comments.

Regarding the general principles of the scholarly apparatus – citing, indicating the sources and compiling a bibliography – please, contact the Board of Editors of the *Studies in Church History* by email: contacts@lkma.lt

The Board of Editors is committed to consulting the graduate and doctoral students involved or willing to become involved in the LCAS activities, young scholars working on their first publication. Every *LACS Annuals* and *Studies in Church History* article and source publication is anonymously reviewed by two peer reviewers. The authors are only presented with the reviews in case their texts are deemed improvable, and the observations of the reviewers are useful for corrections. The Board of Editors does not have to provide explanations to the authors of rejected texts. The maximum duration when the Board of Editors makes a decision to publish, reject, or return the text for corrections, is four months. This duration is not related to the time of eventual publication, as the latter may also depend on the topics of individual volumes.

In terms of language, every published text is reviewed and, if required, corrected by an editor. The authors receive the text layout in the electronic *.pdf format for proofs and authorisation. On returning the text to the Board of Editors, the authors confirm their authorisation and permission to publish the text in the electronic version of the *LCAS Annuals* or *Studies in Church History* in www.lkma.lt and accessed via the databases as open text by regular or electronic signature.

The printed texts and illustrations and CDs are not returned to authors.

Any questions regarding the subject of the material, the principals of preparations or any aspects of contributions to the *LCAS Annuals* or *Studies in Church History* should be addressed to the Editor in Chief.

Board of Editors

BAŽNYČIOS ISTORIJOS STUDIJOS, T. VI

KRIKŠČIONYS IR
NEKRIKŠČIONYS KITI

Viršelio dail. Dainė Galinienė

Redaktorius Justinas Šuliokas
Korektorė Gabrielė Gailiūtė
Maketuotoja Dainė Galinienė

Leido Lietuvių katalikų mokslo akademija,
Pilies g. 8, LT-01123 Vilnius
Tiražas 300 egz.
Spaudė UAB „Petro ofsetas“,
Savanorių pr. 174D, LT-03153 Vilnius
Kaina sutartinė