



Banishment, Exile and Opposition: Jesuit Crises before the 1760s

S A B I N A P A V O N E

Università di Macerata
sabina.pavone@unimc.it

Abstract: This paper focuses on the different cases of expulsions and persecutions that the Society of Jesus faced before its suppression in 1773. The goal is to reconstruct in a global perspective a phenomenon starting from an ideological dimension (such as anti-Jesuitism) but subsequently spanning - depending on the context in which it manifests itself - the social, political and economic sphere, and not just the religious one.

Keywords: Jesuits, Exile, Expulsion, Suppression, Europe, Asia, New World, Anti-Jesuitism.

Expulsão, Exílio e Oposição: crises jesuítas antes da década de 1760

Resumo: Este artigo identifica os vários casos de expulsão e de perseguição que a Companhia de Jesus enfrentou antes da sua supressão em 1773. Pretende-se reconstruir em termos globais a amplitude de um fenómeno que tem uma base ideológica, que é o anti jesuitismo, mas que, de acordo com os diferentes contextos em que se manifesta, toca não apenas a esfera religiosa, mas também a política, a social e a económica.

Palavras-chave: Jesuítas, Exílio, Expulsão, Supressão, Europa, Ásia, Novo Mundo, Anti jesuitismo.

The 1773 Jesuit Suppression and the preceding national assaults on the Society of Jesus represented the greatest crisis in the history of one of the Catholic world's most influential religious orders. The goal of this paper is to place these events in context by analysing some of the many earlier crises endured by the Society. In what follows, I analyse the different typologies of crisis from the Society's foundation up to the 1760s, highlighting both continuities and discontinuities. A fundamental question thus arises: should we see the 1773 Jesuit Suppression as the culmination of longstanding trends and hostilities, or was it a unique event defined by contingent political and cultural circumstances? Perhaps the truth lies somewhere between these two propositions. Anti-Jesuitism was a long lasting phenomenon connected with the global character of the Society of Jesus. Moreover, it explains why Jesuits were expelled not only from Europe but also from many other non-European countries. The Jesuits had their own peculiar vision of "universal empire": it went against not only the more properly political empires – obviously enough, in the light of the emergent Westphalian system of nation-states and its consequences in the colonial context – but also and especially from the middle of the seventeenth century, with other ideologies of "religious empire" within the same Catholic spiritual universe¹. In this sense the suppression of 1773 resulted not only from the hostility of the Bourbon monarchies but also from the enmity of a part of the Roman Curia, especially the increasingly hostile Jansenist party, a traditional opponent of the Jesuits².

Harro Höpfl has written that "the Society of Jesus recognized from its inception that an engagement with the world of secular rulers was inescapable"³. This was certainly true in the England of Elizabeth I. Thomas McCoog identifies the Throckmorton Plot of 1583/84 as "the first of a number of conspiracies involving Spain, real, imagined, fabricated or manipulated"⁴ with which the Jesuits were, rightly or wrongly, associated. The cultural mood was clearly against the Society at the time, as witnessed by a contemporary act of Parliament: it asserted that "not only did Jesuits deny the spiritual authority of the queen but also that they recognized the authority of a foreign prince, the pope, engaged in conspiracies against her"⁵. By

1 See Sabina Pavone – *The History of Anti-Jesuitism: National and Global Dimensions*. In Tom Banchoff, José Casanova – *The Jesuits and Globalization. Historical Legacies and Contemporary Challenge*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press; p. 111-130.

2 See Catherine Maire – *Des comptes-rendus des constitutions jésuites à la Constitution civile du clergé*. In Pierre-Antoine Fabre, Catherine Maire (eds.) – *Les Antijésuites. Discours, figures et lieux de l'antijésuitisme à l'époque moderne*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2010, p. 401-428; Mario Rosa – *Jésuitisme et antijésuitisme dans l'Italie du XVIIIe siècle*. In *Les Antijésuites ...*, p. 587-619.

3 Harro Höpfl – *Jesuit Political Thought: The Society of Jesus and the State, c. 1540-1630*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2004, p. 1. See also Sabina Pavone – *The Wily Jesuits and the Monita Secreta: The Forged Secret instructions of the Jesuits. Myth and Reality*. St. Louis, MO: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2005.

4 Thomas McCoog – *The Society of Jesus in Ireland, Scotland, and England, 1589-1597: Building the Faith of Saint Peter upon the King of Spain's Monarchy*. Aldershot: Ashgate; Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2012, p. 6.

5 *Ibidem*.

any standard, life as a Jesuit in Elizabethan England was difficult. Beginning with the missions of Edmund Campion and Robert Persons, priests were obliged to foster secretive networks; they frequently travelled in disguise, and found themselves subject to a raft of legislation targeting them⁶. The catalogue of arrest, torture and martyrdom is well known. Many Jesuits were arrested in England beginning with Edmund Campion, arrested as a spy and imprisoned in the Tower of London in 1581 on a charge of conspiracy. Having refused to accept the Elizabethan Settlement, Campion was hanged, drawn and quartered for high treason together with the Fathers Ralph Sherwin and Alexander Briant. Later, William Weston was imprisoned between 1586 and 1603. In 1605, the Gunpowder Plot was considered to have been orchestrated by some Jesuits, including Henry Garnet, Edward Oldcorne and Ralph Ashley; the latter two were condemned to death in 1606. The following year, Father Nicolas Owen died in prison. They all became martyrs of the Society of Jesus⁷. What happened in England is clear evidence of the perennial conflict between the Jesuits and the secular authorities, shown also by the dispute between James I and Robert Bellarmine after the Gunpowder Plot regarding the correct use of confession. Henry Garnet was considered guilty of not having exposed the conspiracy, knowledge of which he had from confession. Officially the position taken was that the internal forum was exempt from human law and this way of proceeding evidently created for the Jesuits problems of a political nature that would increase more and more during the eighteenth century, culminating in the Portuguese trial of Gabriel Malagrida, charged with heresy, but also with conspiratorial high treason.

On the other hand, life in Catholic nations carried its own risks. In France, for instance, many Jesuits were involved in the Catholic League during the Wars of Religion, and were thereby accused of being Spanish agents⁸. In March 1594 an instruction from Superior General Claudio Acquaviva instructed French Jesuits to avoid “any oath of allegiance to Henry as long as he was under sentence of excommunication out of deference to the Holy See”⁹. In December of that year an attempt upon the king’s life by Jean Chastel (a former student of the Jesuit College of

6 See Ronnie Po-cha Hsia – *From Buddhist Garb to literati Silk: Costume and Identity of the Jesuit Missionary*. In José Pedro Paiva (ed.) – *Religious ceremonies and images: power and social meaning (1400-1750)*. Coimbra: Centro de História da Sociedade e da Cultura/Palimage Editores, 2002, p. 143-154; Thomas McCoog. – *Dressing for Success: Jesuit Attire on the English Mission*. In Thomas McCoog. – *“And Touching Our Society”: Fashioning Jesuit Identity in Elizabethan England*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2013, p. 227-260; Sabina Pavone – Spie, mandarini, bramini: i gesuiti e i loro travestimenti. *Il capitale culturale. Studies on the Value of Cultural Heritage*. 7 (2013) 227-247: <http://riviste.unimc.it/index.php/cap-cult/article/view/685/460>.

7 On martyrs in general see Brad S. Gregory – *Salvation at Stake. Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2001. On Jesuit martyrs in China see Anthony E. Clark – *China’s Saints: Catholic Martyrdom During the Qing (1644-1911)*. Bethlehem: Lehigh University Press, 2011.

8 See Antoine Arnauld – *Plaidoyé de Monsieur Antoine Arnauld*. The Hague, 1594.

9 Thomas McCoog – *The Society of Jesus in Ireland, Scotland, and England...*, p. 205. Regarding the expulsion from France see Eric Nelson – *The Jesuits and the Monarchy. Catholic Reform and Political Authority in France (1590-1615)*. Aldershot: Ashgate; Rome: Institutum Historicum-Societatis Iesu, 2005.

Clermont¹⁰) inspired the Parlement of Paris to expel the Jesuits: they were to leave the city within three days, and the regions under the Paris Parlement's jurisdiction, within fifteen days. The only regions in which Jesuits survived were those of Bordeaux and Toulouse where local Parlements refused to expel them.

Like many other rulers, Henry IV resented Jesuit interference in the kingdom's political life, but some years later he determined that it would be better to have Jesuits among his friends rather than among his foes. In 1602 he wrote a letter to James I of England in which he explained his reasons for considering the re-admittance of the Society to his realm:

"I also considered that by leaving the Jesuits some hope of being recalled and re-established in my kingdom, I would divert and hinder them from giving themselves entirely to the ambitious wishes of the king of Spain. In this I know I have not been mistaken [...]. Having gained this point over them, I desired to limit and control their power and functions in my realm in order to be served and obeyed in the future without reserve. I left them only the liberty and faculty of serving me now that their self-will has gone. I want this to prevail now as a good regulation which is being well observed: they will be unable, when they wish, to serve said king of Spain and not even the pope with prejudice to me"¹¹.

In 1603 Henry IV "desirous of satisfying the prayer which our Holy Father the Pope has made for our sake" ("*desirans satisfaire à la prière qui nous a esté faite par notre saint père le Pape*")¹² decided to re-establish the Jesuits in France. The resulting edict, signed by the Parlement of Paris on January 2, 1604, set a series of limits on Jesuit activity and stressed that the Jesuits were only being allowed to return because of the king's clemency. Jesuits now had to seek the king's permission to open colleges and houses, their local provincials would have to be French subjects, and all French members of the Society were to pledge loyalty to the monarchy. They were also expected to come under the scrutiny and supervision of the episcopal hierarchy. Henry's strategy was to forge direct links between the Society of Jesus and the state; from this perspective, it made good sense for the king's confessor to be a Jesuit. After the murder of Henry IV by Ravaillac, however, the Jesuits were once more accused

10 See Robert Descimon – Chastel's Attempted Regicide (27 December 1594) and its Subsequent Transformation into an "Affaire". In *Politics and Religion in Early Bourbon France*. Eds. Alison Forrestal, Eric Nelson. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009, p. 86-104; David Buisseret – *Henry IV*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1984, p. 56-68.

11 Quoted in George Minois – *Le confesseur du roi. Les directeurs de conscience sous la monarchie française*. Paris: Fayard, 1988, p. 330.

12 See the *Articles du rétablissement et rappel des Jésuites en France, en l'an 1603. Avec l'Arret contre-eux rendu par la cour le 23 Decembre 1611* (Paris: par François du Carroy, 1612), p. 3. See also David Buisseret – *Henry IV: King of France*. London: Routledge, 1992, p. 121-125.

of promoting regicidal theory¹³, of building “a state inside the state”, of being Spanish spies, and of being papal agents intent on undermining the privileges of the Gallican Church¹⁴.

As shown by Eric Nelson, however, Jesuits became one of the lynchpins of seventeenth-century French Catholic renewal. They were not, for instance, the primary focus of the polemical literature during the General Estates of 1614¹⁵. The *cahiers* submitted by the three Estates “show that the delegates were concerned to define and regulate the Society’s presence in France rather than reject it”, but he continues, “by 1614, the Society’s efforts to accommodate the demands of their Gallican critics had weakened their image as a duplicitous foreign order dedicated to the destruction of the French state and French society”¹⁶. Nevertheless, all the *pamphlets* written during the first twenty-five years of Bourbon rule were used in 1761 by the Parliament and by the detractors of the Society of Jesus to demonstrate that Jesuits had long been enemies of France¹⁷. After the Wars of Religion and the Society’s support of the League the question took on a political significance and innumerable pamphlets against the Jesuits were published at the end of the sixteenth century and later¹⁸. The most famous of these pamphlets was the *Catéchisme des Jésuites* written by Etienne Pasquier, perhaps the most representative of French anti-Jesuitism on the Gallican model. The pamphlet was published anonymously in 1602 when Henry IV was preparing to recall the Jesuits in France and the aim of Pasquier was to unmask the political role assumed by the Society in Europe. The first theme of the pamphlet was the Jesuits’ ambiguity as a religious order: neither regular nor secular they did not live in monasteries and did not want to be called monks. But at

13 Juan de Mariana’s *De Rege* was condemned by the *parlement* of Paris, see *Arrest de la Cour de Parlement, ensemble la censure de la Sorbonne contre le livre de Jean Mariana, Intitulé De Rege et Rege Institutione* (1610).

14 *Anti-lesuite au Roy* (Samur 1611) p. 15, 18-19. At p. 93, the pamphlet ends with a sonnet which sums up French anti-Jesuitism in this period: “Enfin race Encotonnée [the Jesuit Pierre Coton was Henry IV’s confessor]/ Vous triomphés de votre proie,/ Ce grand Roy qui fut notre ioye/Par sa mort nous rend estonnée:/ Car vous persiste ce mystere/ Par Chastel, Ravaillac, Barriere./ Trois monstres instruits autrefois/ En vos confessions damnables,/ Rendants les François miserables/ Ont massacré la fleur des Roys:/ Et votre troupe conjurée/ Du cœur fait encore sa curée./ Allez, barbares Mamelus, Preschez ceste belle victoire,/Changeant vos trois cloux emoulus,/ En trois cousteaux à pointe noire:/ Pour marquer vos trois assassins/Le nombre de trois vous soit saint”. (p. 93). See also *Advertissement pour les Universitéz de France, contre le lesuites. Au Roy, et a Nosseigneurs de son Conseil*. Paris: 1624, where the universities ask the king not to allow the Jesuit colleges to call themselves “universities”, and *Arrest du Conseil privé du Roy, pour les Universités de France jointes en cause*. Paris: chez J. Bessin, 1625, where the rights of the universities are pleaded.

15 See Appendix: Pamphlet Literature 1614-1615. In Eric Nelson – *The Jesuits and the Monarchy...*, p. 245-248.

16 Eric Nelson, *The Jesuits and the Monarchy...*, p. 239. Nelson’s thesis is that “the Society established its presence in post-League France through a new relationship with the French monarchy that was first defined when Henri [IV] chose to make the Society’s rehabilitation a central issue in his campaign to reassert and redefine royal authority following the collapse of the Catholic League” (p. 241).

17 See for example le *Compte rendu des Constitutions des Jésuites* de Louis-René de Caradeuc de la Chalotais, Procureur Général du Roi au Parlement de Bretagne. See Catherine Maire – *Des comptes-rendus des constitutions jésuites...*, p. 401-428.

18 The Thoisy Collection in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France contains a very large number of works against the Society of Jesus. See in particular Thoisy 475, 476, 479.

the same time they enjoyed all the privileges of a religious order increased by their dependence on the Pope (particularly criticized by the Gallican church). This charge was always used against the Society of Jesus, in addition to the others charge listed by Pasquier: the thirst for riches, the use of confession to take in sovereigns and widows, a propensity for conspiracies, an “international” outlook that lead to charges of being “too little French”, duplicity, and political opportunism. Maybe for the first time the *Catéchisme* associated the name of Machiavelli with the Jesuits and insisted on the mingling of the temporal sphere with the spiritual within Jesuit ideology¹⁹.

The charge of being spies for the Spanish kingdom was evoked also in the Low Countries and in the Republic of Venice. In the Low Countries (Tournai and Leuven in particular) the Jesuits were expelled in 1578 for their loyalty to Philip II of Spain and in 1584 they were accused of being involved in the murder of William the Silent, by telling Balthasar Gérard (the murderer) the assassination would gain him the status of a martyr. It was a charge repeated in France some years later after the assassination of Henri IV by Ravailac. The Jesuits were not directly responsible for these assassinations, but it is true that some Jesuit theologians such as Francisco Suárez, Juan de Mariana and Manuel de Sá allowed in determined crisis for the possibility of resorting to regicide. When in the eighteenth century the Bourbon monarchies began their campaign against the Jesuits, they frequently cited regicide as one of the most dangerous pieces of Jesuit ideology²⁰.

The Flanders province was re-established in 1592 after the death of Alessandro Farnese. The so-called *Missio Hollandica* began in October, when two fathers, Cornelys Duyst and Willem de Leeuw, moved from the Southern to the Northern Netherlands²¹. In 1597 Jesuits were prohibited from entering Holland and, in 1616, they were concentrated in what might be described as “reserves”. During the seventeenth century a number of Jesuits met unfortunate ends. For example, Derick van Riswick died in a Nijmegen prison in 1625 and three other Jesuits were condemned to death in Maastricht in 1638. Although exiled definitively from Holland in 1708, before this date “[t]he Jesuits gradually became citizens of the

19 See Etienne Pasquier – *Le catéchisme des jésuites ou examen de leur doctrine*. Ed. critique par Claude Sutto. Québec, Université de Sherbrooke, 1982, p. 132, where it is said that the Jesuits have “something of the fox and something of the lion [...] worthy disciples of Machiavelli”.

20 See for exemple *Delle cose del Portogallo e della Francia rapporto ai padri gesuiti e loro espulsione perpetua da questi regni*. Vol. VII. Lugano, 1765.

21 Gerrit Vanden Bosch – *Saving Souls in the Dutch Vineyard: The Missio Hollandica of the Jesuits (1592-1708)*. In Rob Faesen, Leo Kenis (eds.) – *The Jesuits of the Low Countries: identity and Impact (1540-1773)*. Leuven, Paris, and-Walpole MA: Peeters, 2012, p. 139-151. See also Charles H. Parker – *Faith on the Margins: Catholics and Catholicism in the Dutch Golden Age*. Cambridge MA-London: Harvard University Press, 2008, p. 155-156, where he stress the role of the Catholic gentry as protectors of regular priests in the countryside. See also Sabina Pavone – Spie, mandarini, bramini...

multi-confessional society of the Dutch Republic”²² and “while legislation against the Jesuits was severe, the application of such laws was rather mild”²³.

Harro Höpfl stresses that “the British Jesuits in exile had no reservation at all about explicitly political publications, even if not a few were anonymous. [And] Belgium was the publishing and distribution center of the *Missio Anglicana*”²⁴. On only one occasion, as Höpfl summarizes, when Belgian Jesuits were suspected of involvement in a plot, the Leiden magistrates claimed “that they had foiled a Jesuit-inspired assassination attempt on Maurice of Nassau by a certain Peeter (de) Panne.” Höpfl continues, noting that this event “elicited Coster’s *Sica Tragica* [.: *comiti Mauritio a Iesuiti ut aiunt Calvinistæ Leidæ intentata*] ([Antuerpiæ, I. Trognæsius] 1599), a response so swift and decisive that it virtually eliminated the episode from the anti-Jesuit canon”²⁵. In the United Provinces more caution was required: As Höpfl writes, “captured Jesuits, once the *Missio Hollandica* provided them in any numbers after about 1610, were usually ransomed or expelled, and those who sheltered them suffered pecuniary penalties. There was therefore every reason for a low profile, including a Jesuit low profile”²⁶.

Anti-Jesuitism also played an important role in Italy, especially in the Republic of Venice. During the 1590s a dispute arose between Cesare Cremonini²⁷, professor at the University of Padua, and the local college of the Jesuits²⁸. The Venetian Senate issued a decree forbidding the Society from competing with the university²⁹. With

22 Vanden Bosch – *Saving Souls in the Dutch Vineyard*..., p. 148.

23 *Ibidem*. By the same author, see also *L’image des jésuites dans la République des Provinces-Unies au Siècle d’or: Cinquième colonne ou mythe entretenu?*. In *Les Antijésuites*..., p. 429-454. Willem Frijhoff has called of “interconfessional conviviality” See Willem Frijhoff – *The Threshold of Toleration: Interconfessional Conviviality in Hollande during the Early Modern Period*. In Willem Frijhoff – *Embodied Belief: Ten Essays on Religious Culture in Dutch History*. Hilversum: Verloren, 2002, p. 39-65.

24 Harro Höpfl – *The Political Thought of the Jesuits in the Low Countries until 1630*. In Rob Faesen, Leo Kenis (eds.) – *The Jesuits of the Low Countries*..., p. 46. Höpfl continues saying that “By contrast, their Belgian Jesuit hosts were distinctive in their very limited participation in the Society’s international polemics” (*ibidem*.)

25 Harro Höpfl – *The Political Thought of the Jesuits in the Low Countries*..., p. 54.

26 Harro Höpfl – *The Political Thought of the Jesuits in the Low Countries*..., p. 60. See M. G. Spiertz – *Pratique pastorale dans la Mission Hollandaise: Les Jésuites dans la république des Sept Provinces*. In Eddy Put et al. (eds.) – *Les Jésuites dans les Pays-Bas et la Principauté de Liège*. Brussels: Archives générales du Royaume, 1991, p. 87-88.

27 *Oratione dell’Ecc. Dottore Cesare Cremonino da Cento recitata nell’Ecc.mo Collegio di Venezia a favore dell’università dello Studio di Padova contra li Rev. Pri Gesuiti, l’anno 1591, l’Antiviglija di Natale*, now in Cesare Cremonini, *Le orazioni*, a cura di Antonino Poppi. Padova: Editrice Antenore, 1998, p. 59-69.

28 The Jesuits responded to Cremonini’s *Oratione* with two different pamphlets: *Risposta dei PP. Gesuiti di Padova nella causa mossa contro di loro dalla Università di quella città; Risposta apologetica di Eufemio Filarete all’invettiva del Cremonino*. The last one is written by Antonio Possevino. The two pamphlets – without date and city – are in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan, ms D. 463 Inf.

29 See Eduard Muir – *The Culture Wars of the Late Renaissance: Skeptics, Libertines, and Opera*. Cambridge MA, London: Harvard University Press, 2007, at chapter one, p. 15-57; see also John P. Donnelly – *The Jesuit College at Padua: Growth, Suppression, Attempts at Restoration, 1552-1606*. *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*. 51 (1982) 45-78 (particularly 50-57); Maurizio Sangalli – *Cultura, politica e religione nella repubblica di Venezia tra Cinque e Seicento: Gesuiti e Somaschi a Venezia*. In *Istituto veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti. Memorie: Classe di scienze morali, lettere ed arti*. 84 (1999) 187-276; William J. Bouwsma – *Venice and the Political Education of Europe*, in William J. Bouwsma (ed.) – *A Usable Past: Essays in European Cultural History*. Berkeley: University of California, 1990, p. 266-291.

the interdict affair of 1606 the conflict passed to a political level. Jesuits played a leading role in the so-called “battle of the books”. Figures involved included Robert Bellarmine, Antonio Possevino (who wrote under various pseudonyms), and Paolo Comitoli. Adriano Prosperi observed that the Society of Jesus was no more resistant to lay power than the other religious orders, but “a legend of a Society destined to endure”³⁰ weighed against it, making the Jesuits the natural target for the defenders of the Republic’s liberty, with Paolo Sarpi in the vanguard. Sarpi thought that the Society of Jesus was dangerous because it acted on a political and social plane. According to him, the Jesuits intended to intervene actively in the exercise of power and this was what most worried the supporters of the “lay” state. Sarpi most feared the Jesuits for their role as confessors:

“They have made [confession] so frequent and so detailed that some of their devotees spend more time with their confessor than in the service of God and the conduct of their own affairs [...]. The Society, desiring to aggrandize the order through confessions, to draw profit, and to derive pleasures, ordered confessors to foster the penitents’ feelings and to foment all those views which could render confession more acceptable and more suitable to the fruits the Jesuits have in mind. [...] We have seen how, at the cost of our neighbours, this method easily raises up an entire kingdom against its natural ruler. They bind each one with secret oaths, no matter what his station, be it clerical, military, or civil. They form a league strong enough not only to do away with the state, but even their very lives.”³¹

In Sarpi’s words, the Society of Jesus was a kind of secret society – a myth that would blossom during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. At the end of this “battle of the books” the Jesuits were banished from Venice and only allowed to return in 1656³²: during this half a century the Venetian Accademia degli Incogniti (founded in 1627 by Giovan Francesco Loredano) strengthened the image of the Jesuit’s lax morality and penchant for espionage through books written by Ferrante Pallavicino³³

30 Adriano Prosperi – “L’altro coltello”. Libelli de lite di parte romana. In Mario Zanardi (ed.) – *I gesuiti e Venezia: momenti e problemi di storia veneziana della Compagnia di Gesù: atti del Convegno di studi, Venezia, 2-5 ottobre 1990*. [Venezia]-Padova: Giunta regionale del Veneto-Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1994, p. 287. See [Roberto Bellarmine] – *Risposta del card. Bellarmino al Trattato dei sette Theologi di Venezia, sopra l’Interdetto della Santità del nostro Signore Papa Paolo V et dell’opposizioni di F. Paolo Servita, contra la prima scrittura dell’istesso cardinale*. Rome: C. Facciotto, 1606. Paolo Comitoli – *Trattato apologetico del Monitorio della Santità di N. Sig. Papa Paolo V*. Bologna: G.B. Bellagamba, 1606.

31 Paolo Sarpi – *Opere*. Gaetano and Luisa Cozzi (eds.). Milano: Ricciardi, 1979 [reissued 1997], p. 306-308.

32 See Gaetano Cozzi – *La Compagnia di Gesù a Venezia (1550-1659)*. In *Venezia barocca. Conflitti di uomini e idee nella crisi del Seicento veneziano*. Venice: Il Cardo, 1995, p. 289-323.

33 [Ferrante Pallavicino] – *La retorica delle puttane*. Villafranca: G. Gibaldo, 1642; [Ferrante Pallavicino], *Il corriere svaligiato*. Villafranca: G. Gibaldo, 1644. A syntetic but very good biography of Ferrante Pallavicino is written by Mario Infelise in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 80, 2014, online: [www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/ferrante-pallavicino_\(Dizionario_Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/ferrante-pallavicino_(Dizionario_Biografico)/) See also Jean-Pierre Cavallé – *L’antijésuitisme dans le milieu de l’Académie des Incogniti à Venise (1630-1650)*. In *Les Antijésuites...*, p. 291-304.

and by Gregorio Leti.³⁴ The most notorious accusation against the morality of the fathers was published by Blaise Pascal with his *Lettres provinciales*. For Pascal, the detested casuistry, popularised by the Jesuits and supposedly expressed through a lax attitude toward their penitents, had a highly detrimental effect on the society of the age. As a theological doctrine it was considered, from the rigorous Jansenist position, to be aberrant and was immortalized in the caricature of the Jesuit hypocrite, ready to betray for his own advantage an opinion expressed moments before.

Venice remained one of the most important centres of anti-Jesuitism throughout the eighteenth century: many of the polemical pamphlets written during the period of expulsion from the Bourbon monarchies were published there by the printmaker Saverio Bettinelli, who republished and translated also the *Monita Secreta*. In this context, Sarpi was invoked as one of those who understood in advance the real danger of the Society of Jesus and its role in the Counter-Reformation Church.

In 1606 the Jesuits were also expelled from Transylvania amid rumours of their supposed involvement in the “false Dmitri” affair. A presumed son of Tsar Ivan IV appeared in Poland and laid claim to the Muscovite throne³⁵. The Polish Jesuits, in the hopes of extending the Catholic faith into the troubled but recently extensive Russian Empire, supported the royal identity of the pretender and followed him into Russia. The Jesuits were not the only ones to support Dmitri, but they and the pope were considered chiefly responsible for the whole adventure. As shown by a series of letters written between Rome and the Jesuits in Poland, the Father G. Sawicki was the first Jesuit who met Dmitri in Krakow and the false tsar forswore the orthodox faith at Sawicki’s hands. Possevino thought that Dmitri was “a providential instrument to bring peace among the Slavs and to push the war against the Turkish” and to propagate the Catholic faith³⁶ but, once again, the Jesuit strategy was perceived as a way to interfere in state affairs. In the words of a Dutch report written after the murder of the false Dmitri, “These assassins of princes were too much in a hurry to create a monarch and they invaded the beehive too soon”³⁷. In France the politician

34 See also [Gregorio Leti] – Lettera nella quale si fa vedere che nell’arte della spia non deve ingerirsi nessuno, per esser questo officio appartenente a’ soli Gesuiti, expertissimi e destrissimi in tal esercizio. In [Gregorio Leti] – *Il Vaticano Langente dopo la morte di Clemente X*. Genova: published at the request of friends, 1677.

35 The story is well reconstructed by Yves-Marie Bercé – *Le roi caché. Sauvers et imposteurs. Mythes politiques dans l’Europe moderne*. Paris: Arthème Fayard, 1990, especially in chapter 2. Bercé, speaking of the *hidden king*, linked the Jesuits also to Sebastian I of Portugal when he wrote that the Jesuits were accused of having influenced the king to undertake an expedition against Morocco with the secret hope that the expedition’s failure would lead to the union of the Spanish and Portuguese crowns, but then they were linked with the Sebastianists’ cause anyway.

36 Antonio Possevino – *Per aiutare la Moscovia*. In Paul Pierling – *La Russie et le Saint Siège*. Paris: 1901; reprint The Hague: Europe printing, 1967, t. III, App. 2, p. 445-448.

37 *La Légende de la vie et de la mort de Demetrius, dernier gran-duc de Moscovie*. Amsterdam: [No publisher], 1606, p. 309, quoted in Yves-Marie Bercé – *Le roi caché. Sauvers et imposteurs...*, p. 343. In Russia the negative perception of the Jesuit involvement in the affair was clearly shown in the Pushkin drama *Boris Godunov*, written in 1825, and set to music by Modest Mussorgsky in 1869 (his masterpiece).

and historian Auguste de Thou accused the Jesuits of having supported an impostor such as Dmitri³⁸; in Venice a forged letter attributed to a Pole, Stanislas Przewski, and addressed to Antonio Possevino, after having spoken about Dmitri also accused them of having impelled Sebastian I of Portugal to the disastrous expedition against Morocco where the king lost his life³⁹. The French historian Yves-Marie Bercé in his book on the *hidden king* linked these two affairs as typical of Jesuit involvement in politics throughout Europe⁴⁰.

The Jesuits later returned to Russia during the reign of Peter I when they opened a new mission in Moscow (1684) directed for a short period by Fathers Jean David and Albert de Boye and then (1686) by Father Jiri David. Hereafter, together with their brother Tobias Tichavsky, they were accused by the tsar of excessive proselyting and expelled in 1689 (the same charge brought against the Jesuits in 1820 when they were expelled by Tsar Alexander I). Two other Jesuits returned in 1698 following the Emperor's emissary Orazio Cristoforo de' Guarienti but again, in 1719, they were banished from the Russian empire, this time because of the rivalry between the tsar and the Austrian empire following the affair of the Tsarevich Alexei, the son of Peter the Great, who escaped to Austria and was later condemned to death by his father for high treason⁴¹.

In East-Central Europe, many crises arose at the educational level because of the different pedagogical perspectives adopted by the Jesuit colleges. The problem was particularly acute in those countries that had established a Calvinistic Church: in Transylvania the Jesuits were expelled first in 1588 because their academy was perceived as dangerous for the community; they came back for a short period between 1598 and 1605 when they were banished once again for religious and educational reasons. In 1623 a particularly bitter feud emerged between the Society of Jesus and the Krakow Academy, during which the Jesuits were accused of building colleges with the sole motive of economic profit; it lasted until 1634 and was only resolved when the Congregation of the Index stepped in as intermediary⁴². Something similar happened in Prague between 1622 and 1654. Competition between the Charles University (*Universitas Carolina*) and the Society was inspired

38 Jacques Auguste de Thou – *Histoire Universelle*. The Hague: 1740, t. 10, p. 46-73. De Thou began to write his book in 1593 in Latin with the title *Historiae sui temporis*, which was condemned by the Holy Office in 1609. The first edition in French was published in 1734.

39 *Condoglianza di Stanislao Przewski Lublinese Studente in Padova col padre Antonio Possevino (without date and city)*. A copy of this pamphlet is in the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana of Venice, *Rari Veneti* 314.

40 Yves-Marie Bercé – *Le roi caché. Sauvers et imposteurs...*

41 See Sabina Pavone – *Una strana alleanza La Compagnia di Gesù in Russia dal 1772 al 1820*. Napoli: Bibliopolis, 2008 [but 2010].

42 See *Censura in responsionem Cracoviensium ad protestationem Jesuitarum. Nec non supplicatio pro prohibitionem eiusdem responsionis*, in Archivio della Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede, *Index., Protoc.* B2, cc. 327-348; *Decretum ordinum regni Poloniae adversus Jesuitas pro Academia Cracoviensi*, Warsaw, 4 March 1626, in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, *Dupuy Collection*, 74, ff. 214-215.

by the famous archbishop Ernst Adalbert von Harrach (1598-1667) and – as stressed recently by Alessandro Catalano – derived from the secular state regarding itself as solely responsible for education⁴³. The Society was once more perceived as an unwelcome rival not only by the archbishop but also by other religious orders such as the Dominicans and Capuchins. In Prague, one of the most eager enemies of the Jesuits was the Capuchin Valeriano Magni who wrote a series of pamphlets against the political and pedagogical role of the Society of Jesus. The context was that of the Thirty Years War in which – as shown by Robert Bireley⁴⁴ – the Jesuits suffered because of their political support of the Holy Roman Empire. They were expelled from Paderborn in 1632 (returning in 1643) and from Heidelberg in 1649 (returning in 1686).

Throughout the seventeenth century the Society of Jesus was perceived by some as a secret society. This perception often raised its head in the world of day-to-day Christian devotion. The Jesuit Marian congregations are a case in point⁴⁵. They were implicated, rightly or wrongly, in popular revolts in Naples (1647), Antwerp (1659), and Cologne (1680)⁴⁶. The literary aspect of the anti-Jesuit campaign was also significant. Books such as the *Monita Secreta Societatis Iesu* (published anonymously in Warsaw in 1614 by the ex-Jesuit Hieronymus Zahorowski⁴⁷) contributed to the growth of this black legend, and the impact of such books would still be felt during the crises of the eighteenth century. Many pamphlets written both before and after the Jesuits' expulsion from the Bourbon kingdoms returned to stock images developed during the seventeenth century. Even after the Restoration in 1814, the editor's preface to an Italian translation of the *Monita* could claim that "all secret societies, whatever their purpose may be, ought, if they wish to succeed, to take the Jesuits as a model and to hide their designs, as the Society does, with a prudent, but necessary hypocrisy"⁴⁸.

The Society of Jesus also endured crises beyond Europe. The most famous example is the Rites controversy which began in the middle of the seventeenth

43 See Alessandro Catalano – *Un'altra guerra durata trent'anni: la Compagnia di Gesù e l'università di Praga*. In José Martínez-Millán, Henar Pizarro Llorente, Esther Jiménez Pablo (coord.) – *Los jesuitas: Religión, política y educación (siglos XVI-XVIII)*. Madrid: Universidad Pontificia Comillas, 2012, p. 252.

44 Robert Bireley – *The Jesuits and the Thirty Years War: Kings, Courts, and Confessors*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

45 See Louis Châtellier – *The Europe of the Devout: The Catholic Reformation and the Formation of a New Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989; ed. or.: Flammarion: Paris, 1987, p. 175, in which he examines the myth of the Marian congregations in France transmitted by Molière's *Tartuffe*, and Pascal's *Lettres Provinciales*, and concluded of the Society that it was "a power's organisation with branches everywhere all round the world, and freely developed without being submitted to the king's authority".

46 Louis Châtellier – *The Europe of the Devout...*, p. 131-133.

47 See Sabina Pavone – *The Willy Jesuits and the Monita Secreta...*

48 *Istruzioni segrete della Compagnia di Gesù con importanti aggiunte*. Roma: tipografia della Propaganda, 1814 [?].

century and lasted until the papal condemnations of Chinese rites (1742) and Malabar rites (1744).

Before the Rites controversy, the Society of Jesus had been banished from Japan. This was connected to a series of anti-Christian edicts: the first edict, the so-called Bateren Expulsion Edict (*Bateren Tsuhio-rei*)⁴⁹, was signed by Toyotomi Hideyoshi on 25 July 1587 and forbade the great landed magnates known as the daimyo from becoming Christians; members of the Jesuit mission were thereafter expelled. Kawamura Shinzo has argued that the edict cannot be explained “simply as a whim or sudden act of vengeance on the part of Hideyoshi”⁵⁰. It was part of a larger project to unify the nation. In this situation, Christian communities could not be tolerated. In any event, only a few Jesuits were forced to leave Japan; others continued a covert existence⁵¹.

In 1597, a new edict was signed and the infamous persecution of Christians in Nagasaki ensued. After Hideyoshi's death there was a brief period of calm before new persecutions began in Suo-Nagato (1603), Amakusa and Bungo (1604), Satsuma (1606), and Buzen (1611). In 1614, after the persecution of Christians in Kyoto, a new proscription to banish Christians from Japan was issued by the restorer of the shogunate, Tokugawa Ieyasu (signed by Tokugawa Hidetada, Ieyasu's successor)⁵². This event was part of a broader strategy that led to the wholesale expulsion of the Portuguese from Japan in 1639. The last Jesuit died in Japan in 1644, and the Society would not return until 1908.

In Indonesia, as in other colonial contexts, the Jesuit presence was connected with the Portuguese “enterprise”⁵³. Jesuits were in Ternate from 1547 until 1575, when the death of the sultan Hairun, murdered by a Portuguese, led to the missionaries' expulsion. They built new missions in Amboina and Tidore but soon found themselves expelled even from here in 1605 when the two local fortresses were conquered by the Dutch. Jesuits returned in the following year after the Spanish re-conquest of the islands.

Jesuits in other parts of the Portuguese empire encountered similar difficulties, and the legacy of these events would play a significant role in debates about the Society during the eighteenth century. Brazil is the prime example. In Salvador, a decree

49 For an extensive interpretation of the edict “not only in regards to Christianity, but also in terms of understanding Hideyoshi's political philosophy” (p. 153 of the book quoted), see Kawamura Shinzō – *Communities, Christendom, and a Unified Regime in Early Modern Japan*. In Antoni Üçerler (ed.) – *Christianity and Cultures: Japan and China in Comparison (1543-1644)*. Roma: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2009, p. 151-168.

50 Kawamura Shinzō – *Communities, Christendom...*, p. 161.

51 Quoted in Yamamoto Hirofumi – *The Edo Shogunate's View of Christianity in the Seventeenth Century*. In *Christianity and Cultures...*, p. 256.

52 Yamamoto Hirofumi – *The Edo Shogunate's View of Christianity...*, p. 255-268.

53 See Dauril Alden – *The Making of an Enterprise: the Society of Jesus in Portugal, its Empire, and beyond, 1540-1750*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1996.

(July 30, 1609) demanding freedom for the indigenous population⁵⁴ was regarded by some as a Jesuit initiative. Although some asked for the Society's banishment ("fora dos jesuítas"), the government succeeded in averting the expulsion. A new crisis arose in 1640 when the *paulistas'* violence against the *reducciones* in the Rio Grande do Sul inspired the Jesuits to ask Madrid and Rome for a condemnation of the *paulistas'* behaviour. The local reaction was strong, and the seven towns of the *Capitania* expelled the Jesuits. An interdict against this act was produced by the Sacred Congregation of the Council (Rome, 3 June 1651), but the Franciscans and Carmelites refused to enforce it. In the end, the Jesuits did not return to Sao Paulo until 1653.

In this crisis, António Vieira emerged as the defender not only of indigenous freedoms but also of the new Christians. The new mission in Maranhão directed by Vieira encountered similar problems to those in the *Capitania*, and there were calls for the Jesuits' expulsion in 1653. Nevertheless, the Jesuits managed to stay in Maranhão until 1661; in that year, though, yet another revolt occurred and, after an attack on the Jesuit College, the fathers were accused of being defenders of the indigenous people. Accordingly, they were banished from the *aldeias*⁵⁵. A pamphlet in twenty-five chapters (*Representation of Jorge de Sampaio e Carvalho against the Fathers of the Society of Jesus in which are developed the motives the people had to expel them from Maranhão*) explained the crimes of the Society⁵⁶.

In 1663 a new law allowed the return of the Jesuits, with the exception of Vieira. And again a law published in 1680, inspired by the same Vieira, returned the *aldeias* to the Jesuits. This law produced another revolt and, as a consequence, a new banishment of the Jesuits that lasted until 1685.

There are few better examples of how earlier events influenced the anti-Jesuit campaigns of the eighteenth century. As Maurice Whitehead explained, the first suppression of the Society, in Portugal, was greatly influenced by developments in

54 "The Jesuits and slavery" is a new and interesting topic for the history of the Society of Jesus in the New World. See Carlos A. de Moura Ribeiro Zeron – *Ligne de foi: la Compagnie de Jésus et l'esclavage. Brésil, XVIIe-XVIIIe siècles*. Paris: Honoré Champion et Classiques Garnier, 2009.

55 Serafim Leite – *Historia da Companhia de Jesus no Brasil*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 2004, vol. IV, p. 21-3.

56 *Representação de Jorge de Sampaio e Carvalho contra os Padres da Companhia de Jesus, expondo os motivos que teve o povo para os expulsar do Maranhão*, quoted in B. de Studard – *Documentos para a história do Brasil e especialmente a do Ceará*. Fortaleza: Studard, Minerva, 1921, vol. IV, p. 109-117. Vieira replied to that pamphlet with his *Resposta do P. António Vieira aos Capítulos que deu contra os Religiosos da Companhia (em 1662) o procurador do Maranhão Jorge de Sampaio*. In Alexandre José de Melo Moraes – *Corographia historica, Chronographica, Genealogica, Nobiliaria e Politica do Imperio do Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Typ. Americana, 1858-1863), vol. IV, p. 186-253. Between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries there were also national controversies inside the Brazilian province: in 1663 the *visitatore* Giacinto De Magistris was deposed, and in 1696 Vieira was deprived of his active and passive voice by the provincial authorities. Around 1700, the Italian Jesuits of the Bahia College were violently expelled (cf. Ronnie Po-chia Hsia – Jesuit Foreign Missions: A Historiographical Essay. *Journal of Jesuit Studies*. 1:1 (2014) 56).

South America⁵⁷. Memories were long, and when new problems arose, supposedly as a result of Jesuit machinations, the defamatory pamphlets that had been written against the Jesuits and Vieira in the seventeenth century were once more pressed into service.

More generally, the many examples of Jesuit crises before the climactic mid-eighteenth century played a crucial role in the assault on the Society that culminated in its global suppression in 1773. The consistency of themes is striking⁵⁸.

The missionary strategy adopted by the Jesuits⁵⁹ was independent from that of Propaganda Fide and the *querelle des rites* in China as well as in India⁶⁰ showed very well how critics within the Church accused the Jesuits of using a cunning strategy of relativist “accommodation” that compromised the universalism of Christianity. This Eurocentric perspective prevailed within the Church and the best of the Jesuit transnational “way of proceeding” was not accepted by the Roman Curia. In this sense, the rites controversy was a turning point in the battle that would lead to the suppression of the Society of Jesus in 1773 when its transnational perspective collided both with the Westphalian system of nation-states and with the Roman Church.

The bibliography on the rites controversy is now very rich⁶¹ and it is not the aim of this paper to reconstruct the history of the *querelle des rites*. It is important, though, to stress how the different positions inside the Roman Curia influenced the final decision of Pope Clement XIV to abolish the order. From the middle of the seventeenth century, two Roman congregations – Propaganda Fide and the Holy

57 Maurice Whitehead – *On the Road to Suppression: The Jesuits and Their Expulsion from the Reductions of Paraguay*. In Jeffrey D. Burson, Jonathan Wright (eds.) – *The Jesuit Suppression in Global Context: Causes, Events, and Consequence*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2015, p. 83-99.

58 Guillermo Wilde – *Religion y poder en las misiones de Guaraníes*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Sb, 2009, p. 157-181; *Saberes de la conversión: Jesuitas, indígenas e imperios coloniales en la frontera de la cristiandad*. Compilación, introducción y edición por Guillermo Wilde. Buenos Aires: Editorial Sb, 2012.

59 On this topic there is much new research. See at least the discussion of recent historiography in Ronnie Po-cha Hsia – Jesuit Foreign Missions: A Historiographical Essay. *Journal of Jesuit Studies*. 1:1 (2014) 47-65; the thematic issue *Jesuit Missionary Perspectives and Strategies across the Early Modern Globe*, Bronwen Catherine McShea (ed.), *Journal of Jesuit Studies*. 1:2 (2014); Charlotte de Castelneau-L'Estoire, Marie-Lucie Copète, Aliocha Maldavsky, Ines Zupanov – *Missions d'évangélisation et circulation des savoirs. XVIe-XVIIIe siècle*. Madrid: Colección Casa de Velázquez, 2011; Michela Catto, Guido Mongini, Silvia Mostaccio (eds.) – *Evangelizzazione e Globalizzazione: Le missioni gesuitiche nell'età moderna tra storia e storiografia*. Roma: Società editrice Dante Alighieri, 2010; Adone Agnolin, Carlos A. de Moura Ribeiro Zeron, Maria Cristina Cortez Wissenbach, Marina de Mello e Sousa (eds.) – *Contextos misionários: religião e poder no Império português*. São Paulo: Hucitec-Fapesp, 2011.

60 Recent research has stressed the question of rites in both the East Asian and American contexts. See for example Pierre-Antoine Fabre, Ines G. Zupanov (eds.) – *The Rites Controversy in the Early Modern World*. Boston; Leiden: Brill, in press.

61 On Malabar Rites see Domenico Ferrolí – *The Jesuits in Malabar*. 2 vol., Bangalore 1939 e 1951; Ines G. Zupanov – *Disputed Mission, Jesuit Experiments and Brahmanical Knowledge in Seventeenth-century India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999; on Chinese Rites see at least David E. Mungello (ed.) – *The Chinese Rites Controversy: Its History and Meaning*. Nettetal, Steyler, 1994; Claudia von Collani – Inventory and Classification of the Most Important Documents Concerning the Chinese Rites Controversy. In Martin Woesler (ed.) – *Recht und Gerechtigkeit in China. Festschrift zum 75. Geburtstag von Konrad Wegmann*. Beiträge des Symposiums vom 8. Dezember 2007 an der Hochschule für Angewandte Sprachen, SDI München. Berlin, München: Europäischer Universitätsverlag, Munich University Press, 2007; Nicolas Standaert – *Chinese Voices in the Rites Controversy: The Mondialisation of a Local Problem 1701-04*. Roma: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2012.

Office – battled against the missionary model of the Society of Jesus. The crisis changes its orientation: from a political plane it moves on to a religious one. It was not a mere (or, not only) question of a religious order playing an autonomous role inside the State (accused of promoting plots and regicide), but it was the distinction between orthodoxy and heterodoxy that came to be called into question. At the end of the eighteenth century the Society of Jesus was a polysemous target for political, cultural and religious reasons and it was much easier to suppress it in 1773 after having destroyed its role in the missionary sphere.

In the final suppression of the Society of Jesus, political and religious reasons were directly connected. The Society of Jesus was often perceived as “a state in a state” and for this reason considered very dangerous by early modern states as the history of Jesuit exiles and banishments detailed in this article tries to show. Nevertheless, we can’t explain the suppression as a result of the weakness of the Roman Church at the end of the eighteenth century. This is certainly true, but it is also true that there was a big party inside the Roman Curia unfavourable to the Jesuits. It was connected with the Jansenist party inside the Curia and influenced by the debates inside the Congregation of the Holy Office concerning the rites controversy. In these documents, we can see that in the years before the expulsion from the Bourbon kingdoms Jesuits were considered disobedient, and that some even suggested abolishing the order in case it rejected the Roman decisions concerning the rites. Only if we consider all these elements together can we understand why in 1773 Pope Clement XIV decided to suppress the Society of Jesus⁶².

62 Sabina Pavone – *Inquisizione romana e riti malabarici: una controversia*. In *A dieci anni dall'apertura dell'Archivio della Congregazione per la dottrina della fede: Storia e Archivi dell'Inquisizione (Roma 21-23 febbraio 2008)*. [Atti dei Convegni Lincei 260], Scienze e Lettere. Roma: Accademia dei Lincei, 2011, p. 159.