

MATAS GRUBLIAUSKAS

The Approach of Christophorus Puciłowski SJ (1650–1707) to the Principle of *fides* in the Field of Politics

<https://doi.org/10.51554/SLL.21.52.04>

ABSTRACT. Christophorus Puciłowski, a Jesuit professor of rhetoric and philosophy at Vilnius University at the end of the 17th century, is barely known in the field of early Lithuanian literature. He has still not received proper attention from philologists or philosophers, although pieces of his work have reached our times. Among these is a brochure for the play *Victoria Mariae* (1684), and notes from his course in politics taught during the 1691–1692 academic year at Vilnius University. Both the play and the notes are examined, for they represent the activities of *Societas Jesu* in the context of the political circumstances. The first marks an important event both for the Commonwealth of Two Nations and the entire Christian world: King Johannes III Sobieski's victory over the Turks near Vienna. The second is a course that concerns the governance, virtues and aims of a Christian state. In this article, the emphasis is placed on trying to reconstruct Puciłowski's model of society based on the principle of *fides*. These two sources are compared with other similar sources: firstly, in the case of the course, with two other courses on politics; and secondly, in the case of the play, with other literature written to mark the victory. The views of the Vilnius professor about contemporary political and social life will be reconstructed.

KEYWORDS: political thought; Christophorus Puciłowski; *Praelectiones politicae*; *Victoria Mariae*; *fides*; Jesuits; 17th-century neo-Latin literature.

Many Jesuit professors had to delve into different fields during their careers in the Order, for example, M.C. Sarbievius taught *studia inferiora*, philosophy and theology. In addition, some professors wrote books (the Jesuits were encouraged to become *scriptores*¹) on topics that were not taught by them or at their institution, and in various genres, for example, Albertas Vijūkas-Kojalavičius (Albertus Wiliuk-Koiałowicz) wrote on Lithuanian history, although history was not a separate subject at Vilnius University at that time. Some professors were also more or less closely linked to the noble families, by being their confessors or theologians, which might not even have been required of the Jesuits, but provided them with a different kind of knowledge of political, social and cultural views². So their expertise should have been quite broad³. If they were able to combine their rhetorical knowledge with historical or theological knowledge⁴, could they have combined it with philosophical knowledge too? Moreover, did they draw a somewhat strict line between their multifaceted encyclopedic knowledge and their fields of operation? However one answers these questions, historiography demonstrates that there are very few studies that use Jesuit philosophical thought to explain their belles-lettres, and *vice versa*⁵.

Christophorus (Krzysztof) Puciłowski taught at Vilnius University. His activities transcended one discipline, and his works, or at least his thoughts,

¹ Rivka Feldhay, 'The Cultural Field of Jesuit Science', in: *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts 1540-1773*, edited by John W. O'Malley SJ [et al.], Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000, p. 115.

² Andrea Mariani, 'Aktywność jezuickich kapłanów nadwornych prowincji litewskiej. Między ustawodawstwem zakonnym a praktyką', in: *Rocznik lituanistyczny*, 2015, vol. 1, p. 37-82.

³ Živilė Nedzinskaitė, 'M. K. Sarbievijaus *De acuto et arguto* sklaida ir interpretacijos XVII-XVIII amžiaus rankraštiniuose mokykliniuose poetikos ir retorikos kursuose', in: *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, 2007, vol. 23, p.44.

⁴ For more about the use of rhetorical elements, see Dalia Dilytė, 'Alberto Vijūko-Kojalavičiaus *Lietuvos istorijos kalbos*', in: *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, 2009, vol. 27, p. 77-136; for more about the use of spiritual doctrines in poetry, see Ona Daukšienė, *Motiejaus Kazimiero Sarbievijaus religinė poezija*, doctoral thesis, Vilnius: Vilnius University, 2014.

⁵ The encouragement to immerse themselves in this topic is an acknowledgement that the activities and works of a Jesuit can be interpreted in the light of, or influenced by, *Exercitia spiritualia* or *Constitutiones* (Andrew C. Ross, 'Alessandro Valignano: The Jesuits and the Culture in the East', in: *The Jesuits. Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts 1540-1773*, edited by John W. O'Malley SJ [et al.], Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000, p. 346; Karl Joseph Hölting, 'Henry Hawkins: A Jesuit Writer and Emblemist in Stuart England', in: *ibid.*, p. 604, 615-619, 623).

have been preserved to the present day: a brochure for his play *Victoria Mariae*⁶ (performed in Vilnius in 1684), and his *dictata* on politics⁷ taken by a philosophy student, Adalbertus Paulus Daugėla, during the 1691–1692 academic year at Vilnius University. We should point out that they are not full-length texts. In the brochure, we find just the main, or the most important, information in the scenes, with no details; in the notes, there are blank spaces, missing chapters, and errors. Nonetheless, by involving these two sources, not only the main characteristics of late 17th-century Lithuanian educational and cultural standards can be revived, but also a (still barely investigated⁸) name can be presented to the field of early Lithuanian literature and philosophy.

Before starting the analysis, a few points must be made. First, when one talks about thinkers who belong to an organisation (as mentioned before, Puciłowski was a member of *Societas Iesu*) with its own, universally accepted and supervised rules and way(s) of proceeding, one finds oneself in a delicate situation, surrounded by questions such as: How much do they generate their own thoughts and views, and how much do they simply adopt those of the organisation? How much does the thinker want to be, or can be, original?

⁶ [Krzysztof Puciłowski], *Victoria Mariae seu Vienna Austriae [...] ab obsidione Liberata [...] A Iuventute Rhetorica in Alma Academia Vilnensi Societatis Iesu [...] in scenam producta 1684 12 Februarij*, the National Museum in Kraków (MNK), f. 17-11169-I.

⁷ *Tractatus Politicus duabus suis partibus [...]*, Manuscript Division of Vilnius University Library (VUB RS), F3-1390.

⁸ Christophorus Puciłowski is not unknown to scholars of early Lithuanian literature and philosophy, because he is mentioned by Romanas Plečkaitis and Vanda Zaborskaitė. However, the first describes Puciłowski's course, and states that 'at the theoretical level, the most mature lectures were taught by [Puciłowski's colleague] Modzelewski' (Romanas Plečkaitis, *Lietuvos filosofijos istorija*, vol. 1, Vilnius: Kultūros, filosofijos ir meno institutas, 2004, p. 490). And the latter just lists him among other authors of the late 17th century (Vanda Zaborskaitė, *Prie Lietuvos teatro ištakų*, Vilnius: Mokslo, 1981, p. 31). However, Puciłowski's play is discussed more among Polish scholars: Anna Czarniecka mentions it in the context of propaganda literature, which had to show the divine aspect of Sobieski's victory (Anna Czarniecka, *Nikt nie słucha mnie na życie ... Jan III Sobieski w walce z opozycją propagandą [1684-1696]*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Neriton, 2009, p. 82); Kazimierz Puchowski describes the role of the play's choruses (Kazimierz Puchowski, 'The Relief of Vienna in Jesuit Theatre in Poland', in: *Вісник Прикарпатського університету. Педагогіка*, 2011, т. 39, p. 25); Jan Okón mentions it together with other plays that depict the vanity of court life (Jan Okón, *Dramat i teatr szkolny. Sceny jezuickie XVII wieku*, Wrocław [et al.]: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1970, p. 202).

How much does he follow the constitution of the organisation voluntarily, and how much obligatorily?⁹ It could be that Puciłowski expressed only Baroque features and Jesuit ideas, and only in their accepted ways, in his play and lectures; but if we accept this premise, we would disregard his individuality¹⁰.

Second, if a researcher does not accept this premise, however, he or she could get lost at the other extreme, that is, by paying too much attention to the thinker's personality and psychology¹¹. When considering two different works penned by the same author, we should address the issues of their audience and the continuity of the author's ideas. In Puciłowski's case, we have two different texts; however, they found room together at Vilnius University. Puciłowski wrote the play when he was a professor of rhetoric, and he taught the above-mentioned politics course when he was a professor of ethics¹². The play was written to mark the victory of Johannes III Sobieski, the King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania, in 1683 at Vienna, and was performed before guests and residents of Vilnius, probably mostly laymen, who had their own opinions about the intervention of the Commonwealth's army in

⁹ An attempt and failure to find the one and true Jesuit way of proceeding are well described by Gauvin Alexander Bailey in 'Le style jésuite n'existe pas: Jesuit Corporate Culture and the Visual Arts', in: *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts 1540-1773*, p. 38-89.

¹⁰ The British thinker Isaiah Berlin, writing about scientific descriptions and interpretations of the past, points to two levels of reality: 'an upper, public, illuminated, easily noticed, clearly describable surface from which similarities are capable of being profitably abstracted and condensed into laws; and below this a path into less and less obvious yet more and more intimate and pervasive characteristics, too closely mixed with feelings and activities to be easily distinguishable from them. It is the first level that is findable and describable by social scientists', while the other one is neglected and left behind, because in this path 'each step is more difficult, each effort to advance robs us of the desire or ability to continue' (Isaiah Berlin, 'The sense of reality', in: *The sense of reality: studies in ideas and their history*, edited by Henry Hardy, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1997, p. 20).

¹¹ To put it in Berlin's words: 'endlessly shifting views, feelings, reactions, instincts, beliefs which constitute the uniqueness of each individual and of each of its acts and thoughts' (*ibid.*, p. 19).

¹² The manuscript file of Paulius Rabikauskas on the persons of the Lithuanian Jesuit Province, Archives of the Lithuanian Jesuit Province (Pauliaus Rabikausko rankraštinių Lietuvos jėzuitų provincijos asmenų kartoteka. Lietuvos jėzuitų provincijos archyvas), f. 149, ap. 13, b. 2-6; Krzysztof Ignacy Puciłowski, in: *Encyklopedia wiedzy o jezuitach na ziemiach Polski i Litwy 1564-1995*, opracował Ludwik Grzebień SJ, Kraków: Wyższa Szkoła Filozoficzno-Pedagogiczna Ignatium / WAM, 1996. Website: <https://www.jezuici.krakow.pl/cgi-bin/rjbo?b=enc&q=PUCILOWSKI&f=1>.

the foreign war¹³. The addressee of the politics, however, is narrower; that is, students at the university, some of whom intended to continue studying theology after finishing their studies in philosophy, or who had already taken their vows and become Jesuits. Thus, the audience is different; consequently, the content of the play and the course is elaborated by it, and they cannot be properly compared. But another issue remains: can we say that these two texts, conveying the thoughts of the same author, complement each other? In other words, do we perceive them better, now that they are put together, than before? If we answer this positively, we can deduce from Puciłowski's personality that his views had not changed during the decade, that he had a stable mental project, with a precise and defined goal, and that by the time he wrote the play he was already 'complete' as a person. If we follow this direction, we will find ourselves in the field of the psychology of the self.

A third way can be proposed in reconstructing Puciłowski's views concerning statecraft: we could look not just for common characteristics, but for how individuality can work within these characteristics¹⁴. So it is possible to put the main emphasis not on the occasion when the play was written, and not on the search for characters it has in common with other similar plays, as Jan Okón¹⁵ has done, or on the dominant moral concept in it, or on placing it among others which have similar details in composition¹⁶,

¹³ Even though the Sejm voted to send Polish and Lithuanian troops to help the Emperor Leopold I, the Lithuanian army did not intervene in this war, because of the opposition to the king by Hetman Jan Sapieha, who was at that time one of the most powerful men in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. After the victory, Sobieski was in a hurry to spread the 'just' description, so that his opponents would not have time to do otherwise. (Anna Czarniecka, *op. cit.*, p. 90.)

¹⁴ Berlin emphasises that what a scientist describing a particular event in the past should avoid is to 'concentrate solely upon those characteristics of it which it has in common with as many other [past events] as we can discover, ignoring the differences as irrelevant to our study; and a scientist should show what is specific, unique, in a given character or series of events or historical situation, so that the reader, presented with this account, should be able to grasp the situation in what is called its 'concreteness', that is, as it occurred at the particular time, in the particular place, as the result of the particular antecedents, in the framework of the particular events in which it and it alone occurred – the respects in which it differs from everything which has occurred before or is likely to occur after it' (Isaiah Berlin, *op. cit.*, p. 21–22).

¹⁵ Jan Okón, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

¹⁶ It depends on which aspects the researcher puts his emphasis. For example, *Victoria Mariae* could be analysed in respect to the occasion (Sobieski's victory), or the Christian calendar

and not on involving in the general overview the common and most popular notions of political thoughts¹⁷, which is what Romanas Plečkaitis has done with Puciłowski's course. Although these points of view help us to understand cultural phenomena and institutions, they can be complemented by analysing their individual parts (each play, each course, etc) in their uniqueness.

First of all, to do this, Puciłowski's works are compared with similar ones. In the case of lectures, they are compared with two other courses on politics. The first, called *Institutiones politicae*¹⁸, took place in Würzburg in 1618, dictated by Professor Papius and written down by Joannes Suiderski, a student who also studied at Vilnius University. A later one, with the same name as Puciłowski's *Praelectiones politicae*¹⁹, was taught during the 1690–1691 academic year at Vilnius University by Zacharias Modzelewski, and written down by the same student who took notes during Puciłowski's lectures. These courses have been chosen in order to compare how courses given by different professors coincide or differ in the same institution and in different courses, and because they are quite extended in their length. In the case of the play, remarks will be made about the literature that was written in the Commonwealth of Two Nations to celebrate Sobieski's victories.

WHAT WAS THE COURSE ON POLITICS ABOUT?

*Ratio studiorum*²⁰ states clearly the aims of different disciplines: theology, philosophy, and *studia inferiora*²¹. Politics (like ethics and economics) was

(it was performed at Shrovetide), or the theme (the anti-Turkish mood), because it has all the characteristic elements: glorification of Sobieski, an 'obscene' convivial scene, and an unfavourable depiction of the Turks as infidels.

¹⁷ The nature of political society, the king's authority, war, the legal system, freedom, anti-Machiavellism (Romanas Plečkaitis, *op. cit.*, p. 493–505).

¹⁸ *Institutiones politicae*, Bibliotekej Jagiellońskiej Oficina Rękopisów (BJ OR), 1973, f. 90–112.

¹⁹ VUB RS, F3-1390.

²⁰ *Ratio atque institutio studiorum societatis Iesu superiorum permissu*, Toruni: apud Claudium Michaellem Typographum Universitatis, 1603. It was important for Vilnius University professors, but perhaps not as much to Würzburg's, because that did not belong to the Jesuits. It was Catholic, however.

²¹ [Professor scholasticae theologiae] *sui muneris esse intelligat solidam disputandi subtilitatem ita cum orthodoxa fide, ac pietate coniungere, ut huic inprimis illa deserviat* (p. 55); [professor]

incorporated into moral philosophy, a subdiscipline of philosophy. Philosophy aimed to prepare students properly for theological studies. No other aim for moral philosophy is outlined apart from the one quoted. However, it is noted that the *professor philosophiae moralis* has to *progrediendo in textu breviter, docte, & graviter praecipua capita scientiae moralis, quae in decem libris Ethicorum Aristotelis habentur, explicare* and to avoid theological questions²². After widening the limits of moral philosophy, the list of the course material had to be widened, too. At least Aristotle's *Politics* had to be added. Before starting teaching politics, a professor had to consider what he was going to teach his students²³ and for what purpose: either to teach students how to theorise about politics, how to be a good citizen, officer or ruler, or how to introduce them to politics as a type of knowledge without seeking to stimulate their critical thinking? An attempt to answer these questions is made by looking deeper into the above-mentioned courses, comparing their various features.

The structure of the course

Institutiones politicae by Papius is divided into four parts: an introduction, where the professor discusses what *scientia politica* (political science) is, and three main topics. The first investigates *societatem humanam* (human

ita tractet [artes, vel scientiae naturales], ut auditores suos, ac potissimum nostros ad Theologiam praeparat, maximeque ad cognitionem excitet sui Creatoris (p. 83); *Adolescentes [...] sic magister instituat, ut una cum litteris mores etiam Christianis dignos in primis hauriant* (p. 117); '[Professor of Scholastic Theology] should understand that it is his duty to combine keenness of mind in disputation with untarnished faith and sincere love of God so that his professional competence will contribute to his progress in the spiritual life; [professor] should teach these secular subjects in a spirit which will prepare his students, and especially his Jesuit students, for the study of theology. He should above all lead them to a knowledge of their Creator; the teacher shall so train [...] that they [students] may acquire not only learning but also habits of conduct worthy of a Christian' (translation is from *The Jesuit Ratio studiorum* of 1599, translated into English, with an introduction and explanatory notes by Allan P. Farrell, Washington: Conference of Major Superiors of Jesuits, 1970).

²² '[T]o explain briefly and in a scholarly and serious manner the principal topics of moral science as contained in the ten books of Aristotle's *Ethics*' (p. 91).

²³ This question was partially answered by Plečkaitis: Modzelewski was concerned more with the problems of the contemporary state, and Puciłowski with issues common to every commonwealth (Romanas Plečkaitis, *op. cit.*, p. 490). In this analysis, however, an attempt will be made to emphasise the difference in the professors' beliefs of what the course in politics is *per se*.

society), which is divided into two main groups: the *familia* (household), and *res publica* (commonwealth). The latter is split into three *status* (kinds): *monarchicus*, *poliarchicus* and *mixtus*. Examples of contemporary states are given to demonstrate each and to compare them with each other. The main subject of the second part is the ruler's *maiestas* (majesty). It examines what it is, who can have it, and what rights it has. In the last part, the discussion turns to subjects and citizens of the commonwealth, and what their duties are. Questions are raised about what a good citizen is, to whom he should be loyal, and what kind of relationships may exist between members of different social orders and citizens of foreign countries.

Modzelewski's *Praelectiones politicae* starts with a discussion of monarchy or kingship: what kinds there are, which is the best, how it came into being, and how it changes into forms of statehood (*tyrannis* gets a lot of attention in this part). Later, Modzelewski explains two ways one can become a king, that is, by elections and succession. He pays more attention to the first. The third question considers regal *authoritas et maiestas* (authority and majesty), and what the regal rights are. The last part of the course is named *excursus hystorico-politicus*. However, it is not complete²⁴.

Puciłowski's *Praelectiones politicae* begins with a description of what the secular state and its authority are like, and where their foundation lies. The professor primarily demonstrates its complexity. On one hand, the state arose from God, because He banished the biblical forefathers from Paradise; and on the other hand, from human nature. After all, they saw that it is safer and more convenient to live in groups on the Earth, and started living in households, villages and cities, creating states, colonies, kingdoms and empires. However, authority comes only from God. Later, Puciłowski talks about the changes in civic countries, referring to Johannes Sleidanus' *De Quatuor Summis Imperiis*. Most of the course²⁵ is concerned with how an *imperium* (power)

²⁴ For the time being, it is hard to say whether the professor did not finish teaching it, or if the student did not finish writing it down. It is clear, though, that the notes are incomplete, because the narration stops after describing Italy, although at the beginning of the excursion, it says that all of Europe will be described.

²⁵ It has to be said that *Quaestio Quarta* follows after the *Quaestio Prima* (*vide supra*). As for now, it is hard to say whether it is a mistake in the numbering, because there are a few other chapters without numbers, or the second and third questions for some reason were not written down.

can be obtained. The answer is expressed clearly: *Ego ad unum titulum omnia conservandarum Rerum publicarum media revoco, scilicet ad unam Religionem*²⁶. Puciłowski continues to prove it by quoting various historical evidence²⁷. This course, like Modzelewski's, should have finished by talking about Europe, but the notes end after the historical description of Poland, Prussia and Lithuania.

It is evident now that these three courses do not share the same structure. It is too early, though, to declare which one properly followed the model (if there was one at all²⁸). What can be said is that although these courses cannot be treated as explaining political science as contained in the eight books of Aristotle's *Politics* (i.e., like the course on theology where St Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae* is followed *articulus by articulus*), we can agree with the statement that they are based on *the legacy of interpretations of Aristotelian political science*²⁹, when *legacy* is understood as taking one or another of a philosopher's thoughts into consideration, but not all of his treatise.

Now I will show how the professors answer the most important questions concerning political science in general, or considerations of state governance. (The structure of Puciłowski's course will be followed.)

²⁶ 'I reduce all the ways of preserving Commonwealths to one reason, and that is one common Religion' (VUB F3-1390, f. 102). (The translations, if not indicated otherwise, are by the author of the article.)

²⁷ It is not uncommon among the Jesuits to search for *unities* that rule human life and which make it intelligible (T. Frank Kennedy SJ, 'Candide and a Boat', in: *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts 1540-1773*, edited by John W. O'Malley SJ, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000, p. 318: 'They [...] often managed to live lives characterised by [...] "effective meanings" [...] that create or reveal the unity or oneness of human beings, making life intelligible [...] A commitment to the search for effective meanings encouraged Jesuits to seek relationships between various disciplines').

²⁸ There is a list of themes concerning the course and examination in politics at Vilnius University after the suppression of the Jesuit order and under the supervision of the Education Committee (*Dowód rocznego postępkę [...] w szkołach Akademii Wileńskiej dany roku 1780 dnia 24 lipca* [Wilno: Drukarnia Akademicka, 1783], (VUB RS), IV 23113). As for now, I leave it for future research, because the question of whether professors were already using this model in the 17th century, or if this model was formed later according to what was taught by them, is too wide for this research.

²⁹ Romanas Plečkaitis, *op. cit.*, p. 491.

Quid est res publica?

In order to answer this question, Papius cites Jean Bodin: *Respublica [...] est familiarum rerumque inter ipsas communium summa potestate ac ratione moderata multitudo*³⁰. Puciłowski gives quite a similar definition, but does not mention any author:

Est autem Res publica rerum et vitae quaedam communitas unius societatis, quae efficit unum corpus quoddam civile ex pluribus diversis tanquam membris compositi sub potestate suprema velut sub uno capite³¹.

Modzelewski does not define a commonwealth. As one can see from the structure of his course, he is mostly concerned with monarchy, and does not take time³² to talk about a commonwealth in general.

Finis rei publicae

Puciłowski tells his students that the purpose of a commonwealth is *ad bene et commodius vivendum in hac mortali vita, ut quam facilius ad aeternam perveniatur*³³. Although Modzelewski also expresses earthly life-centred ideas not surpassing *mortal life, ad finem naturalem, quae est pax et tranquillitas Reipublicae*³⁴, he does it contrary to the ecclesiastical state or the Church whose purpose is *divine*. However, it should be taken into consideration that

³⁰ 'Commonwealth is a multitude of families and things which unto them are in common and moderated by a high power' (BJ OR 1973, f. 91).

³¹ 'Commonwealth is some generality of things and life in one society which forms some civic body from many various parts which is unified by the high power like body parts by a head' (VUB F3-1390, f. 94).

³² It will not be examined here whether Daugėla wrote down what the professor dictated word for word or not. This is another topic worth wider consideration. That dictating was not promoted during the educational process and students were encouraged to write down just the main information for revision, see Paul Nelles, 'Libros de Papel, Libri Bianchi, Libri Papyracei. Note-Taking Techniques and the Role of Student Notebooks in the Early Jesuit Colleges', in: *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, 2007, vol. 76, p. 88.

³³ 'To live well and comfortably in this mortal life in order to get to the eternal one as easily as possible' (*ibid.*, f. 94).

³⁴ 'To reach the [human] nature which is peace and tranquility of the commonwealth' (*ibid.*, f. 67).

Modzelewski talks only about monarchy, and not about commonwealth in general. By this, we can say, he implies that other forms of state have their purpose, or that other forms, unlike monarchy, cannot *reach human nature* because of their imperfections. Papius' position is even more secular than the ones mentioned. While professors at Vilnius University place the discussion about the purpose of the state in the context of religion or the Church, Papius does it more in accordance with other sciences, consciously stating that it is the job of political scientists (*scientia civilis*), not of the state itself, to have a purpose which is *eiusdem [societatis humanae] salus*³⁵.

Origo rei publicae

Both Papius and Puciłowski point out that humans form communities, societies or states by nature (*a natura naturali*³⁶; *ipsa natura instinctu quodam innato impellit hominem ad vitam socialem*³⁷). Modzelewski, however, stresses that only communities or states which are based on monarchical principles are natural to human beings (*primi mortalium [...] naturam incorrupti sequabantur, eundem habebant et ducem et legem*³⁸).

Mutationes rerum publicarum

Modzelewski explains that states change because human virtues degenerate, and then monarchy, the best form of state, turns into aristocracy, later it becomes oligarchy, then tyranny, and finally democracy. Puciłowski connects the changes or disturbances in a state with the lack of one virtue, piety (*principalis causa intestinorum bellorum ac tumultuum, immo et interituum in regnis provenit ex neglectu Religionis Catholicae, seu ex multitudine sectarum*³⁹). The neglect of one religion causes a bitter life on the Earth, so

³⁵ 'The well-being of human society' (BJ OR 1973, f. 90).

³⁶ 'Naturally' (VUB F3-1390, f. 91).

³⁷ 'The same nature by some innate impulse urges a man for social life' (BJ OR 1973, f. 94).

³⁸ 'First men used to follow nature uncorruptedly, their leader and their law were in unity' (*ibid.*, f. 71).

³⁹ 'The main causes of civil wars and rebellion, even of destructions in the reigns, arise from the neglect of the Catholic religion or from the multitude of faiths' (*ibid.*, f. 104).

there is no tranquility while waiting to reach eternal life. Therefore, the state loses its purpose. The professor does not delve into theoretical observations of how states change from one form to another. This variety of topics between two professors at the same university can be explained as follows. On one hand, for Modzelewski, it is important to stress the superiority of the monarchy, because he might have witnessed the gradual weakening of the Commonwealth of Two Nations in the second half of the 17th century. It could be that he attributed the cause of 'The Deluge' to the 'golden freedom' of the gentry. This reign of nobles (aristocracy) or magnates (oligarchy) is *per se* lesser than monarchy for him. On the other hand, Puciłowski sees the problems of the state in another issue, however, also observed from the circumstances in the Commonwealth of Two Nations. The state fought many wars during the second half of the 17th century, especially against enemies of a different faith: the Ottoman Empire, the Kingdom of Sweden, and the Grand Duchy of Moscow.

In quo consistit rei publicae salus?

As has been mentioned, Puciłowski named one remedy for preserving the well-being of the state, that is, the one and true religion, by which *pax et concordia, iustitia et caeterae virtutes*⁴⁰ are guaranteed. To prove this, he provides some arguments pro and contra. The professor divides what preserves the state into two parts: first, it is religion; and, second, the one and true religion. For the first part, Puciłowski gives the following arguments:

omnis Respublica pendeat a DEO, a quo omnis descendit potestas [...] Ethnici unanimes consensu id docuerunt [...] Pietate erga DEUM sublata, fidem et humani generis societatem tolli est necesse [...] nulla unquam Res publica in orbe fuit quae religionem ac pietatem in DEUM primam felicitatis suae basim non agnoverit [...] subditi in unius DEI cultu et adoratione debitaque erga Principem obedientia retinentur [...] Religio et Iustitia totam in se vim imperiorum, aeternitatem complectuntur.⁴¹

⁴⁰ 'Peace and harmony among people, justice and other virtues' (*ibid.*, f. 102).

⁴¹ 'Every Commonwealth depends on GOD, from whom power descends [...] Pagans with unanimous agreement taught [...] that it is necessary that trust and human society would be risen by a piety directed towards GOD [...] never ever was there a Commonwealth on Earth

For the second part, he argues that only uniform faith in the state can provide *unitatem animorum*. On the contrary, a multitude of faiths defines differently the main characteristics of rulers; therefore, their honour and majesty may be violated (*Nec regia Maiestas tuta esse potest, vilesceat Praesulum et Antistitum dignitas, Magistratum honor in despectum abit, ubi diversarum religionum viges superstitio*⁴²). After this, he presents the arguments of *pseudopolitici*, who deny the statement of the cultivation of a sole religion in the state. In their opinion, Puciłowski says, the world consists of oppositions that fight against each other, and it is a common feature of the state, so it should be *dissimilium multitudo*, not *similium unitas*. To accomplish harmony among *dissimiles*, it is most important that every citizen obeys the law, and it is less important that everyone has the same opinion about God (*non obest si cives aliter et aliter de DEO ac religione sentiant, modo legibus unanimes obedient*⁴³). The professor responds to these counter-arguments by negating them. Even though the world consists of oppositions, they are harmonised by God. In the state, these oppositions are recognised as different orders and offices, but not as various faiths, because states are created not only so that citizens obey the law, but also so that they *vivant DEUM verum colendo vitamque aeternam consequantur*⁴⁴. So if some citizens cultivate false gods and seek different after-lives, or have different concepts of it, there cannot be any peace among them, because they treat each other as untrustworthy (*fieri enim non potest, ut quis cum alio pacem et amicitiam colat, et iisdem legibus obediat, quem infidum credit*⁴⁵). Finally, Puciłowski reveals that it is the Catholic faith that is best suited to *preserve the status of any power*, because it is the only religion that makes people obey consciously (*conscientiae vincula omnes homines ad Regis et cuiuscunque Domini obedientiam adstringit*⁴⁶), without any coercion, for it is given directly by God. On the contrary, other *sectae* (faiths) are artificial, inspired by felonies or cravings for glory (*aut hominum scelus, aut ambitio aut*

which did not recognise that the main basis of felicity is religion and piety [...] subjects by honouring and adoring only one GOD retain rightful obedience to the ruler [...] Religion and Justice hold in their selves all the power of the emperors and eternity' (*ibid.*, f. 102).

⁴² *Ibid.*, f. 102.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, f. 103.

⁴⁴ 'Would live by cultivating the real GOD and would seek eternal life' (*loc. cit.*).

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 103.

⁴⁶ *Loc. cit.*

*praestigia daemonum*⁴⁷). To sum up, Puciłowski tries to show why and how the state is made by the Catholic faith a proper place to live and await eternal life.

Papius describes this issue briefly. In his opinion, the welfare of the state depends on laws that ensure its longevity. However, he answers the question about ways that could preserve the welfare of the state by saying that there is nothing stable in human affairs, and every state is already condemned to perish (*nihil est in rerum humanarum natura quod sit perpetuum [...] cuiusque rei publicae fatalem exitum esse*⁴⁸). But Modzelewski does not even raise this kind of question. One could say, though, that his *quaestio secunda* is concerned with the issue of the well-being of the state. In this *quaestio*, he examines which aspects one has to have in mind when considering how to avoid the degeneration of monarchy, the best form of state: is it better when kings gain their power by succession, or by election? Is it better when *rex est lex* or *lex est rex*? Is it better when a king is a foreigner or a fellow countryman? What age is the most appropriate for a king?⁴⁹ And so on.

So it is quite clear that each professor had his individual view of what the course *per se* about the commonwealth should teach the students. For Papius, it is the sum of knowledge of human society and its government. For Modzelewski, the professor of politics should be concerned with the actual form of the state in which his students live. For Puciłowski, it is a field for deliberation about ways to secure a safe and peaceful life for every citizen.

THE PRINCIPLE OF *FIDES* IN PUCIŁOWSKI'S *PRAELECTIONES*

Puciłowski's precept to ensure a safe and peaceful life in society is the Catholic faith, which is the only one that can inspire trust between citizens, so that they can be guaranteed that promises, contracts and truces will be kept. The professor demonstrates the soundness of his statement by using historical evidence. In Germany, when various *sectae* were founded, the peasants started a revolt against their lords, so they broke the promise to be loyal to

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, f. 104.

⁴⁸ BJ OR 1973, f. 91.

⁴⁹ VUB F3-1390, f. 76-87.

their masters⁵⁰. For the same reason, the King of England dared to break the vow given at the altar to his wife, already a family member⁵¹. On accepting Lutheranism, Livonia broke international treaties many times⁵². While the first examples deal with the situation within the state, the last one crosses the borders of one country, and that is an issue (international relations with non-Catholic countries) to which Puciłowski devotes a large part of his course.

This is not surprising, because during the second half of the 17th century the Commonwealth of Two Nations was engaged in wars with three countries whose faiths were different to its own: in the Kingdom of Sweden the dominant religion was Lutheranism, in the Grand Duchy of Moscow it was the Christian Orthodox faith, and in the Ottoman Empire it was Islam. Therefore, it is not enough to reach concordance of faith within a state; there is always a threat from other countries, because it is almost impossible to preserve international peace, since the leaders of states of different faiths cannot trust each other to keep their agreements on peace or truce.

As in within a state, in international relationships the unified Catholic faith can also help to keep promises. Catholics are kept from breaking their word by fear, shame or punishment, and they are motivated to keep it by honour, duty and glory (*Alios metus coerctet et paena, principes pudor [...] Etiam in Ethnicis solius honestatis et bonae famae amore viguit fides*⁵³). On one hand, the latter are acquired when a Catholic keeps a promise to another Catholic⁵⁴. On the other hand, a Catholic can incur the first by not keeping a promise, even to a non-Catholic⁵⁵. Even though Puciłowski shows the deserved punishment of King Vladislaus of Poland when he broke his promise to *Turca*, in the next chapter [*d*]ictis et exemplis probatur fidem non servari datam hosti, qui veram non colunt Religionem Catholicam⁵⁶. To confirm it, he cites Machiavelli, saying that it is more important to keep the motherland safe than to keep a promise to the enemy, even though to do so is not the Catholic way (*Sola*

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, f. 106–107.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, f. 107.

⁵² *Ibid.*, f. 107.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, f. 108.

⁵⁴ *Loc. cit.*

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 108–109.

⁵⁶ 'It is shown by sayings and examples that a given promise is not kept for an enemy who does not cultivate the true Catholic faith' (*ibid.*, f. 109).

*innocentia hodie vivere est [...] nimis periculosum, cum vulpibus vulpinandum est, ubi occasio Patriam liberandi, libertatemque asserendi affulget pereat fides potius, quam Patria, cum decipere pro moribus temporum turpe non sit, sed prudentiae tantum experimentum, utique violatio Fidei erit censenda quaedam prudentia*⁵⁷). The examples the professor gives, however, include only promises broken by non-Catholics.

By doing this, Puciłowski shows that one should not trust them, and that one must be vigilant and clever in dealing with them and when it involves the preservation of oneself or the motherland. We can see that this inclusion and the stress on *fides* to observations of politics was chosen by the professor deliberately, because Modzelewski does not distinguish this virtue from others, and Papius briefly says that a promise must be kept, even a promise to the enemy⁵⁸.

FIDES IN VICTORIA MARIAE

After a brief review of Puciłowski's course on politics, it is time to look at his other work, a play written to celebrate the victory of the liberation of Vienna in 1683. The combined forces of the Holy Roman Empire and the Commonwealth of Two Nations led by Johannes III Sobieski defeated the Turkish army on 12 September. Almost immediately afterwards, a large number of works glorifying the battle were created⁵⁹.

Challenges before starting to write a drama with a happy ending

As the article's main goal is not to compare with and place his work among other literature glorifying King Sobieski, it will show briefly the main tendencies, by summarising the research already done. On one hand, it is important to note how Sobieski was depicted in literature. Images and characteristics of Sobieski can be grouped into three categories. Firstly, he is compared to mythical heroes or ancient warriors who were great leaders

⁵⁷ *Loc. cit.*

⁵⁸ BJ OR 1973, f. 110.

⁵⁹ Piotr Borek, 'Jan III Sobieski pod wiedniem w literackim świadectwie epoki (rekonesans)', in: *Prace Historyczne*, 146/2019, Issue No 2, p. 450.

(Achilles, Odysseus, Alexander the Great, Darius, Caesar), or historical personalities who fought wars or did great things by defending Christianity from its enemies (Constantine the Great, Theodosius the Great)⁶⁰. Secondly, he was seen not only as a liberator of Vienna, but also of the whole world⁶¹. Thirdly, because of his virtues, he was depicted as the chosen one by God to fulfil His plans on Earth, that is, to reduce the power of the Ottomans⁶², or elevate the importance of the Polish gentry in the course of history⁶³. On the other hand, it is worth looking at what was shown on the stage in favour of the wars against the Turks. Among them, we can find interventions by the saints, parallel depictions (past events performed along with present ones), and introductions of allegorical, symbolic figures⁶⁴.

As can be seen, the goal of poets, prose writers and playwrights was to underline Sobieski's importance in the victory, and its significance to European and world history; to achieve this, they had to influence and excite readers, so they wrote using different poetic figures and various kinds of representation. They would have been expected to celebrate the king and his accomplishments creatively and effectively⁶⁵.

It was common practice in Jesuit school theatre to represent political and social events of great importance⁶⁶. The battle was won the year when Puciłowski was professor of poetics and rhetoric, so it was part of his duties to produce a play on this occasion. He must have found himself in the same situation as other writers, that is, to compose an affective work in a given

⁶⁰ Živilė Nedzinskaitė, 'Eilės Jono Sobieskio garbei: figūrinių poezijos galimybės XVII amžiuje', in: *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, 2015, vol. 40, p. 180; Anna Czarniecka, *op. cit.*, p. 83–84.

⁶¹ *Tu stupor Austriadum [...] Tu servata salus, Tu spes invicta Viennae* (Stanislaus Josephus Biezanowski, *Oriens Byzantinus [...]*, Crocovie: Typis Universitatis, 1683, p. G2v); *Hinc tibi in victoriosum diadema, totus, qua late patet, Orbis flectitur; cui in ornamentum, tot inscripti Regum, Pontificum, Ducum, Procerumque nomina* (Michaelis Chreptowicz, *Maestas Sarmatiae [...]*, Vilnae: Typis Soc. Jesu, 1688, p. B2v); for more, see Anna Czarniecka, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

⁶² Piotr Borek, *op. cit.*, p. 455–457.

⁶³ Barbara Milewska-Ważbińska, 'The Attitude towards the Turks in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth under the Reign of Jan III Sobieski', in: *Nordic Journal of Renaissance Studies*, 2019, vol. 16, p. 226.

⁶⁴ Kazimierz Puchowski, *op. cit.*, p. 24–26.

⁶⁵ Anna Czarniecka, *op. cit.*, p. 77. Nonetheless, as the researcher adds, in reality, there were composers of second and third-rate literature (*ibid.*, p. 78).

⁶⁶ Vanda Zaborskaitė, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

genre. A playwright needs a combination of at least a few dramatic elements: tension, peripeteia, perfidy, hamartia, or recognition. However, the material for the play is not suitable for a drama: the victory was achieved quite easily, Vienna was liberated, and both Sobieski and his son Jacob, who also fought in the battle, returned safe and alive. Another possible approach could be taken from the point of those who were in Vienna. Even though the tension would have been high while waiting for Sobieski and his army, other elements could not be used, because they show the faults and imperfections of the characters, and if before being saved they acted in this way, it would not have been worth saving them, so the victory would have been diminished. In addition, Jesuit school theatre had to have a didactic element, so it would have been inappropriate to portray Christians as wicked. Therefore, Puciłowski was left with one solution, to portray the Turkish military camp. In this case, it was not necessary to adhere strictly to the historical truth, and it was possible to create more dramatic and vivid action⁶⁷.

The beginning of dramatic tension

The first act begins with the joyful news in the Turkish military camp that auxiliary forces have come. Vizir proclaims his younger son, Dirachus, as commander, and sends him into battle. However, in the next scene, a Polish captive is brought to the camp, from whom Vizir learns that the King of Poland has come to the aid of Vienna with a large army. So the joyful atmosphere starts to fade, because a new enemy is waiting to fight. He trusts his oldest son Selimus to keep the news secret and guard the captive. Even though Vizir tries to avoid any disturbance in the camp, another threat breaks into his tent: *sacrificulus* rushes in and informs him about a prophecy that says that *the born Queen of Poland will conquer the Turks*. Vizir's council cannot understand it, so it is sent to *magum* to decipher.

While the threats from outside the camp grow, later, however, they start to grow from within. Selimus is offended because he has not been proclaimed

⁶⁷ Contemporary researchers have demonstrated that dramatic elements are better incorporated into a plot when morally imperfect characters are used (see Eugenija Ulčinaitė, 'Įvadas', in: *Lietuvos jėzuitų teatras: XVI-XVII amžiaus dramų rinktinė*, Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2008, p. 28). This could have been noticed by the Jesuits, too.

commander; it is his privilege as the oldest son to replace the father on the battlefield. But now his younger brother will get the great honour. On one hand, we can see it as a mistake by Vizir, who acts like a tyrant because he does not adhere to the tradition. On the other hand, if we try to look at it from a political point of view, Vizir is a senior commander in the army, and has *maiestatem*, so *ex officio* he can act like this; moreover, he can hide information from his subjects in order to maintain order among them⁶⁸. Selimus takes it, first, as a personal betrayal by the father of the son, so he decides to murder his younger brother in order to take revenge on his father. Therefore, he breaks the loyalty between him and his father and brother, by conspiring with Vizir's scribe Mezolus against them. But this *conspiratio* is heard by Sardanus, *Veziri Ephebus*. He appears to the conspirators, and threatens to give them away to Vizir. Frightened by this incident, they come up with the idea that Selimus will change clothes with the Pole, in order to hide safely. So at the end of the first act, the dramatic tension is great. There is a threat to Vizir and the whole Turkish army from the Polish army, to Dirachus from Selimus, to Selimus from Sardanus, and to the Pole, who will have to face the punishment appointed to Selimus for his conspiracy.

Hamartia

After introducing a web of intrigue in the first act, which is common in Jesuit school drama⁶⁹, Puciłowski slows down the pace of the development of the action, and concentrates mostly on the plot of Selimus and Mezolus. In the first scene, Mezolus continues creating an escape plan: he will steal away to the Polish camp, and will negotiate the liberation of the captive, but in fact of Selimus. The Pole, who is now dressed in Selimus' Turkish clothing, does not understand the real purpose of this exchange; however, he senses that he will not benefit from it. One can expect that there was a monologue by him (*miratur secum*) in which he suspects that he will perhaps be pressurised to become a Muslim, so he promises to himself to stay faithful to the Christian faith (*suspiciatusque ne ad Mehometismum pelliciat, constantiam in fide pollicetur*).

⁶⁸ E.g., Modzelewski, while taking *de Monarchiae praestantia*, teaches that monarchy is superior because secrets can be kept better (VUB F3-1390, f. 71).

⁶⁹ Vanda Zaborskaitė, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

In the next scene, another unexpected event regarding Selimus' conspiracy occurs. The *magus* tells Vizir that the Polish captive can reveal the true meaning of the prophecy. So Selimus, dressed up as the Pole, is brought to Vizir, and is ordered to explain the *mysterium*, but he cannot. Selimus is in danger himself, even though other lives were threatened by his plots. Vizir becomes angry because he cannot interpret the prophecy, for it might help to avoid harm, as prophecies usually do, especially when this one is from the Quran. Irritated, he kills (as he thinks) the Pole. On one hand, we can again see Vizir here as a cruel and uncontrollable tyrant. On the other hand, we should pay more attention to the circumstances: Vizir thinks he killed his enemy who did not collaborate with him, even though he showed him mercy and did not kill him at first when he was captured. One should rather see the deserved punishment for Selimus in this scene. Although Vizir does not yet know it, his next mistake is made by not knowing what is really happening, and its consequences are great. The end of the second act is even more tragic for Vizir, because Dirachus comes back from the battle and says he has lost. Vizir once again shows his cleverness⁷⁰: he does not announce the defeat to the rest of the army; on the contrary, he lies that they have won, and orders the celebration of the *apotheosis* of the fallen soldiers.

Didactic element

After Selimus' storyline is resolved, which had great importance in moving the action on in the previous acts, the focus turns to the other side of the battlefield. Here, *Principes Germaniae* transfers the *direction of the war* to Sobieski, who appoints his patron *Deipara* Mother of God. We can see a parallel with the first act: new forces arrive, and a new commander is appointed, although no mistakes are made and neither does anyone act arbitrarily like a tyrant. However, there is no tranquility either. In the second scene, it is reported that a triumphal feast is being celebrated by the Turks. No one can understand this

⁷⁰ When Modzelewski talks about *how the authority of the king is acquired*, among other virtues, he includes cleverness (*prudentialia Regiae inter alios actus sunt, primo dissimulare cum populo imprimis, cogere enim nunquam fas est eos, quibus persuadere nos posse diffidimus. Deinde in rebus adversis de industria mentitam licet hilaritatem ostentare*) (VUB F3-1390, f. 88).

kind of *laetitia* among those who have just lost a battle. So confusion (*varii sensus*) arises in the tent of the *principes*. But it does not last for long. In the next scene, Mezolus is brought, who reveals the intentions of Vizir.

It can be seen here that Puciłowski also tried to include some dramatic tension among the heroes; but it is less effective, because it had barely started before it was ended, contrary to that among the Turks. With nothing left to resolve, the act ends with Sobieski giving the order to go into battle. On one hand, this is a way of stressing the contrast between Muslims and Christians, because among the former there is much disturbance, and among the latter there is none, so a didactic element arises. On the other hand, Puciłowski interrupts the action in the Ottoman camp to increase the dramatic tension for the spectators, because there are still some unresolved questions left.

Acquiring knowledge

In the fourth act, the focus returns to the Turkish camp, where the final touches are being made before the real battle. It takes place at the feast, which is a common motif in Jesuit drama to show culminating events⁷¹.

It is not clear from the brochure how it happens, but during the feast Vizir hears the words of the prophecy. However, it interrupts the celebration, the joyful mood is lost, and Vizir must confront his destiny, no matter how hard he was trying to avoid or postpone it. The Pole, who is at the feast dressed up as Selimus, reveals the mysterious words: *natam Reginam Poloniae, esse Deiparam*. By this, Vizir acknowledges that through his own fault, he murdered his son, and becomes furious. Moreover, his anger is increased by Sardanus, who reveals too late the conspiracy by Selimus and Mezolus, and Vizir forces him to drink the poison which was prepared for Dirachus. The latter, first crying about his older brother's fate, now full of hatred towards him, asks his father to make the Pole his brother. The Pole has to be asked to convert to Islam, but he remains faithful to the promise he gave earlier, and dies in glory (*glorioso occumbit*).

Thus ends the fourth act. Vizir, contrary to the first act, is at his lowest point. He finally learns that his son was conspiring against him, that he has

⁷¹ Vanda Zaborskaitė, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

killed his son, and that he is destined to lose the battle. On the contrary, the Pole, even though he is killed, is at his highest point, because he chooses death, in order to not betray his faith. A simple soldier, he acts as a true Christian saint⁷².

The tragedy of Vizir

The last act begins with the appearance of Sobieski's army near Vizir's camp. The battle begins, and in the next three scenes, the battle is enacted on the stage: the German army arrives to help the Poles; the Turks flee and drown in the Danube. Vizir now sees clearly his defeat, but he does not want to accept the obvious truth and give up his plans to take Vienna, so he calls on his soldiers to stay. Yet another parallel can be seen here. Like the Polish captive, he was involved from the beginning in a web of intrigue, acting, taking decisions and looking for answers blindly. However, in contrast to the Pole, his faith, Islam, is a false one, so he cannot acquire true knowledge completely by himself, which would have saved him like it saved the Pole.

The play finally ends with Sobieski's triumphal entrance into Vienna, where he announces that the victory was won thanks to the patronage of the Blessed Virgin Mary. By this, he fulfils his promise to Her as She kept Hers and protected him. So this happy ending is reached, as Puciłowski interprets it, by Sobieski's most important virtue, *fides*, that is, faith, and keeping promises. In Sobieski's storyline, we can see the structure of a comedy, in the sense that the story begins with a great threat (the siege of Vienna), and ends happily (the liberation of Vienna). Vizir's storyline, on the contrary, follows the structure of a tragedy: it begins happily (fresh forces arrive), but he later finds himself continuously in difficult circumstances, until he finally meets his tragic fate. The tragedy of earthly life is enacted here. Its actions are motivated mostly by treachery, which sows distrust among the characters; therefore, they act unjustly and recklessly.

So from this analysis, it can be inferred that Puciłowski was not just a *rhetor* while composing a play, and not just a *philosophus* while teaching politics.

⁷² The defence of the faith was considered appropriate for plays performed on Christian feast days (Jan Okón, *op. cit.*, p. 185).

The range in the variety of themes, dramatic elements and characters shows that he did not create a static, one-sided play. Its storyline is not based on anti-Turkish views, or Sobieski's political campaign, but rather has a deeper philosophical meaning. Everything that happens depends on the point of view of fidelity and confidence. This leads to the conclusion that the siege of Vienna is just a context, not the main theme: the main theme is fidelity, of the believer to the faith, of one family member to another, of subjects to rulers, and of one Christian to another. Puciłowski expands the importance of *fides*, incorporates it into different contexts, and explores it from various sides. It can be seen that on his politics course he devotes a great deal of attention not so much to theoretical deliberation, but to didactic, practical deliberation, that is, to education in virtue, which was the aim of those who attempted to ensure the stability of the state. So the professor is politically engaged with respect to the virtue he decided to teach. (Neither Modzelewski nor Papius concentrated on one particular virtue.)

It is quite clear now that the various activities that Jesuit professors had to perform influenced each other. Even though it is hard to tell whether Puciłowski modelled his concept of *fides* before, during, or after the creation of *Victoria Mariae*, it cannot be denied that it affected the professor's views on contemporary politics: what transformed into a theoretical discussion was presented to his students to consider as appropriate subject matter for higher education, academic, and philosophical thought.

Nonetheless, it should be admitted that it did not exhaust all interpretative possibilities concerning both the course and the play. The views of contemporary fellow citizens on the governance of the commonwealth remain to be compared with those of Puciłowski; a comparison is possible between the opinions of Puciłowski and of other Jesuits and political writers who taught and wrote at that time in different countries. The consideration could be raised whether it follows the methods applied in teaching natural philosophy and metaphysics. By this, the originality or uniqueness of the professor could be demonstrated. As for the play, an interesting study would emerge if it was compared not only with contemporary literature or works on the same theme, but with other plays representing events from the point of view of the defeated enemy, for example, Aeschylus' *Persians*.

MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

Institutiones politicae, Bibliotekej Jagiellońskiej Oficina Rękopisów (BJ OR), 1973, f. 90–112.

Archives of the Lithuanian Jesuit Province (Lietuvos jėzuitų provincijos archyvas), f. 149, ap. 13, b. 2-6 (The manuscript file of Paulius Rabikauskas on persons of the Lithuanian Jesuit Province – Pauliaus Rabikausko rankraštinė Lietuvos jėzuitų provincijos asmenų kartoteka).

Tractatus Politicus duabus suis partibus [...], Manuscript Division of Vilnius University Library (Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekos Rankraščių skyrius – VUB RS), F3-1390.

PUBLISHED SOURCES

BIEZANOWSKI STANISLAUS JOSEPHUS, *Oriens Byzantinus* [...], Crocovie: Typis Universitatis, 1683.

CHREPTOWITZ MICHAELIS, *Maiestas Sarmatiae* [...], Vilnae: Typis Soc. Jesu, 1688.

Dowód rocznego postępu [...] w szkołach Akademii Wileńskiej dany. Roku 1780. Dnia 24. Lipca [Wilno: Drukarnia Akademicka, 1783], VUB RS, IV 23113.

[PUČIŁOWSKI KRZYSZTOF], *Victoria Mariae seu Vienna Austriae Intra octavam natae Virginis Deiparae ab obsidione Liberata Cuius argumentum desumitur ex Literis Serenissimi Ioannis III Regis Poloniae ad Serenissimam Consortem suam sub Vienna in Tentoriis Veziri, datis 13 Septembris 1683 A Perillustri, Magnifica atque Praenobili Iuventute Rhetorica in Alma Academia Vilnensi Societatis Iesu, Ludis antecinerilibus in scenam producta 1684 12 Februarij*, [2] pages, signing A²; 4^o, shelf number MNK 17-11169-I.

Ratio atque institutio studiorum societatis Iesu superiorum permissu, Torunii: apud Claudium Michaellem Typographum Universitatis, 1603.

The Jesuit Ratio studiorum of 1599, translated into English, with an Introduction and Explanatory Notes by Allan P. Farrell, Washington: Conference of Major Superiors of Jesuits, 1970.

LITERATURE

BAILEY GAUVIN ALEXANDER, “‘Le style jésuite n’existe pas’: Jesuit Corporate Culture and the Visual Arts”, in: *The Jesuits. Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts 1540–1773*, edited by John W. O’Malley SJ [et al.], Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000, p. 38–89.

BERLIN ISAIAH, ‘The sense of reality’, in: *The sense of reality: studies in ideas and their history*, edited by Henry Hardy, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1997, p. 1–53.

BOREK PIOTR, ‘Jan III Sobieski pod wiedniem w literackim świadectwie epoki (rekonstrans)’, in: *Prace Historyczne*, 146/2019, Issue No 2, p. 449–459.

CZARNIECKA ANNA, *Nikt nie słucha mnie na życia... Jan III Sobieski w walce z opozycyjną propagandą (1684–1696)*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Neriton, 2009.

DAUKŠIENĖ ONA, *Motiejaus Kazimiero Sarbievijaus religinė poezija*, doctoral thesis, Vilnius: Vilnius University, 2014.

- DILYTĖ DALIA, 'Alberto Vijūko-Kojalavičiaus Lietuvos istorijos kalbos', in: *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, 2009, vol. 27, p. 77–136.
- Encyklopedia wiedzy o jezuitach na ziemiach Polski i Litwy 1564-1995*, opracował Ludwik Grzebień SJ, Kraków: Wyższa Szkoła Filozoficzno-Pedagogiczna Ignatium / WAM, 1996. Website: <https://www.jezuici.krakow.pl/cgi-bin/rjbo?b=enc&q=PUCILOWSKI&f=1>.
- FELDHAY RIVKA, 'The Cultural Field of Jesuit Science', in: *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts 1540-1773*, p. 107–130.
- HÖLTGEN KARL JOSEPH, 'Henry Hawkins: A Jesuit Writer and Emblematist in Stuart England', in: *The Jesuits. Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts 1540-1773*, p. 600–626.
- KENNEDY T. FRANK, SJ, 'Candide and a Boat', in: *The Jesuits. Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts 1540-1773*, p. 317–332.
- MARIANI ANDREA, 'Aktyvność jezuickich kapelanów nadwornych prowincji litewskiej. Między ustawodawstwem zakonnym a praktyką', in: *Rocznik lituanistyczny*, 1 (2015), p. 37–82.
- MILEWSKA-WĄŻBIŃSKA BARBARA, 'The Attitude towards the Turks in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth under the Reign of Jan III Sobieski', in: *Nordic Journal of Renaissance Studies*, 2019, vol. 16, p. 215–229.
- NEDZINSKAITĖ ŽIVILĖ, 'Eilės Jono Sobieskio garbei: figūrinės poezijos galimybės XVII amžiuje', in: *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, 2015, vol. 40, p. 177–200.
- NEDZINSKAITĖ ŽIVILĖ, 'M. K. Sarbievijaus *De acuto et arguto* sklaida ir interpretacijos XVII–XVIII amžiaus rankraštiniuose mokykliniuose poetikos ir retorikos kursuose', in: *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, 23 (2007), vol. 23, p. 43–80.
- NELLES PAUL, 'Libros de Papel, Libri Bianchi, Libri Papyracei. Note-Taking Techniques and the Role of Student Notebooks in the Early Jesuit Colleges', in: *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, 2007, vol. 76, p. 75–112.
- OKÓN JAN, *Dramat i teatr szkolny. Sceny jezuickie XVII wieku*, Wrocław [et al.]: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1970.
- PLEČKAITIS ROMANAS, *Lietuvos filosofijos istorija*, vol. 1, Vilnius: Kultūros, filosofijos ir meno institutas, 2004.
- PUCHOWSKI KAZIMIERZ, 'The Relief of Vienna in the Jesuit Theatre in Poland', in: *Вісник Прикарпатського університету. Педагогіка*, 2011, т. 39, p. 21–27.
- ROSS ANDREW C., 'Alessandro Valignano: The Jesuits and the Culture in the East', in: *The Jesuits. Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts 1540-1773*, p. 337–351.
- ULČINAITĖ EUGENIJA, 'Įvadas', in: *Lietuvos jėzuitų teatras: XVI–XVII amžiaus dramų rinktinė*, Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2008.
- ZABORSKAITĖ VANDA, *Prie Lietuvos teatro ištakų*, Vilnius: Mokslas, 1981.

Jėzuito Kristupo Puciłowskio (1650–1707) *fides principas* valstybės politikoje

S a n t r a u k a

Straipsnyje dėmesys sutelkiamas į Kristupą Puciłowską – Vilniaus universiteto retorikos ir filosofijos profesorių – kol kas nei plačiai žinomą lituanistikos tyrimų baruose, nei sulaukusių dėmesio tiek iš filologų, tiek iš filosofų, nors jo veiklos pėdsakai pasiekė ir mūsų laikus. Tai dramos *Marijos pergalė* (1684) programa ir jo 1691–1692 m. skaityto etikos kurso dalies – *Praelectiones politicae* – studentiški užrašai. Abu šiuos šaltinius sieja vienas bendras vardiklis – Jėzaus Draugijos narių veikla tuometinių politinių realijų kontekste, mat pirmasis skirtas pažymėti svarbiam Abiejų Tautų Respublikos, apskritai krikščioniškojo pasaulio politiniui įvykiui – Jono Sobieskio pergalei prieš turkus prie Vienos, o antrasis – tai paskaitų ciklas, kuriame dėstoma apie krikščioniškos valstybės valdymą, vertybes, tikslus. Todėl iš šių šaltinių – iš pirmojo ne tiek tiesiogiai, kiek iš antrojo – bandoma rekonstruoti tobulos ar bent siektinos visuomenės modelį.

Šiam tikslui analizuojami ne tik Puciłowskio kūriniai, bet ir su jais lyginami kiti panašios tematikos ir paskirties kūriniai. Visų pirma, tyrimas pradamas nuo politikos paskaitų aptarimo į jį įtraukiant dar du paskaitų ciklus: *Institutiones politicae*, dėstytos profesoriaus Papijaus 1618 m. Viurtsburge, bei *Praelectiones politicae*, skaitytos Zacharijo Modzelewskio 1690 m. Vilniaus universitete. Iš šios tyrimo dalies daromos išvados, kad nebuvo bendro ir nusištovėjusio koncepto, kas yra politikos disciplina *per se* ir ko iš jos turėtų išmokti studentai. Puciłowskio atveju matyti, kad profesoriui politikos paskaitos buvo erdvė svarstyti apie bendras valstybių problemas, o ypač – valstybės išsaugojimą ir taikos joje palaikymą. Vienintelis būdas tam užtikrinti – *fides principas*, t. y. piliečiai turi ne tik būti vieno tikėjimo, bet ir vieni kitais pasitikėti, nelaužyti duoto pažado.

Antrojoje tyrimo dalyje analizuojama drama pasitelkiant būtent šį *fides principą*, t. y. kaip jo nebuvimas tarp piliečių ir tarp valdovų veda į neišvengiamą tragediją politinių įvykių arenoje. Osmanų imperijos atstovai nesilaiko nusistovėjusių tradicijų, laužo priesaikas, rengia klastas, dėl to netenka artimųjų, pralaimi mūšį, žūsta. Visiškai kitokia situacija vaizduojama kitoje kariuomenėje, kur *fides* padeda išlikti vieningiems bei įveikti priešą. Šių šaltinių analizė atskleidžia jeigu ne originalias, tai bent individualias Puciłowskio pažiūras į to meto socialines ir politines realijas: religijos vaidmenį valstybės valdyme, kita-

tikių padėtį valstybėje, būdus užtikrinti taiką. Dėl to jėzuitų politinę mintį galima traktuoti ne tik kaip atspindinčią epochos bruožus, bet ir kaip sąmoningai juos kontempliuojančią.

REIKŠMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: politinė mintis; Kristupas Pucilovskis; *Praelectiones politicae*; *Victoria Mariae*; *fides*; jėzuitai; neolotyniškoji XVII amžiaus literatūra.