

Orsolya Báthory

WORKS OF PÉTER PÁZMÁNY IN LATIN

The only collected edition of Péter Pázmány's works in Latin is the six-volume *Petri Cardinalis Pázmány Opera Omnia*, published between 1894 and 1904.¹ The series contains the manuscript and printed writings known and available at the end of the 19th century, which are attributed with sufficient certainty to Pázmány. These were notes and publications used in the teaching of philosophy and theology at university level; religious, political and religious-political treatises; writings on liturgy and church organisation. However, the *oeuvre* published in *Opera Omnia* is not complete; for one reason or another several writings have been omitted, and these are briefly described in the following review of Pázmány's works in Latin.

After completing his studies in Rome, the Jesuit Pázmány lectured in philosophy at the University of Graz, also run by the Society of Jesus, after being awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy on 26 October 1597. The course in philosophy with the Jesuits lasted three years. The first was logic, the second physics (natural philosophy) and the third metaphysics.² The course was based on the books of Aristotle, which the students read in Greek, and the teacher explained them in the lectures according to the method laid down by the Jesuit order of study, the *Ratio Studiorum*.³ Pázmány taught philosophy to his students from November 1597 to September 1600, and some of his lecture notes have been preserved

¹ PPOO I–VI.

² PÁZMÁNY 1983, 16.

³ ÖRY 1970, 79.

in manuscript form in the collection of the Budapest University Library (references A 6, A 7).⁴ The manuscripts include autograph notes, which Pázmány himself donated to the University of Nagyszombat, and copies. The material is incomplete: it lacks commentaries on Aristotle's treatise on the soul (*De animo*) and on the complete course on metaphysics. The manuscripts, entitled *Dialectica* and *Physica* (obviously with the appropriate additions), were intended by Pázmány to be published as printed textbooks for the prospective students of the University of Nagyszombat (Trnava), which he founded in 1635.⁵ The notes were published in the first three volumes of *Opera Omnia* (1894, 1895, 1897). In the first volume, the notes for the course in logic given by Pázmány were published under the original title *Dialectica* (the humanistic name for logic) by István Bognár.⁶ The notes published in Volumes 2 and 3 were also published under the title given in the manuscript, *Physica*.⁷ The *Dialectica* contains commentaries on Porphyry's *Isagoge* and parts of Aristotle's *Organon* (*Categories*, *On Interpretation*, *Analitica Prior/Prior Analytics* and *Analitica Posterior/Posterior Analytics*). The *Physica*, divided into two volumes, is a collection of commentaries on Aristotle's works on natural philosophy (*Physics*, *On the Heaven*, *On Generation and Corruption*, *Meteorology*). The six thesis booklets that Pázmány compiled for his students as examination material are also among the Latin-language writings relating to the philosophy courses at Graz.⁸ In essence, Pázmány's lecture notes give a scholastic philosophy of the Jesuits, which, being sufficiently open to other philosophical systems and schools, is generally characterised by a peculiar eclecticism. This eclecticism is also reflected in the great diversity of the authors cited by Pázmány, who, for example, used, in addition to the most important Jesuit commentators (Francisco de Toledo, Pedro da Fonseca, Benedict Pereira, Francisco

⁴ PÁZMÁNY 1983, 22.

⁵ PPOO I, Prologus, XIX. Pázmány's philosophical views and methodology are discussed in GERENCSÉR 1937; FÉLEGYHÁZY 1937; BLUM 2012, 51–65.

⁶ BLUM 2012, 62.

⁷ PPOO, I–III.

⁸ Duplicate editions of the theses are available in BLUM 2003.

Suárez), also modern Averroist and Renaissance philosophers (Giovanni Giacomo Pavese, Agostino Nifo, Jacopo Zabarella, etc.).⁹

During his second stay in Graz, Pázmány taught theology at the university for four years (1603–1607). In his courses, he presented the so-called “scholastic theology” (*Theologia Scholastica*),¹⁰ i.e. he commented on certain *quaestiones* (questions) of St. Thomas Aquinas’ *Summa Theologiae* according to the Jesuit order.¹¹ The notes also survive in the Budapest University Library (reference A 33), and this too may have been intended by Pázmány as a textbook for the University of Nagyszombat. The material is divided into three types of manuscript: Pázmány’s own handwritten writings; student notes based on dictation; and copies prepared for printing and completed and corrected by the elder Pázmány.¹² The editors, Béla Breznay and Dezső Bitá, compiled a coherent text from the three manuscript bases, which was published under the title *Theologia Scholastica* in the last three volumes of the *Opera Omnia* (1899, 1901, 1904). From the point of view of content, the notes show that the commentary on the first part of the Summa (*Prima pars* [First Part]; I) is completely missing. Pázmány wrote commentaries on selected *quaestiones* from the first part (*Prima Secundae* [First Part of the Second Part]; I–II) and the second part (*Secunda Secundae* [Second Part of the Second Part]; II–II) of the second part, as well as from the third part (*Tertia pars* [Third Part]). The commentaries were prepared as separate treatises (*tractatus*) and formed the material for the oral lectures.¹³

Also in the notes of the *Theologia Scholastica*, wedged between explanations of two *quaestiones*, we find Pázmány’s only independent work

⁹ For a list of the authorities used by Pázmány, see FÉLEGYHÁZY 1937, 219–222; GERENCSÉR 1937, 60–68; ROKAY 2013.

¹⁰ LUKÁCS–SZABÓ 1987, 16.

¹¹ LUKÁCS–SZABÓ 1987, 19.

¹² LUKÁCS–SZABÓ 1987, 16–17.

¹³ Such treatises with separate titles for the lectures are for example *De Peccatis* [On Mistakes]; *De Spe* [On Hope]; *De Charitate* [On Charity] etc. The lectures *De Iustitia et Iure* [On Justice and Right] and *De incarnatione Verbi* [On Incarnation of the Verb] were also published separately by Miklós Öry, supplemented with the so-called Götzweig manuscript. ÖRY 1984; LUKÁCS–SZABÓ 1987, 17–18.

of political theory, entitled *De ecclesiastica libertate circa causam Veneti interdicti*.¹⁴ The work, which remains in manuscript, was published once in print, in volume IV of the *Opera Omnia*.¹⁵ The editor Béla Breznay published the work following the manuscript order after the commentary on the quaestion of *Summa* II–II, XXXIII, with a *parergon* (appendix) on the inside title page. The reason for writing this short treatise in 1606 was the conflict between the papal authority and the Venetian Republic. In the early 1600s, the Venetian government had enacted or renewed laws that were detrimental to the interests of the papacy, as its authority over Venice was fundamentally challenged.¹⁶ Pope Paul V placed the city under *interdictum* (ecclesiastical interdict) in April 1606. The majority of the Venetian clergy, accepting the arguments of the Republic, did not obey the interdict, but three orders (the Jesuits, the Capuchins and the Theatines) supported the interdict. As a result, they were expelled from Venice. After the interdict had been issued, Pázmány drafted a document reflecting the official (papal and Jesuit) position and refuting the legitimacy of the Venetian laws.¹⁷

It was also during his second stay in Graz, in 1605, that Pázmány published his first religious treatise in Latin, the *Diatriba theologica de visibili Christi in terris Ecclesia*.¹⁸ Theological polemics was a treatise in the form of a theological treatise, a so-called *libellus*, for a university debate. In it, Pázmány refuted a 1599 work by the English Puritan theologian William Whitaker, which in turn criticized the Jesuit controversialist Roberto Bellarmino's conception of ecclesiology.¹⁹ The rhetorical structure of the *Diatriba* is based on the quotation and collision of sentences from the opposing sides (Whitaker and Bellarmino), and thus contains an extraordinary number of quotations and marginal notes.²⁰ No publication of the work is found in *Opera Omnia*, although

¹⁴ In manuscript: A 33, 327–336. HARGITTAY 2006, 105–112; HARGITTAY 2009, 153–160.

¹⁵ PPOO V, 789–808.

¹⁶ HARGITTAY 2006, 105; HARGITTAY 2009, 153.

¹⁷ HARGITTAY 2006, 106; HARGITTAY 2009, 154.

¹⁸ Facsimile edition of PÁZMÁNY 1605/1975.

¹⁹ WHITAKER 1599.

²⁰ BITSKEY 2015, 41.

the biography at the beginning of the first volume lists it as a work by Pázmány.²¹ The reason for this omission was presumably that the scholars who have studied the *Diatriba* (Vilmos Fraknói, Árpád Hellebrant, Rajmond Rapaics) did not unanimously attribute the work to Pázmány, since the title page of the publication does not mention his name as the author, but as *praeses*, that is, as the president of the examinations. In a paper written before the facsimile edition of the work, Miklós Öry argued convincingly for Pázmány's authorship.²² His arguments are mainly of a substantive and stylistic nature. The Latin of the treatise shows a rhetorical intensity typical of Hungarian works. According to Miklós Öry, the manuscript of the work was already completed by 1602, so the *Diatriba* can be regarded as Pázmány's first work in which the rhetoric that would later become his trademark, is already evident in its "full armoury".

From 1602, Pázmány worked as a theological advisor to Ferenc Forgách (1560–1615), Bishop of Nyitra (Nitra). He also began his political career with Forgách, Archbishop and Cardinal of Esztergom from 1607, although his success was due to the fact that he took a position opposed to that of the Primate on the methods of the Catholic Restoration.²³ In the autumn of 1608, Pázmány attracted the attention of the participants of the Diet in Pressburg and the Habsburg government with two Latin-language letters.²⁴ A few months earlier, Archduke Matthias, as the designated king, had asked several theologians for their opinions on the question of whether Protestants should be allowed to practice their religion freely in preparation for the royal Diet.²⁵ The Estates had made the enactment of the Peace of Vienna of 1606, with its first article guaranteeing the free exercise of religion, a condition for being crowned king.²⁶ In a short memoir, Pázmány wrote about the arguments for and against the free exercise of religion.²⁷ His reflections were

²¹ PPOO I, Vita Petri Cardinalis Pázmány, VI.

²² PÁZMÁNY 1605/1975, 12–21.

²³ BENDA 1978, 227–228.

²⁴ PÁZMÁNY 1983, 35.

²⁵ BENDA 1978, 228.

²⁶ ACSÁDY 1897, 639

²⁷ PPÖL I, 26–29.

based on *realpolitik*, in so far as he considered it more expedient to make concessions in the prevailing situation.

Also on the basis of the Peace of Vienna, the same Diet of 1608 planned to deprive the Jesuits of their possessions and order their exile. It was at this time that Pázmány wrote his petition defending the interests of the Society of Jesus, mainly addressed to the Catholic nobles and magnates, which appeared in 20th century editions under the title *Libellus apologeticus Petri Pazmani pro Societate Iesu Hungarica, ad proceres regni Hungariae*.²⁸ In his argument, Pázmány invoked the very article of the Peace of Vienna, which guaranteed religious freedom, and demanded that the decrees against the Jesuit order be changed, since they guaranteed Protestants the free exercise of their religion “without prejudice to the Catholic religion”.²⁹

Also related to the 1608 Diet is Pázmány’s Latin-language welcome speech, with which Bálint Lépes, represented by Cardinal Forgách, greeted Archduke Matthias on his arrival at the king-electing and coronation Diet.³⁰ The speech is in keeping with the traditional idea of apostolic kingship and with Pázmány’s views on the free exercise of religion as expressed in his *Memorandum on the Free Exercise of Religion*. According to this, the future King Matthias II should also excel in the spread of “vera religio” (true religion) and “verus cultus” (true worship), thus serving the glory of God.³¹

Pázmány’s speech, written in classical Latin, is not the only official document he edited on Forgách’s behalf. He is also probably the author of the archbishop’s protest against the synod of the Lutherans of ten „Cis-Danubian” counties which met in March 1610 in Zsolna and its decisions. The Lutherans, under the patronage of the Primate, György Thurzó, did not leave the Primate’s resolution unchallenged. Their brief, clearly worded response, the *Apologia*, resulted in a minor pamphlet battle in which Pázmány came up with two unusual Latin-language writings.³² The *Peniculus Papporum* and *Logi alogi* are, according to Sándor Sík, “two

²⁸ PPOO VI, 189–193; PPÖL I, 22–26.

²⁹ BENDA 1978, 228.

³⁰ PPÖL I, 29–35.

³¹ PÁZMÁNY 1983, 37.

³² PÁZMÁNY 1610/1611, PPOO VI, 197–271; PÁZMÁNY 1612, PPOO VI, 287–468, PÁZMÁNY 1613, App., 1–118.

of Pázmány's most enigmatic works".³³ Published under the pseudonym of Johannes Jemicus, the Latin, which cannot be called classical, is rather demanding, complicated and difficult to understand; the style is excessively rhetorical, the tone is often coarse and even obscene. Alongside the reasoned argumentation, the work often contains mannerist digressions (*egressus*, *digressio*), which seek to impress the reader with surprising sensory effects, strange associations and startling images. The pamphlet *Anonymi sycophantae glomeratae criminationes*, published as an appendix to *Peniculus papporum*, which refutes the anti-papal mockery of an unknown buckwheat preacher, is also characterised by a highly mocking and obscene tone.³⁴

Pázmány's pamphlets of a political nature written during the civil war (1619–1621) led by the Prince of Transylvania Gábor Bethlen (1613–1629) are characterised by a much more simplified rhetoric and a Latinate style approaching the standard language. The Archbishop of Esztergom was forced to flee from Bethlen and his allies to Vienna, together with the bishop's staff. There he wrote a treatise entitled *Falsae originis motuum Hungaricorum succincta refutatio*, in which he refuted the grievances of the Protestant orders, collected and printed at the Diet of November 1619.³⁵ Although the subject matter was Hungarian, it was published first in Latin and later in German, and Pázmány eventually translated his own work into Hungarian.³⁶ He published it with the Latin text in 1620. The bilingual publication is interesting for us because a joint examination of the Latin and the Hungarian versions reveals how Pázmány understood his own Latin text.

Away from his diocese, Pázmány sought to influence matters affecting the Catholic Church as a prominent participant in court politics. As a confidential adviser to King Ferdinand II, he was probably the author and compiler of many official Latin-language treatises and documents.³⁷ From his forced emigration to Vienna, we know of two writings of hitherto

³³ SIK 1939, 410. For more on the works, see BÁTHORY 2018; BÁTHORY 2019a.

³⁴ PPOO VI, 272–286. The *Anonymi sycophantae glomeratae criminationes*, like the *Logi alogi*, was published as an appendix to the first edition of the *Kalauz*. PÁZMÁNY 1613, *Appendix*, 118–126.

³⁵ PÁZMÁNY 1619. On the work, KÁRMÁN 2019, 164–175.

³⁶ PÁZMÁNY 1620a, PPOO VI, 469–519.

³⁷ FRANKL 1868, 544.

unknown authorship which we can identify with a high degree of probability as the works of Pázmány. One is the anonymous discussion paper *Calvino-Praedificantium Ungarorum genius malus*, written in response to a pamphlet by Pázmány's main political and denominational opponent, the Calvinist Péter Alvinci, entitled *Machiavellizatio*.³⁸ The literature has rejected Pázmány's authorship in the absence of a more thorough examination, although there are many arguments, mainly based on its subject, in favour of it.³⁹ There are also content-related arguments, mostly parallels with other Pázmány writings, that the imperial decree issued after the fall of Bethlen's campaign, which annulled the decrees of the Diet of Besztercebánya (Banská Bystrica, June–August 1620) and the election of the reformed Gábor Bethlen as king, may also have been partly or partly the work of Pázmány.⁴⁰ The *Edictalis Cassatio* then served as a convenient legitimating background for Pázmány's final, politically motivated treatise, entitled *Vindiciae ecclesiasticae*.⁴¹ The work clearly held Bethlen and his party members responsible for the outbreak of the civil war, and argued convincingly that since the Diet of Besztercebánya (Banská Bystrica) was illegitimate, the decisions taken there could indeed be considered null and void.⁴²

Pázmány was able to return to his homeland in 1622, where he could finally work directly on church affairs. An important aspect of his efforts in church government was to conform to the ideals and decisions of the Council of Trent. In 1630, in order to unify the liturgy, he succeeded in persuading the Hungarian episcopate to abandon the most widespread version of the Roman rite in Hungary, the Esztergom rite. Before that (in 1625), however, he published the *Rituale Strigoniense*, which covered rituals other than the Mass and the canonical hours, which could be performed not only by the bishop.⁴³ To ensure transparent governance, Pázmány held an annual diocesan synod from 1629. The first of these was the Synod of Great Saturday

³⁸ PÁZMÁNY 1620b.

³⁹ ALMÁSI 2014, 116.

⁴⁰ About the editions of PÁZMÁNY 1620c: KÁRMÁN 2020, 171.

⁴¹ PÁZMÁNY 1620d, PPOO, 521–565.

⁴² For more on *Vindiciae*, see BÁTHORY 2019b, BÁTHORY 2019c.

⁴³ PÁZMÁNY 1625.

in 1629, which gave directives on, for example, the liturgy, apostolic activity and spiritual life. The minutes and decisions of the synod, with Pázmány as the author, were also published in Pozsony (Bratislava) (*Acta et decreta synodi dioecesis Strigoniensis* [...]).⁴⁴ The three appendices to the publication are an important source of Hungarian church history. In the first one, we find a description of the state of the diocese of Esztergom and a list of its parishes. The second appendix gives a list of the former monasteries in Hungary, and the third enumerates the archbishop's privileges.

Pázmány published one last Latin-language religious treatise, anonymously, in Pozsony (Bratislava) in 1631. However, *Dissertatio an unum aliquid ex omnibus Lutheranis dogmatibus Romanae Ecclesiae adversantibus Scriptura Sacra contineat* did not leave the press without precedent.⁴⁵ The *Dissertatio* was the fifth in a series of disputes between Pázmány and the Lutheran superintendent Jan Hodik of Trenčsén (Trenčín).⁴⁶ The dispute began when the Catholics sent a handwritten Latin-language discussion paper (*Thema papisticum provocatorium, anno 1630 die 23. Januarii transmissum*) to Trenčsén on 23 January 1630 with provocative intent.⁴⁷ To this, Hodik wrote a reply (*Consideratio [...] propositionis papisticae*),⁴⁸ to which Pázmány responded anonymously with his manuscript work *Breve responsum ad Considerationem*.⁴⁹ This was refuted by Hodik's *Hyperaspistes*, for which Pázmány then wrote the *Dissertatio*.⁵⁰ Surprisingly, however, unlike usual, Pázmány did not have the last word: as far as we know, Hodik closed the debate with his *Statera Dissertationis*.⁵¹ Thanks to Hodik, *Breve responsum ad Considerationem* was published in print in 1632, after the superintendent of Trenčsén had collected the entire course of the controversy in one volume, with the exception of the already printed *Dissertatio*.

⁴⁴ PÁZMÁNY 1629, PPOO VI, 567–671.

⁴⁵ PÁZMÁNY 1631; PPOO VI, 673–697; HELTAI 2005, 130.

⁴⁶ Hodik has published the complete series of debates, with the exception of Pázmány's *Dissertatio*. HODIK 1632.

⁴⁷ HODIK 1632, [11].

⁴⁸ HODIK 1632, 12–33.

⁴⁹ HODIK 1632, 34–40.

⁵⁰ HODIK 1632, 41–84.

⁵¹ HODIK 1632, 85–240.

Both the *Breve responsum* and the *Dissertatio* were written by Pázmány to persuade an unnamed young Hungarian nobleman, presumably Ádám Batthyány, who had been converted to Catholicism by him.⁵² The works, in a moderate tone, emphasising rational persuasion, address three general questions. Does Scripture teach that the Pope is not the head of the Church? Can we be convinced from Scripture that faith alone saves? Does the Word of God assure man of his own salvation?⁵³

The final piece of the last volume of the *Opera Omnia* is the *Cardinalis Pasmanni ad Pontificem Urbanum VIII Anno M. DC. XXXII Legati Caesarii Oratio*, i.e. the speech of Pázmány addressed to Pope Urban VIII, delivered in Rome on 6 April 1632.⁵⁴ The purpose of the journey to Rome was for Pázmány, as Emperor Ferdinand II's legate extraordinary, to inform the Pope of the situation of the Thirty Years' War, which threatened Catholicism as a whole, and to persuade him to join a later Catholic league and contribute to the costs of the war.⁵⁵ Pázmány wrote a detailed final report of his trip to Rome in the form of a letter, which appeared in several editions *Relatio legationis Romanae, quam obiit Card. Petrus Pázmány jussu Caesariae Majestatis apud Suam Sanctitatem anno 1632*.⁵⁶ More recently, Péter Tusor has drawn attention to the fact that Pázmány himself compiled the most important documents (notes, letters) of his legation for later publication in a volume.⁵⁷

At the end of the outline of the Latin works, we must also mention Pázmány's correspondence. This is justified by the fact that several of his writings of a non-missile epistolary nature – for example, his political petition and memoir of 1608, already mentioned, and his subsequent account of 1632 – were published in two volumes of his *Collected Letters*. A collection of letters written exclusively by Pázmány, intended to be complete, was published by Ferenc Hanuy in 1910–1911, preceded by the publication of parts of the correspondence by Jakab Ferdinand Miller and Vilmos

⁵² RMNy 1983, 517, no. 1512.

⁵³ FRANKL 1869, 423; SIK 1939, 422.

⁵⁴ PPOO VI, 699–710; PPÖL II, 256–261.

⁵⁵ BECKER–TUSOR 2019, 178–179.

⁵⁶ PPÖL II, 315–328.

⁵⁷ BECKER–TUSOR 2019, 306–308.

Fraknói⁵⁸ and several additional publications of letters. In the Hanuy edition, more than seventy percent of the letters were written in Latin, a proportion that reflects the prominence of the classical language in the period: in addition to being a language of scholarship, it was also the *lingua franca* of official and international communication.



⁵⁸ PPÖL I–II; MILLER 1822; FRANKL 1869, 187.