

NOTES CRITIQUES

Acta Poloniae Historica
25, 1972

Domenico Caccamo, *Eretici italiani in Moravia, Polonia, Transilvania (1558 - 1611). Studi e documenti*, G. C. Sansoni editore Firenze, The Newberry Library, Chicago 1970, 273 pages, Biblioteca del Corpus Reformatorum Italicorum.

The dramatic fortunes of the Italian religious exiles in the 16th century, and especially the history of their radical, left wing, have given rise to an ample literature, foremost among which is the classic work by Delio Cantimori, *Eretici italiani del Cinquecento*. But that work, still a fertile source of inspiration to present-day historians, devoted comparatively little attention to the Italian heretics in Central-Eastern Europe, and its treatment of the wane of this movement, in the eighties and nineties of the 16th century, is particularly brief.

Eretici italiani in Moravia, Polonia, Transilvania by Caccamo is in a sense a continuation of Cantimori's book, since it largely deals with the Italian religious emigration in the period of decline referred to above. Caccamo, did not attempt at giving the history of this group on a broad canvas — he has simply chose to outline some aspects only. This is not meant as a reproach. For as a matter of fact — although one might not expect so — the sources are so numerous, so scattered, and so heterogeneous, and our knowledge of them so scanty yet, that it would be extremely difficult to give a full account. This task, in my opinion, would have to be preceded by a whole series of detailed researches including monographic studies of various persons or problems, and by the editing of sources, etc. Another difficulty of no mean proportions is that towards the end of the 16th century, as a result of the growing orthodoxy in all organized churches, the heretic movement became an international movement *par excellence*. As a matter of fact this change was also reflected in the ideology of the movement, which now definitely veered towards universalist Utopianism.

These reservations, which are necessary to a fair assessment of Caccamo's labours, do not clash with the view that Caccamo is most at home when dealing with Poland. Indeed, it is about the doings of the Italian religious refugees in Poland that he has most to say. On the other hand, he has treated the Italian heretics in Transylvania extremely briefly, without drawing on the basic manuscript sources (such as *Historia ecclesiastica Unitariorum in Transilvania*,¹ or the writings of the Transylvanian Unitarians, an acquaintance with which is a *condicio sine qua non* for any comparative studies), or of the printed sources (for example

¹ On the authorship of this work, see A. St.-Ivanyi, *The "Historia" and its Authors*, New York 1966, The American Hungarian Library 3.

Documenta Romana historiae Societatis Iesu in regnis corona Hungarica unitis, of which three volumes have already appeared), or the abundant Hungarian literature on the subject.¹ As for Moravia, the conciseness of the author's account of the history of the Italian religious exiles there may be due to the fact that this is ground that had already been gone over by Urban¹ and to some extent by Stella. Probably — and rightly too, for that matter — Caccamo simply avoided to repeat the statements made by his predecessors, and on the whole — though not in every case — he has confined himself to summarizing their views (usually enriched by new views), or, alternatively, to presenting them in a different, and sometimes controversial, way.

In this review we shall come back more than once to the question of the use that Caccamo has made of the available sources and of the literature on the subject. Nevertheless one must stress the value of this book in being, as far as I know, the first Italian study of the heretic movement that has made skilful and critical use of Polish and Czechoslovak sources and literature (the only reservation here is that the author does not seem to have read the latest Polish works published within the last three years). I would even go so far as to hazard a guess that Caccamo's familiarity with the Polish literature on the subject has influenced to some extent his choice of method, and widened his general outlook of the problems involved. We have a hint of this, for instance, in his interest in what might be termed the sociology of the heretic movement, and in the links between social factors and theological opinions in the strict sense. He repeatedly tries, for instance, to bring out the connection between the heretics' social situation and their religious ideas.

The reader should be warned that this review will deal with Caccamo's conclusions, and will not go into minor questions of fact, which would take up too much space to discuss. On the other hand, from time to time I shall quote passages from other sources, to fill out what has been said by Caccamo, and supplement his arguments or offer a different interpretation.

The first study, on the rupture with Calvinist Orthodoxy and the abandonment of refuge in Switzerland (*La rottura con l'ortodossia calvinista e l'abbandono del rifugio svizzero*) acts as a general introduction to the subject. The author elucidates various questions arising out of the interpretation of the heretic movement in Italy. He gives a succinct account of the dispersal of the Italian religious refugees who had been living in Switzerland, and describes how the movement in Switzerland broke up because of doctrinal differences with the orthodox Calvinists, and how it ended in a mass exodus to Poland, Moravia, and Transylvania. At this juncture, Caccamo also discusses the religious and economic situation in these countries, and the growth of the Reformation movement there. Considering that all these problems — and only the most important have been mentioned here — are dealt with in hardly more than thirty pages, the author has naturally had to limit himself to a summary, almost textbook account, which nevertheless will perhaps be of aid to Italian historians, who are usually only marginally interested in the heretic

¹ Vide B. Keserü, W. Urban, *Stan badań nad heterodoksją węgierską* [Research on the Hungarian Heterodoxy], in: *Wokół dziejów i tradycji ar|an|izmu* [The History and Traditions of Artanism], ed. L. Szczucki, Warszawa 1971, pp. 29 - 42.

² The author seems to be unfamiliar with Urban's short but important dissertation on *Rola Moraw w rozwoju środkowoeuropejskiego antytrynitaryzmu* [The role of Moravia in the Development of Middle European Anti-Trinitarianism], in: *Z polskich dziejów slawistycznych* [Polish Slavonic Studies], *Historia*, Warszawa 1968, p. 91 - 100.

movement in the countries mentioned here. But the author's decision to do no more than sketch the story of the first generation of Italian heretics in Poland seems a wise one. For the subject is well known, and all the sources have been thoroughly studied, so that there would have been little point in merely repeating the opinions propounded by others earlier.

The second study about Moravia and popular Anabaptism (*La Moravia e l'anabattismo popolare*) is not uniform in character. In the first part of the study (p. 35 - 50), Caccamo discusses the subject given in the title, whereas in the second part he described the activities of Niccolò Buccella, who, it is generally known, was connected with Moravian Anabaptism in his youth. To come back to the first part of the essay, the author was faced with some difficulties, since the topic had already been discussed by Urban and Stella. Caccamo has therefore endeavoured to clarify certain problems that had not been dealt with before, or had been wrongly interpreted (such as religious problems in Slavkov, or the links between the Venetian Anabaptists and the Hutterites, or the problem of anti-Trinitarianism among the Anabaptists). It must be stressed that he has made a significant and interesting contribution to these subjects. It is only a pity that he has not drawn on the ecclesiastical sources available in Italy, such as those in the Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu, or in the Archivio Segreto Vaticano, as they could have augmented our knowledge about the Italian heretics in Moravia.⁴ It is all the more regrettable in that neither Urban nor Stella made use of these sources, either.

Caccamo's portrait of Buccella (p. 51 - 60), court physician to the Polish king Stephen Batory, is a very skilful one. This is the best account we have of Buccella, and of the diverse Italian heretics whom he ardently supported, even although in many cases (such as Bovio) their views on social matters were quite the contrary

⁴ An idea of the interest shown by Rome in the Italian heretics who had emigrated to Moravia can be gained from a letter sent by the Papal Nuncio Biglia to Rom, on 1st April, 1567: "non manco di far scacciar questi [eretici] che sono in questi parti di italiani et questi di passati! avisando il vescovo di Olmuz che in Bruna si trova un tristo heretico milanese, quale fa gran tempo che lo andava pensando modo di farlo castigarlo. Il buon vescovo non ha mancato di venir in persona nella città di Bruna et ha saputo così bene pratica della cosa con gli cittadini, che il mal huomo si è fatto in carcere et tenuto qualche di in distretto et volendo procedere al castigo come lo gl' aveva scritto, gli detti cittadini lo hanno domandato in gratia, con conditione, ch'egli in dieci di habbia abbandonate queste provincie e si è fatto uno scritto di questa sua promessa [con] il sugillo de' primi di loro cittadini, et come si viene tra questa natione a promessa simile inviolabilmente si osserva, e se ci trovarà si farà giustiziare [...] Gli due fratelli di Gandino Bresciani, pessimi heretici di quali ho fatto tante pratiche per farli scacciare da Vienna et da questi paesi et credo d'haverne parlato a S.M.^{ti} cento volte, la quale gl' fece ultimamente intendere che dovessero absentarsi, l'uno d'essi morse in Vienna gli di passati, ostinatissimo nella sua heresia, e fu sepulto nella Chiesa delli heretici, l'altro per nome Heraclito, il più ignorante, si è partito di Vienna et intendo che si ritrova in Brescia. Io ne ho voluto avvisare V.S.Ill.^{ma} perché sarà bene avvisarne gli padri inquisitori et il vescovo di Brescia che lo facciano prendere et castigare; io non manco di far ogni pratica per far castigare un prete quale à capo di anabaptisti et è in una villa di Moravia et così andarò ricercando dove ne saranno altri!" (Bibl. Ambrosiana, Trotti 22, k. 106 r.v. See also *NuntiatuBerichte aus Deutschland*, Abt. II, vol. 8, No. 55). The author does not mention, either, that there are many materials in the Vatican Archives concerning the Papal Nuncio Bonhomini's unsuccessful efforts to bring about the extradition of the Italian apostate monk Bonifacio Benincasa (Nunz. di Germania 105 passim). Caccamo was wrong in saying (p. 37) that we do not know the outcome of these efforts. Besides, he could have avoided this error if he had carefully studied W. Urban's work *Studia z dziejów antytrynitaryzmu na ziemiach czeskich i slowackich w XVI - XVIII w.* [*Studies on the History of Anti-Trinitarianism in Bohemia and Slovakia in the 16th and 17th Centuries*], Kraków 1966, p. 40, which, as a matter of fact, is based on different sources.

of his own. But for some reason, which does not seem obvious, Caccamo makes no reference to Buccella's writings, even to the *Refutatio scripti Simonis Simonii* (1585), thus renouncing to explore a valuable source that throws light on the Italian physician's religious views.⁶ As an aside here, it is worth pointing out that this debate between Simoni, Squarcialupi and Buccella is a rich mine of abundant, although somewhat misleading, information about the Italian heretics, that lies ready awaiting the scholar who would exploit it to the full.

The next study on the Italian colony in Cracow in the 16th century (*La colonia italiana di Cracovia nel Cinquecento*) really deals with a wider area than one would expect from the title, for the author tells us a little about the doings of all the Italians who were settled not just in Cracow but in other parts of Poland as well. Despite the somewhat haphazard arrangement (for instance, it is not altogether fortunate that Filippo Buccella and Bernardino Bonifacio d'Oria⁷ come into this chapter instead of the next one), and the fragmentariness of the source (for Caccamo has not drawn on the sources in the Cracow archives at all, but has confined himself to the works of Ptaśnik), it must be acknowledged that

⁶ An inadequate acquaintance with this discussion sometimes leads Caccamo to make false hypotheses. For instance, when Simoni in his disputation with Buccella, tells the latter that his brother was drowned in Venice for expounding Anabaptist opinions, there is no justification for doing as Caccamo does (on p. 51, note 45), that is, for taking "frater tuus" not in the ordinary sense of "frater", but as "confrater", and therefore as referring to Giulio Gherlandi. The person who was in fact meant here was Niccolò's nephew, whose first name is not known. He was also a doctor, and on his way to Transylvania about 1578 he went missing (see M. Buccella, *Confutatio responst Simonis Simont* [...], Cracoviae 1588, p. 47, and S. Simonius, *Simonius supplex* [...] ad [...] *Marcocamillum quendam Squarcialupum* [...], Cracoviae 1585, f. H.); Amadei Curtii *Responsum ad Epistolam cuiusdam Georgii Chia-kor...*, 1587, f. D₃. Besides, we have no data that would justify us in identifying, as Caccamo does (on p. 82), the architect Bernardo Morando with Palaeologus' friend and correspondent Bernardo Mora. Two different persons are undoubtedly meant here.

⁷ We have a very interesting account of Bonifacio from a letter written by Andrea Dudith to Thomas Jordanus on 28th September, 1578: "Marchis mihi infelix esse videtur, quietem quaerit, quam nusquam inveniet, nisi prius animum tranquillaverit; ad hanc autem tranquillitatem singulari Dei beneficio opus esse video. Quare bono viro non irascor, miseror magis sortem et condicionem eius. Fuit vir summo genere, opibus, potentia, principem locum apud suos habuit, magnos honores, summos magistratus gessit in sua patria. Ob Lutheranismum (cui uni sctae etiamnum se addictum profitetur) ante 22 annos sua sponte patria excessit in qua sibi diutius tutum locum sperare non poterat. Ab eo tempore huc atque illuc vagatur miser, neque ullis amicorum consiliis aut suis detrimentis adduci potest, ut domicilium sibi figat alicubi. Omnes regiones pervagatus est, quae a Christianis adiri possunt, in Indiis nondum fuit, fortasse illuc quoque abiret, si tuto posset. Noribergae in Carthusianorum monasterio vixit triennium, nusquam diutius, nunc in Daciam, illinc fortasse Byzantium proficiscetur. Diffisilies, morosus, μιάνθρωπος est, in omnibus regionibus par pari ei refertur ab iis, quibus notior est, quam mihi; fuit nuper apud me, antehac in Polonia ter, summum quater, allocutus sum hunc, ut mihi videbatur et nunc multo etiam magis, calamitosum. Conatus sum ei, cum aliquot aliis amicis eximere hoc peregrinandi studium et fatalem quandam inconstantiam, sed nihil profeci. Pecuniosus fuit, nunc res ei ad restim, ut dici solet, rediit, quo etiam miserabilior est, id aetatis homo, etiam corpore parum firmus, quod magis debilitat inedia et crudo potu. Cum quaererem, quo iturus esset, nescio, inquit. Ubi consistes? Deus, inquit, solus novit, mihi quidem nondum id patefecit, etsi continue in corde meo quaeram: Domine, quo me mittis? Mira mihi visa est haec eius pietas et vereor ne species aliqua sit μαμῶσ aut μελαγχολίασ illius, cuius mirifica συμπτώματα Galenus et vestri memorant. Ut ut est, magnum dolorem sentio ex tanti viri et sane litterati calamitate. Sed quid est, quod ex me scire cupis, quae D. Rutilius docere rectius potest? Nam in eius erga se amore commorando multus fuit nuper apud me. Mihi haec, quae tuae obsequens voluntati ingenue et libere scripsi, ex aliorum sermonibus notiora sunt, quam ex meo experimento" (Gotha, Landesbibliothek, Cod. Chart. A. 404, f.309v.).

this broad canvas has one prime advantage — it shows us how the heretics were involved in the life of the entire Italian colony, and how they were linked with that colony by complex family and commercial ties, etc. Caccamo rightly points out that despite many internal disputes the little world of the Italian exiles was a close-knit one, cemented by a feeling of national solidarity. This solidarity mitigated the regional antagonism which, as a rule, were so strong in Italy itself, and toned down the religious differences and even the class antagonisms. In this connection it is worth mentioning Caccamo's interesting analysis of the doctrinal views expressed in the prayer book of Pietro Franco, whom Caccamo rightly regards as a "late representative of Italian evangelicism, who, without being aware of it, clearly and resolutely cultivated the ideas of the Reformation."

Of course the author's interest in the Italian colony in Cracow is mainly focused on the national history of this group. But his strict adherence to the Italian framework seems to have somehow restricted the horizons of this essay. It has also rather spoilt the great trouble he took to collect a wealth of material on the links between the Italian exiles and the Polish society. This subject, it is true had been taken up by Ptaśnik, but not exhaustively. Of course, to do this properly Caccamo would have had to broaden his framework and take specifically Polish matters into account thus overstepping the field of his immediate concern. But had he do it, his analysis would be more complete, for the religious views of the Italian refugees — particularly of those who advanced the radical ideas — were, for some time at least, connected in some way, or even dependent upon, the anti-Trinitarian Church in Poland. But in spite of these criticisms, this is an important and valuable study. Indeed, it is perhaps the best chapter in the book, since it marks a definite advance in our knowledge about the Italian religious refugees in Poland in the 16th century.

The fourth chapter on the society of humanists round the imperial diplomat Andrea Dudith (*Una società di umanisti intorno al diplomatico imperiale Andrea Dudith Sbardellati*) is undoubtedly, as far as subject-matter is concerned, the most important part of Caccamo's book. One is well aware of the many obstacles (such as profusion of sources) the author must have encountered in writing this chapter, yet one must confess that on reading it one is left with a feeling of a certain insatiety: in its present form it is a loose collection of biographical and doctrinal thumb-nail sketches, without an attempt being made to grasp them in a syncretical perspective, and to make the best possible use of the available sources (in particular, one finds the somewhat frequent repetition of already well-known facts).

The main figure in this chapter is Andrea Dudith, who is known to have been an exceptionally complicated and enigmatic person. Caccamo's portrait of Dudith has largely been influenced by P. Costil's well-known study, weakest where it discusses Dudith's religious views. According to Caccamo, Dudith's opinions did not undergo any remarkable evolution from the time he broke away from Rome. Caccamo, while rightly drawing attention to Dudith's anti-sectarianism,⁷ his aversion to dogmatism, and his clear tendency to simplify, as far

⁷ As early as 1568, that penetrating observer, the Jesuit L. Maggio, already perceived this aconfessional tendency in Dudith. For on 5th July, 1568, Maggio wrote from Cracow to the General of the Jesuits, Borgia: "Hoggi con consilio del P. Nontio apostolico ho parlato lungamente con Sbardellato, olim Quinqueecliesiens, et già mio amicissimo e la cosa è passata molto quietamente; egli con ogni confidenza mi ha scoperto tutto il cuor' suo et disegni suoi, S'io me potessi trattenere qui un pezzo, sperarei con l'aiuto divino poter far qualche cosa, perché mi mostra molta affetione et credito, anchor che i vincoli della carne lo tengono legatissimo,

as possible, the fundamental principles of religion, at the same time stresses that Dudith's declared religious views fitted into the framework of the ideal of Christianity propagated by the Italian heretics. The author takes into account the opinions expressed by Dudith in the early days of his heretical activities, but completely ignores his later correspondence with Faustus Socinus, in which Dudith voiced numerous basic doubts about Christianity, for example attacking in an explicit way the authority of the New Testament (it was at Dudith's request that Socinus wrote his treatise *De S. Scripturae auctoritate*, which, it may be said, by no means convinced the former). Caccamo holds that we do not know the real extent of Dudith's doubts, which are not confirmed by other sources (p. 121, notes). Yet one has only to examine Socinus's letters (from which Dudith's letters can be reconstructed) and to consider the circumstances in which they were published,⁸ to see how groundless these objections are, and to realise that there is a great difference between Dudith as the author of the letter to Stancarò and Dudith who corresponded and disputed with Socinus. (It should be noted that Caccamo very much exaggerates the importance of this letter, which repeats over and over again arguments which even then were already mere stereotypes in the anti-Mosaic controversy). There is no doubt that for a long time, or at any rate at least from 1580 to 1582, Dudith's standpoint was a radically sceptical one, which really set him outside the bounds not only of anti-Trinitarian heresy, but even of Christianity altogether. The first buds of this standpoint are apparent even earlier, as we can see from an extremely interesting letter — which Caccamo has overlooked — from Dudith to Palaeologus on December 31st, 1576.¹ In my opinion, Dudith's religious standpoint should be examined against a much wider background of his entire correspondence.

I should like to add that, in my opinion, Caccamo was wrong in treating Dudith as an Italian. It is true that he grew up under the influence of Italian humanism, and that he was the friend of many Italian intellectuals, but at least from the time of his rupture with the Catholic Church his most vital interests were concentrated not only on Italy but on the countries of middle-eastern Europe. As the years passed, his intellectual interests, too, veered more and more strongly towards the pole of German culture, with which he became most closely connected owing to his friendly association with the crypto-Calvinist group of scholars. After the king's unsuccessful election, and after Dudith was forced to leave Poland,

et è bisogno di gran virtù divina. La verità è, che egli non è papista, né calvinista, né lutheranus, né d'alcuna altra setta (come mi ha detto) ma è un risoluto et ambiguo in tutte, etiamdio nel matrimonio suo, s'egli l'ha potuto legittimamente fare. Io l'ho esortato molto a riconoscere, et ho gli raccomandati alcuni ricordi, quali mi ha promesso di fare. È cosa certo di gran compassione. Iddio l'aluti" (Archivum Rom. Societatis Iesu, Germ. 121/1, f. 118 r.).

¹ Vide Z. O g o n o w s k i, *Socynianizm i Oświecenie* [Socinianism and the Enlightenment], Warszawa 1966, pp. 15-34. Strange that an author as familiar with the Polish literature as Caccamo has ignored this important work almost entirely.

¹ This letter was published by K. L a n d s t e i n e r in *Jacobus Paleologus. Eine studie[...] Mit noch nicht gedruckten Urkunden und Briefen aus dem Archive des k.k. Ministeriums des Innern*, Separat-Abdruck aus dem Programme des *Josefstädter Gymnasiums*, Wien 1873, pp. 46-50 (the letter is unsigned, but, as clearly shown by the gist of the letter, it is absolutely certain it was written by Dudith). Since we intend to deal with this letter in greater detail in a dissertation being planned on the religious views of Dudith, we shall confine ourselves here to citing only one passage, but a characteristic one at that: "Me offende l'animo tanta varietà d'opiniononi nel christianesimo in tutte le sette. Se la verità è una, perché tante contrarietà? Ubi est igitur nella scrittura? Come l'intenderò in tanta varietà opinionum? Ognuno la vuole per se. So ben quel che si risponde a questo, ma sono cose che servono ad ogni parte, sono luoghi communj etc."

where he had been an *Equus Polonus* and enthusiastic about the country of his adoption, Dudith declared himself indifferent to national sentiment (which makes him fundamentally different from his two friends Palaeologus and Socinus), and raised his cosmopolitanism almost to the level of a declared programme.¹⁰

Caccamo despite the intellectual rank he assigns to M. Squarcialupi¹¹ (a view concomitant with my own), devotes very little space to him. He is much more expansive when writing of the philosophical opinions of Simone Simoni. But even this portrait is fragmentary, and the background is inadequately sketched. Nevertheless it testifies to the author's great interpretative adeptness, for he cleverly highlights in the writings of this Italian doctor those elements that bring out the essential difference between him and other Italian religious exiles.¹² This series of profiles closes with a skilful and interesting (although far from complete) portrait of the historian Gianmichele Bruto.

The chapter on the end of the Italian religious emigration and the beginnings of Socinianism (*La fine dell'emigrazione religiosa italiana e le origini del socinanesimo*) rounds off the book. The first part of this chapter is devoted mainly to the dispute of the Unitarian Church in Poland and Transylvania on the adoration of Christ and on the office of the sword. The author pays special attention to the activities of Faustus Socinus, who was as it were compelled to wage a war on two fronts: a war against the religious extremism of the non-adorantists, and a war against the Anabaptist opposition. The author's dissertation is lucid and practically faultless. There are only a few instances in which he has been hasty in his conclusions (particularly where he writes of the Polish-Transylvanian non-adorantism, of which he has only second-hand knowledge).¹³

In the second part of the chapter, the author discusses very briefly the decline of the activities of the Italian heretics in Poland. He regards 1611 as the date

¹⁰ "Amor et patriae desiderium vulgari ingenio praeditos vexat, non exultos doctrina et pietate, qui norant Domini esse terram et plenitudinem eius et se mundanos cives esse sciunt. Patriae, quae me non ornat, sed deserit, egentemque esse cum uxore et liberis aequo animo patitur, semper anteponendum iudico eam gentem, quae me et honoribus, et vitae commodis meosque cumulare pergit" (Dudith to T. Hajek, 12th Jan. 1584 — quoted by S. B. Klose in: *Neue litterarische Unterhaltungen*, B. I, Breslau 1774, p. 533).

¹¹ An outstandingly rich and important source of information about Squarcialupi, and one that has been completely forgotten by Caccamo, is Squarcialupi's polemic with Simonius (see in particular M. Squarcialupi, *Simonis Simonii Lucensis primus triumphus de Marcello Squarcialupo...*, Claudopolis 1584).

¹² The author rightly draws attention to Simoni's ambiguous attitude both to the Catholic Church and to Catholics in general after his conversion to Catholicism. Here it may be of interest to note that towards the end of his life Simonius wished to arrive to Italy. The details of the whole affair are shrouded in mystery. Our only information about it comes from a brief minute of the Roman congregation of the Holy Office, dated 17th August, 1600: "Simonis Simonis medico Luccensi, relato eius memoriale remisso Sacrae Congregationi a Sanctissimo, fuit concessus salvus conductus accedendi ad Urbem et comparendi coram Ill.issimis Dominis Cardinalibus Congregationis S. Officii ad sex menses inchoandos a die receptionis litterarum patentiarum" (Rome, Bibl. Casanatense, cod. 3825, f. 168v.)

¹³ I think Caccamo exaggerates the link between non-adorantism and conservatism in social questions. For surely, as in the case of Anabaptism and social radicalism, this is a link of a personal rather than conceptual nature. Even Caccamo is not altogether convinced, since in another context counts Josephism, which is a prime element in the ideology of non-adorantism, as one of the typical attitudes of popular protest (p. 30).

which finally brings to a close the history of the Italian religious emigration in Poland. That was the year in which the young Italian Calvinist Franco di Franco was executed in Vilna for blasphemy against the Holy Sacrament. This episode, although venerated by the historians of Socinianism, has nevertheless no connection with the history of the Italian heretics *sensu stricto*, and so it looks as if we should be not far wrong in keeping to the traditionally accepted date of 1604 (the year of the death of Faustus Socinus)¹⁴ as marking the end of the activities of the Italian heretics abroad.

At the end of the book there is an extensive appendix with sources (pp. 177-273). Although a few errors (probably most of them printer's ones) occur here and there in the transcription of the texts, it is on the whole correct. Perhaps I will be allowed to remark here that for my own part I prefer the full modernisation of the spelling and punctuation (since, for instance, the retention of the old punctuation in a poor copy of a letter that has survived from Dudith to Stancaro makes it sometimes difficult to read). But from the textological point of view, the author has been guilty of a most serious sin, for, being unable to handle the Hebrew texts in Dudith's letter to Stancaro; he has simply left out these passages, and contented himself with giving a rough idea of the sense in the notes.

The second important question is the author's choice of documents. While being well aware that this choice is always subjective, I must yet confess that I do not always fully understand the criteria which led Caccamo to his particular choice. He must have had reasons of his own for publishing a letter from Vergerio (No. 1) and also part of a letter from Bruto to Dudith (No. 13). It is also

¹⁴ The author makes no mention of the intriguing and important question of the relations between the Italian heretics and their homeland. On this topic see V. Marchetti, *Do biografii Fausta Socyna [A contribution to the biography of Faustus Socinus]*, "Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce," Vol. XIV, 1909, pp. 151-164. I should like to add two comments to this valuable study. In relating the efforts made by the Inquisition in 1591 to have an effigy of Socinus publicly burned in Siena, Marchetti writes: "I was unable to trace whether or not this act did in fact finally take place. At any rate, it can be said that this campaign by the Inquisition was the last episode in the vicissitudes of the Sienese heretic in Italy" (p. 162). But in XXIII D 3, f. 19-44 of the *Bibl. regia Società di Storia Patria in Naples*, one may find a treatise called *Constitutum Franchi Franchini super bonis confiscatis in Sancto Officio in causa Fausti Sozzini* (from which one can read quite clearly an intention to hand over his property to the secular authorities). One of the passages in this treatise reads: "Cum Faustus Sozzinus Senensis, Marianus oris nepos, infauste a fide catholica defecisset, damnatus fuit eo nomine ab inquisitore, combusta item fuit illius imago et iudicii laico demandatum, ut si quando is caperetur, poenas non tamen pro merito exgeret" (italics mine, L. S.). Therefore, the "last episode in the vicissitudes of this Sienese heretic in Italy" took place nine years later, and was connected with the confiscation of his property, as we learn from two of these notes in the minutes of meetings of the Roman congregation of the Holy Office (it should be remarked that Faustus is recognized as having already died in 1600). The first of these notes is dated 15th May, 1600: "Alexandri quondam Celsi Soccini Senensis, petentis sibi fieri liberam gratiam scutorum quadringentorum, quae tenet ad censum a Sancto Officio Senarum occasione transactionis factae super confiscatione bonorum quondam Faustii Soccini, praetendentis non esse locum confiscationem propter fideicommissum factum a quondam Mariano Soccino in ore, lecto memoriale ac litteris inquit datis 20 Decembris 1598, illi domini nihil ei concedere voluerunt, sed utatur iure suo quoad fideicommissum" (*Bibl. Casanatense*, ms. 3825, f. 113); 23 May 1600: "Alexandri Soccini Senensis lecto memoriale fuit commissa causa pro iustitia R. P. Dandino super censu annuo scutorum et debito Sancto Officio Senarum occasione confiscationis bonorum quondam Faustii Soccini et scribatur inquisitori, ut mittat sua iura." (*ibidem*, f. 123).

no easy matter to guess what principles the author was following when he chose for publication only some of the letters of Marcello Squarcialupi; it would have been most useful to have them here edited in full, for as matters stand we must still have recourse to the manuscripts in Basle and Wroclaw. On the other hand it was a very good idea to publish in full, at last, the fascinating deposition of Marcantonio Varotta (No. 8), and the prayer-book of Pietro-Franco (No. 17).

The author has supplied a commentary to the published documents. In my opinion it was not necessary, since only parts of the texts have been edited. But as the author has in fact furnished a commentary, let us see how he has done it. Unfortunately, it seems to have been prepared in great haste—this is the only explanation one can offer for its sometimes quite astounding shortcomings. While giving quotations Caccamo does not specify exactly where they come from. At the same time he very often gives an information as to who is the author in question, but does not refer respectively to the given passage in writings themselves—while this was the important thing to do. Random examples of this may be found on p. 220, note 6, or p. 224, note 9-13. But when we wish to find out about the persons mentioned in the text, or about allusions to various events mentioned there, the position is even worse. This is especially true of the correspondence of Squarcialupi. To justify these criticisms, let it suffice here to quote a few examples. David Sigemundus, who is unidentified by Caccamo (p. 243, note 1) was the Rector of the Unitarian School in Alba Julia; Lucas Cracerus (p. 244, note 12) was a former Jesuit who taught in the Unitarian School in Kolozsvár (d. 1589); Coccius (p. 244, note 13) was actually Ulrich Koch (1525-1585), theologian and philosopher, professor at Basle University, as too was Joannes Nicolaus Stupanus (1542-1621), a well-known physician connected with the Perna circle (on p. 244, note 15, the author erroneously identifies him with a certain Antonio Stuppa). Caccamo also finds it hard to cope with the facts in the correspondence. For instance, he is unable to identify Squarcialupi's writings or the facts of his life.¹⁵ To repeat, all these shortcomings are due only to haste, for none of these questions presents any difficulty. The facts are often available even in the works cited by Caccamo (e.g. the facts about Carolus Oslevius, unidentified on p. 237, note 3, are to be found for example in the often quoted work by Costil, p. 174).

I should like to point out, however, that these criticisms of Caccamo's editorship, and the other reservations expressed above, do not by any means obscure the book's value. For many years to come it is sure to be a very useful text which everyone who is interested in the history of the Italian heretics in Poland in the 16th century will have recourse.

Lech Szczucki

¹⁵ On p. 247, line 19, no comments are added, although data could have been taken from a short treatise by Squarcialupi (*Simonis Simonii Lucensis primus triumphus de Marcello Squarcialupo...*, Claudiopolii 1584, p. 69: "nos Decembr mense, anno iam abhinc nono in Danubio supra Ratisbonam vix ex naufragio evasisse"). On p. 245, line 20, there is no footnote referring the reader to Simonius' dissertation, *Commentariola medica et physica ad aliquot scripta celsiusdam Camillomarcelli Squarcialupi Plumbinensis, Vindobonae 1584*, and *Simonis Simonii primus triumphus* by Squarcialupi. Another work by Squarcialupi, this time unidentified by Caccamo (p. 246, note 1) is: *M. Tullii Ciceronis... morales definitiones. Et in eandem scholia philosophica...*, Claudiopolii Transylvanorum 1584.