

Andrea T r e n t a

THEORHETORIC, SACRED TOPOGRAPHY, AND CULTURAL MEMORY.

The Jesuit contributions to the myth of Jaroslav of Sternberg (1655–1747)*

ABSTRACT

For the Jesuits, history was an inquiry into the past primarily aimed at discovering traces of divine manifestation. Wherever they set foot, they read the local past through theological lenses, producing fascinating historical narratives and employing them for pedagogical, devotional, and even legal purposes. An enlightening case study of this Jesuit approach to the past is the legendary episode of the nobleman Jaroslav of Sternberg and his heroic defence of Olomouc against the Tatars in 1241. From 1655 onwards, the Jesuits started contributing to this myth (circulating approx. from the mid-14th century). The first Jesuit enriching the Sternberg myth was Bohuslav Balbin, who transformed this event into the founding memory of the Olomouc Jesuit church. The rationale for this innovation was the ongoing dispute with the Conventuals over the jurisdiction of the same church, where the Jesuits used the Sternberg myth as legal argumentation. In 1661, Jan Tanner devised another version, modelled after the genre of sacred topography and influenced by the Habsburg *pietas eucharistica*, associating the myth with the Olomouc Corpus Christi chapel and the Eucharistic mystery. Later, when Ottoman and Tatar marauders brutally attacked Moravia in 1663, the Jesuits linked the mythical 1241 Tatar invasion to the pilgrimage sites of Hostýn and Kotouč, making them extremely popular. Due to their constant medial and ritual repetition, the Jesuit contributions to the Sternberg myth (summed up in a canonical form by Johannes Schmidl in 1747) gradually became part of the Bohemian and Moravian cultural memory, remarkably influential to be copied and modified even by the Conventuals. The Jesuit suppression in 1773 did not constitute the end of the Sternberg myth: eventually, it remerged, playing a significant role in the Czech national revival.

Keywords: the Jesuits – Jaroslav of Sternberg – Olomouc – cultural memory – rhetorics

* The funding for the present research paper was provided by the Czech Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports for specific research (IGA_FF_2023_011).

"Perhaps it will not be unpleasant to retrace from ancient times the famous origins of the church and the monastery of this [college of Olomouc]." With these words, in 1747, the official historian of the Bohemian Jesuit Province, Johannes Schmidl, began recounting the inception of the Olomouc Jesuit church in the first volume of his *Historiae Societatis Iesu Provinciae Bohemiae*.¹ This founding memory dates back to 24th–25th June 1241. An enormous pagan Tartar army, having devastated Central Europe, decided to move to Moravia. Being repelled twice by Kotouč and Hostýn, the Tartars were confident of conquering Olomouc. The city was put under siege and appeared doomed. Before engaging in battle, the pious nobleman Jaroslav of Sternberg, commander-in-chief of the defendants' army, took holy communion with his captains in the church of the Corpus Christi (in Schmidl's days, a chapel of the Jesuit college). Then, he gathered the army in the main square, invoked divine protection, and made a sacred vow to the Virgin. He also ordered to put the five holy particles left from the Mass in a small casket and place it on a donkey. The priest who had consecrated the particles led the donkey to battle, as the biblical Ark of the Covenant. Having miraculously defeated the Tartars, Sternberg deposited the particles in the Corpus Christi church and fulfilled his vow, building a church dedicated to the Assumption of the Virgin Mary (in Schmidl's days, the students' main brotherhood was devoted to this Marian dogma). This church would then be donated (1270) to the Conventuals by King Otakar II. Due to popular credulity, the original title was later removed, and that of St. Francis was imposed on the church. After the Jesuits arrived in Olomouc in 1566, they obtained this church thanks to the mediation of the Olomouc bishop Vilém Prusinovský of Vickov.²

When Schmidl composed the *Historiae*, the tale of the Tatar siege of Olomouc had been circulating in the Czech Lands for around four hundred years. Illustrious chroniclers, historians, and poets had described this crucial, albeit mythical, event in Moravian history, each slightly diverging from the others.³ From 1655, with

¹ "Iniucundum fortassis non erit, memorabilem templi huius, tum et coenobii originem ab antiquitate reposcere." Johannes SCHMIDL, *Historiae Societatis Iesu Provinciae Bohemiae I* (1555–1592), Praga 1747, p. 240–246.

² Agreement between bishop Vilém Prusinovský and Conventual Provincial of Austria Valentinus de Cingulo, 5. 9. 1567. Bohumil NAVRÁTIL (ed.), *Jesuité olomoučtí za protireformace. Akty a listiny z let 1558–1619 I (1558–1590)*, Brno 1916, p. 29–34. In exchange, the Conventuals received the Augustinian nunnery of St. James.

³ Chronicle of the so-called Dalimil (early 14th century) Jiří DAŇHELKA et al. *Staročeská kronika tak řečeného Dalimila II*, Praha 1988, p. 313–325; chronicle of Přibík Pulkava of Radenín (late 14th-century), Josef EMLER (ed.), *Kronika Pulkavova*, Fontes rerum Bohemicarum V, Praha 1893, p. 143–144; Václav HÁJEK Z LIBOČAN, *Kronyka Czeská*, Menší Město pražské 1541, p. CCXXXVIIr–CCXXXVIIIr; Ennio S. GLATOVINUS, *Breve Encomion Olomucii metropolis in Moraviae Marchionatu*, Prostějov 1550, p. A4b–B; Johannes DUBRAVIUS, *Historiae*

the *Diva Wartensis* of Bohuslav Balbín, the Jesuits entered the historiographical debate over the Sternberg myth, turning this chapter of secular history into a manifestation of sacred history. Balbín was the first Jesuit historian to mention the foundation of the Olomouc Marian church.⁴⁾ In 1661, Jan Tanner was the first author to include the Eucharistic miracle in the story, associated with the Corpus Christi chapel.⁵⁾ Later on, his friend Balbín and his brother Matěj enriched the story with miraculous details, relating to the sacred sites of Hostýn⁶⁾ and Kotouč.⁷⁾ In 1669, Georgius Crugerius, in his *Sacri pulveres*, established a precise date for commemorating the event, 25th June.⁸⁾ In 1687, in one of his sermons, Caspar Knittel made the defence of Olomouc an inspiring model for fighting the Ottoman enemy.⁹⁾ Around 1714–1723, Johannes Miller wrote extensively on this topic, even attempting to retro-date the events of the Tatar invasion by one hundred years (1141).¹⁰⁾ Ultimately, in 1747, Schmidl created a canonical version of the story,

Regni Boemiae, Prostějov 1552, p. Cr–Clr; Bartolomeus PAPROCKÝ Z GLOGOL, *Zrcadlo Slawneho Margkrabstwij Morawského*, Olomouc 1593, p. 103–106 (chapter XXVII).

⁴⁾ Bohuslaus BALBÍN, *Diva Wartensis, seu Origines, Et Miracula Magnae Dei, Hominumque Matris Mariae, quae à tot retro saeculis Wartae, in limitibus Silesiae, Comitatusque Glacensis, magnâ populorum frequentia colitur, Clarissima Miraculis*, Praegae 1655, p. 164–169.

⁵⁾ In 1661 Jan Tanner wrote a celebrative treaty for the young brothers Václav Vojtěch and Jan Norbert, scions of the Sternberg family. Jošt Wolf of Schwarzenwolf was the preceptor of the two pupils; thus, his dedication was placed at the beginning of the book. Jodocus WULFF A SCHWARTZENWOLF, *Vestigia Virtutis et Nobilitatis Sternbergicae in Regno Bohemiae*, Praegae 1661, p. A–D.

⁶⁾ Bohuslaus BALBÍN, *Diva montis sancti, seu origines et miracula magnae dei hominumque Matris Mariae, quae in Sancto Monte Regni Bohemiae, ad Argentifodinas Przibramenses, quotidiana populi frequentia, in Statua sua mirabili, aditur et colitur. V. Libris comprehensa*, Praegae 1665, p. 30–31.

⁷⁾ Matěj TANNER, *Hora Olivetská, na rozličné stanoviště bolestným Krista Pána tajemstvím posvěcené, rozdělená u Štramberka na panství novojičinském v Moravě vyzdvížená*, Knihovna Národního muzea v Praze, sign. 33 F 23, p. 33–39. According to Jaromír Linda, the original manuscript was composed around 1660–1665 and approved by the Jesuit Bohemian provincial in 1667. The first surviving publication dates to 1704. Jaromír LINDA, *Hora Olivetská Matěje Tannera*. Knihovní obzor 1, nr. 4, 1993, p. 21–26.

⁸⁾ Georgius CRUGERIUS, *Sacri pulveres mensis Iunii: sub auspiciis Sacromontanae Virginis, et SS. Patriarchae Norberti, Candidissimi Ordinis Praemonstratensis editi ac publico donati*, Praegae 1669, p. 242, 249–252.

⁹⁾ The sermon is entitled *Mars Christianus contra Sultanum*. Caspar KNITTEL, *Conciones Dominicales Academicæ, per omnes anni Dominicas distributæ. Pars Hyemalis, a Dominica I. Adventus usque ad Pascha inclusive*, Praegae 1687, p. 176–184.

¹⁰⁾ Moravský zemský archiv v Brně (further MZAB), G10 Sbíрка rukopisů Moravského zemského archivu, inv. nr. 187, *Historia Fabricae Templi Collegii Olomucensis S. I. Sub Rectoratu P. Ioannis Miller, fol. 87–108*. Národní knihovna České republiky (further NK ČR), Rukopisy Národní knihovny, rukopisy Pražské lobkowiczské knihovny, sign. XXIII r, C104/1 (XXIII C

seamlessly integrating the previous Jesuit contributions and silencing the non-Jesuit ones circulating during that period.

By outlining the origins, development, and diffusion of the Jesuit versions of the Sternberg story, this article aims to show that the emergence responded to specific Jesuit issues or *desiderata* about the realms of theorhétoric, sacred topography and cultural memory. This article will stress the role of Balbin's *Diva Wartensis* as the first Jesuit contribution to the story. It would be argued that this contribution was primarily theorhétoric and aimed to sustain the Olomouc Jesuits in a legal dispute *vis à vis* the Conventuals over the rights of their church. Secondly this article will focus on the version crafted by Jan Tanner in 1661. It would be argued that this contribution was the first to echo the genre of sacred topography, linking the miraculous origins of a sacred space (the Corpus Christi chapel) to an epic event of the Moravian past. Concerning the diffusion, this article will focus on two Conventual sources based on Caspar Knittel's anti-Ottoman sermon, which claimed that Sternberg had founded their monastery in Olomouc.¹¹⁾ It would be argued that the combination of medial and ritual reproductions of the story favoured its entry into the Bohemian and Moravian cultural memory,¹²⁾ making the Jesuit version so popular that even their "rivals" followed it. In conclusion, in the footsteps of Miller,¹³⁾ Schmidl attempted to create a Jesuit canonical version of the Sternberg story with the *Historiae*, defending it from the Conventual efforts to revise this narrative.

This last Jesuit endeavour failed due to their suppression in 1773, the forceful closure of the pilgrimage sites in 1783, as well as the changing cultural, political, and spiritual climate in the Czech Lands in the late 18th century. The end of the Jesuit guardianship did not mean oblivion for Jaroslav of Sternberg; hence his

104a), Johannes Miller. *Historia provinciae Bohemiae Societatis Iesu ab anno 1555 usque ad annum 1723. Prolegomena*, fol. 125–128. Zemský archiv Opava, pobočka Olomouc (further ZAO-O) sign. 1737, inv. nr. 5308, Anfang, und End der alten, wie auch der unter dem Titel, und Nahmen MARIAE-Schnee, in dem Collegio der Gesellschaft IESU in Ollmütz neu aufgebauten Kirche. Beschrieben von P. Johann Müller, Rektor der Ollmützer Kollegiums.

¹¹⁾ MZAB, E 58 Premonstráti Nová Říše, inv. nr. 50, cart. 38 f, dodatek (microfilm), *Historia Conventus Sancti Francisci Ordinis Minorum Conventualium Olomucii ad Sanctum Iacobum Maiorem*, fol. 4v–5r. *Saeculum quintum bis fortunatum, terque beatum, a quo unus Seraphin impressit Seraphico Patri Francisco quinque signa, quinque amoris insignia, cum quinque stolis optimis*, Neostadii Austriae 1724, p. 39–40.

¹²⁾ I will use the terms Bohemian and Moravian for referring to the pre-nationalistic Lands of the Bohemian Crown. I will use the term Czech for the 19th-century nationalistic context.

¹³⁾ For Miller's role as first official historian of the Bohemian Province and the development of the Bohemian Jesuit historiography Ivo CERMÁN, *Jesuit Historiography in Bohemia*, Jesuit Historiography Online, https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/jesuit-historiography-online/jesuit-historiography-in-bohemia-COM_192532?lang=de, last modified 18. 6. 2019.

memory was kept alive¹⁴⁾ and gained momentum with the forgery of the poem *Jaroslav* in 1816 by the Czech philologist Václav Hanka,¹⁵⁾ casting a Czech nationalistic shadow upon the Moravian past throughout the 19th century.

Methodology

In the Jesuit division of knowledge, History, defined as the teacher of the past (*magistra antiquitatis*), was never considered an autonomous discipline, yet always a branch of rhetorics. In his dialogue *Phaedrus* (370 BC), Plato aptly established rhetorics as “the art of leading souls to true knowledge through dialogue and dialectic.”¹⁶⁾ This truth emanated from the Gospel for the Jesuits, and rhetorics identified as “a speaking to, for, and about God.”¹⁷⁾ Saint Paul, described by Nicholas Poussin as a θεορήτωρ (theorhētor), was the Jesuit model of eloquence: animated by the divine fire of the Gospel, Paul overcame the human eloquence of his pagan accuser Tertullus.¹⁸⁾ Following Caussin, Jesuit rhetoric has been defined as theorhētoric.¹⁹⁾ It could employ as decisive argumentation manifestations of God’s will in the past and present human events. The primary application of theorhētoric was Jesuit pedagogy. The Jesuits aimed at forming capable orators and pious believers familiar with the classical, biblical and local history (full of signs of divine intervention).²⁰⁾ This conceptualisation of rhetoric informed Jesuit legal disputes

¹⁴⁾ After the Jesuit suppression, among others, two influential ex-Jesuit cultivated the Sternberg memory. František PUBIČKA, *Chronologische Geschichte Böhmens unter den Slaven*, Prag 1781; Ignaz CORNOVA, *Jaroslav von Sternberg: der Sieger der Tartarn*, Prag 1813.

¹⁵⁾ Václav HANKA (ed.), *Kralodvorský rukopis. Sebrání lyricko-epických národních zpěvů, věrně v původním starém jazyku, též v obnoveném pro snadnější vyrozumění, s připojením německého přeložení starobylých skládání*, díl zvláštní, Praha 1819.

¹⁶⁾ Michael J. MacDONALD, *Introduction*, in: Michael J. MacDonald (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Rhetorical Studies*, Oxford 2017, p. 4.

¹⁷⁾ Steven MALLOUX, *Wars of Words. Catholic and Protestant Jesuitism in Nineteenth-Century America*, in: Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra – Robert Aleksander Maryks – Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia (edd.), *Encounters between Jesuits and Protestants in Asia and the Americas*, Boston – Leiden 2018, p. 328–346, here p. 339.

¹⁸⁾ Nicolas CAUSSIN, *Eloquentiae sacrae et humanae parallela*, Paris, 1619, p. 6.

¹⁹⁾ Marc FUMAROLI, *The Fertility and Shortcomings of Renaissance Rhetoric: The Jesuit Case*, in: John O'Malley, Gauvin Alexander Bailey, Steven J. Harris, T. Frank Kennedy (edd.), *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts, 1540–1773*, vol. I. Toronto 2006, p. 90–106, here p. 101.

²⁰⁾ Moreno BONDA, *History-Writing and the Philosophy of Language. A Proposal for the Periodization of Early Modern Jesuit Historiography*, Jesuit Historiography Online, https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/jesuit-historiography-online/history-writing-and-the-philosophy-of-language-a-proposal-for-the-periodization-of-early-modern-jesuit-historiography-COM_20630, last modified February 2019.

as well. Claiming to interpret God's design righteously, theorhétoric could be an effective form of advocacy and response to anti-Jesuit critiques.

One of the Jesuits' favourite historiographical genres was that sacred topographies or hagiotopographies. This peculiar genre of sacred history is characterised, according to Dominique Julia's definition, by the presence of an explicit divine intervention in the narrated story (miracle), often performed by a Saint or the Virgin Mary, producing tangible results (relics, icons) connected to a place of worship deemed holier than the "average" parish churches (often a pilgrimage site).²¹⁾ In the context of the Habsburg domains, this genre was imbued with *pietas Austriaca*, namely the Marian and Eucharistic devotion, and the veneration of the Cross.²²⁾ Whenever possible, the Jesuits opted for injecting new spiritual life in ancient and abandoned sacred sites, whose popularity had fallen due to the passing of time or the influxes of the Reformations.²³⁾ Since political visions also animated these works, their historiographical value has been recently stressed.²⁴⁾ A common trend in the (re)emergence of these religious traditions is their development from narrating a miracle, connecting it to an existing shrine, and finally leading their pilgrimages.²⁵⁾

Cultural memory has been defined as the answer groups provide to the question, what must we not forget.²⁶⁾ It might refer to (fictional or real) events in a very remote past, as the founding myths.²⁷⁾ It legitimises the group *status quo* by creating a sense of historical continuity. It could also provide an antidote to an "*unacceptable present*".²⁸⁾ Cultural memory is codified in a canon and shared primarily by performing rituals and secondly by media. The selection and transmission of a canon, including the rejection of everything deemed unfit are tasks performed by

²¹⁾ Dominique JULIA, *Sanctuaires et lieux sacrés à l'époque moderne*, in: André Vauchez (ed.), *Lieux Sacrés, Lieux de culte, Sanctuaires*, Roma 2000, p. 256, 259–260.

²²⁾ Anna CORETH, *Pietas Austriaca*, West Lafayette 2004 (orig. *Pietas Austriaca. Österreichische Frömmigkeit im Barock*, Wien 1959).

²³⁾ D. JULIA, *Sanctuaires et lieux*, p. 269.

²⁴⁾ Anna-Maria PÍPALOVÁ, *Bohuslav Balbín and the Patriotic Reconceptualization of Bohemia, c. 1650–1675*, *The Historical Journal* 65, 2022, p. 992–1014, here p. 993.

²⁵⁾ Václav FLAJŠHANS, *Zázrak hostýnský a báseň Jaroslav*, *Český časopis historický* 38, 1932, p. 78–92, here p. 92.

²⁶⁾ Jan ASSMANN – John CZAPLICKA, *Collective Memory and Cultural Identity*, *New German Critique* 65, 1995, p. 125–133, here p. 126.

²⁷⁾ Jan ASSMANN, *Communicative and Cultural Memory*, in: Astrid Erll – Ansgar Nünning (edd.), *Cultural Memory Studies An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, Berlin 2008, p. 109–118, here p. 112–113.

²⁸⁾ David LOWENTHAL, *The past is a foreign country*, Cambridge 1985, p. 39–40.

specialists.²⁹⁾ For groups, remembering the past is generally an exception, while forgetting is the norm.³⁰⁾ Rituals are considered the most successful vehicle for cultural memory transmission since they are based on the strict repetition of their content, and their public performance “*consolidate[s] the coherence of the group in time and space*”.³¹⁾ Media, by contrast, are a much more dangerous form of sharing cultural memory, as they are more frequently subject to variations.

State-of-art research on the topic

Regarding its origins and development, Tomáš Somer³²⁾ has stressed that the story of the nobleman of Jaroslav of Sternberg (who never existed) and his heroic struggle against the Tatars (who never attacked Olomouc) was based on the creative combination of two actual historical events: the Mongol invasion of Central Europe in 1241, which never touched Olomouc, and the unsuccessful siege of Olomouc laid by the Hungarian king Bela IV in 1253, supported by Cuman troops. While Somer’s article analysed the contributions to the myth made by numerous Medieval and Early Modern chroniclers and historians, the role of Bohuslav Balbin’s *Diva Wartensis* does not constitute the author’s primary focus. The article’s proposed contribution in this field is to highlight Balbin’s crucial role in forming an alternative Jesuit version of the legend, in the context of their legal dispute with the Conventuals.

Concerning the myth and its artistic representations, Kateřina Dolejší, Leoš Mlčák,³³⁾ and Katrin Štěrba³⁴⁾ have analysed the iconography of the frescos in the Olomouc Corpus Christi chapel executed in 1728 by Johann Christoph Hanke. The version painted in the chapel resembles the description made by the Jan Tanner in 1661. According to Dolejší and Mlčák, Tanner’s version was based on an

²⁹⁾ Aleida ASSMANN, *Canon and Archive*, in: A. Erll – A. Nünning (edd.), *Cultural Memory Studies*, p. 97–108, here p. 99–101.

³⁰⁾ Charlotte LINDE, *Working the Past. Narrative and Institutional Memory*, Oxford 2009, p. 7, 9.

³¹⁾ Jan ASSMANN, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization. Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*, Cambridge 2011, p. 42 (orig. *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*, München 1992).

³²⁾ Tomáš SOMER, *Forging the Past. Facts and Myths behind the Mongol Invasion of Moravia in 1241*, *Golden Horde Review* 6, 2018, p. 238–251.

³³⁾ Kateřina DOLEJŠÍ – Leoš MLČÁK, *Zobrazení legendy o záračném vítězství Jaroslava ze Sternberka nad Tatary*, in: Martin Elbel – Ondřej Jakubec (edd.), *Olomoucké baroko II*, Olomouc 2010, p. 107–113.

³⁴⁾ Katrin ŠTĚRBA, *From Visible to Invisible: Teaching Catholic Dogma in the Jesuit Church and Corpus Christi Chapel in Olomouc*, in: Kateřina Horníčková – Michal Šroněk (edd.), *Jesuit Arts and Czech Lands. Missionizing through the Arts*, London 2023, p. 269–314.

early 17th-century account, that was inspired by the Spanish miracle of the “Los Sanctissimos Corporales de la Ciudad de Daroca,” a legendary event of the Reconquista which took place around 1239.³⁵⁾ Some Spanish Jesuits³⁶⁾ imported to Olomouc the Daroca miracle with its engraving made by the Flemish Jacques Granthomme. This article aims to contribute to this field of research, contesting that Tanner crafted an original version of the myth, modelled after the hagiotopographical genre and influenced by the Habsburg *pietas eucharistica*.³⁷⁾ This article will also question the authorship and circulation of the Daroca engraving as an identical copy, printed by the Flemish Thomas de Leu, has been recently discovered by Evelyn Verheggen in an Amsterdam manuscript.³⁸⁾

Ultimately, there is a vast literature on the crucial role played by the Sternberg myth in forming the Czech national identity. Recently, Dalibor Dobíáš, Michal Fránek, Martin Hrdina, Iva Krejčová, and Kateřina Piorecká authoritatively and meticulously analysed the rapid, triumphal rise of the myth into the Czech national pantheon and its slow, problematic demise in the second half of the 19th century.³⁹⁾ The dissertation of Stanislav Buček shed additional light on the Jesuit and non-Jesuit adaptations of the myth, in addition to the religious activity surrounding the sacred places associated with the Tatar invasion of Moravia.⁴⁰⁾ The article's contribution to this field lies in the application of the concept of cultural memory to the Jesuit medial and ritual activities surrounding the Sternberg myth, in particular its inclusion in sermons, as in the case of Caspar Knittel's *Conciones Dominicales*, its connection to pilgrimage sites, as in the case of Hostýn and Kotouč, its entry in the calendar, as in the case of Crugerius' *Sacri pulveres*, and its canonical definition, as in the case of Schmidl's *Historiae*.

³⁵⁾ José Luis Corral LAFUENTE, *Una Jerusalén en el occidente medieval: la ciudad de Daroca y el milagro de los Corporales*, Aragón en la Edad Media 12, 1995, p. 61–122.

³⁶⁾ Father Hurtado Pérez lived in Olomouc from 1566 until his death in 1594, serving as rector for most of this time. Father Pedro Jiménez was rector of the Olomouc college from 1600 until 1607, and then again from 1618 until 1622.

³⁷⁾ A. CORETH, *Pietas Austriaca*, p. 13–23.

³⁸⁾ Evelyn Maria Fabiola VERHEGGEN, *Beelden voor Passie en hartstocht/ Bid- en devotieprenten in de Noordelijke Nederlanden, 17de en 18de eeuw*, Zutphen 2006, p. 111–112. The manuscript is preserved in the Allard Pierson Reading Room of the University of Amsterdam, hs. XXV C 79.

³⁹⁾ Dalibor DOBÍÁŠ et al., *Rukopis královédvorský a česká věda (1817–1885)*, Praha 2014.

⁴⁰⁾ Stanislav BUČEK, *Obraz Svatého Hostýna v raně novověké literatuře*, M. A. thesis, Olomouc 2014.

Origins, development, and diffusion of the Jesuit versions of the Sternberg myth

"This is the summary of the Tatar war, which we recalled at the request of our friends." In *Diva Wartensis*, Bohuslav Balbín motivates with these words the brief description (less than two pages) of the mythical Tatar Olomouc siege of 1241 and the heroic defence commanded by Jaroslav of Sternberg.⁴¹⁾ This short passage opens with the troops and the citizens invoking the Virgin in the Olomouc main square, continues with the sacred vow made by Jaroslav of Sternberg, and concludes with the erection *ex-voto* of a church dedicated to the Virgin Mary, which *"now our Society of Jesus owns"*, as Balbín reminds the reader. If carefully scrutinised and linked with unedited Jesuit and Conventual archival sources, this fragment would reveal that the first Jesuit version of the Sternberg myth primarily fulfilled the delicate role of evidence for asserting their legal rights in a dispute with the Olomouc Conventuals over their church on the Předhradí hill. This legal function would co-exist with the pastoral use of the myth, then elaborated by Balbín himself and other authors, namely Jan and Matěj Tanner, and Caspar Knittel.

The Jesuit-Conventual controversy has been a less researched aspect of the Olomouc Jesuit church.⁴²⁾ Only Bohumil Navrátil, who edited the Olomouc Jesuit sources for 1558–1590, was aware of the controversy and quoted a fragment of a prominent accusation made against the Jesuits by the Conventuals in 1640.⁴³⁾ Josef Vylvěčka did not frame the relevant events concerning the Jesuit church as part of this legal dispute, leaving them isolated.⁴⁴⁾ Contemporary research has not

⁴¹⁾ *"Haec Tartarici Belli summa, quam rogatu amicorum memoravimus."* B. BALBÍN, *Diva Wartensis*, p. 168–169.

⁴²⁾ The first author studying the Olomouc Jesuit church without mentioning the controversy was Gregor WOLNÝ, *Kirchliche Topografie von Mähren, I. Abteilung, Olmützer Erzdiözese I*, Brünn 1855, p. 206–211. There is no mention of the controversy in the following volumes: August PROKOP, *Die Markgrafschaft Mähren in kunstgeschichtlicher Beziehung IV*, Wien 1904, p. 1050–1053; Alois KROESS, SJ, *Geschichte der Böhmisches Provinz der Gesellschaft Jesu*, Wien 1910, p. 308–312; Josef KACHNÍK, *Beschreibung und Wertung der Oelgemälde und Fresken in der garnisonkirche Maria Schnee zu Olmütz*, Olmütz 1917; Josef TITTEL, *Die Restaurierung der Maria-Schneekirche (k. u. k. Garnisonskirche) in Olmütz in den Jahren 1916–1918: historische und kunsthistorische Notizen zu der Geschichte des Gotteshauses*, Olmütz 1918; Václav RICHTER, *Plány Jezuitských staveb v Olomouci*, in: Oldřich J. Blažiček – Jan Květ (edd.), *Cestami umění. Sborník prací k počtě šedesátých narozenin Antonína Matějčka*, Praha 1949, p. 152–160; Václav RICHTER, *Raně středověká Olomouc*, Praha – Brno 1959, p. 134–135.

⁴³⁾ B. NAVRÁTIL, *Jesuité olomoučti*, p. 33. For the complete edition of this accusation Andrea TRENTA, *Spor olomouckých minoritů a jezuitů o kostelu sv. Františka: nepublikovaný dokument z roku 1640*, *Studia theologica* (forthcoming).

⁴⁴⁾ Josef VYVLEČKA, *Príspevky k dějinám kostela Panny Marie Sněžné v Olomouci*, Olomouc 1917, p. 36, 61, 63–64.

focused on this topic as well.⁴⁵⁾ The most comprehensive source on this topic is the *Controversiae Patres Societatis IESU inter, et Patres Conventuales Olomucii*, an unedited compilation of original and copied documents gathered by Johannes Miller in his tenure as rector of the Olomouc Jesuit university (1711–1715).⁴⁶⁾ Other unedited Jesuit⁴⁷⁾ and Conventual sources⁴⁸⁾ will be mentioned to corroborate Miller's *Controversiae*. The controversy started in 1635/1636, continuing throughout four phases (1635–1641, 1661–1665, 1685, 1712–1715) and ended only with the construction of the new church of Saint Virgin Mary of the Snows in 1715.

Concerning the controversy's origins, around 1635/1636, the Olomouc Jesuits planned to erect new votive chapels (one devoted to the city patron St. Pauline),⁴⁹⁾ and to impose a Marian devotional title to their church (Assumption of the Virgin Mary). The Conventuals met the project with hostility and accused the Jesuits of defaming their religious order and patron Saint, secretly planning to erect a brand-new church. First, the Conventual Minister General acted on behalf of the Olomouc Conventuals, putting pressure on the Jesuit General in Rome; then, a legal action started in Olomouc. It is uncertain when the protest was initiated: the Conventuals mentioned 15th July 1635 as the beginning of the dispute,⁵⁰⁾ while the first Jesuit source is a letter between the general Mutio Vitelleschi and the Bohemian

⁴⁵⁾ Ondřej JAKUBEC, *Konventní kostel olomouckých minoritů ve středověku*, Střední Morava 6, 1998, s. 38–49; Michal ALTRICHTER – Milan TOGNER – Vladimír HYHLÍK, *Olomouc. Univerzitní kostel Panny Marie Sněžné*, Velehrad 2000; Jiří FIALA et alii, *Jezuitský konvikt. Sídlo uměleckého centra Univerzity Palackého v Olomouci. Dějiny – Stavební a umělecké dějiny – Obnova a využití*, Olomouc 2002; Jiří FIALA et alii, *Univerzita v Olomouci (1573–2009)*, Olomouc 2009; Petronilla CEMUS (ed.), *Bohemia Jesuitica 1556–2006 I–II*, Praha – Würzburg 2010; Antonín KALOUS (ed.), *The Transformation of Confessional Cultures in a Central European City: Olomouc 1400–1750*, Rome 2015.

⁴⁶⁾ MZAB, G10 Sbirka rukopisů Moravského zemského archivu, inv. nr. 223, *Controversiae Patres Societatis IESU inter, et Patres Conventuales Olomucii, annis diversis actae, ratione Monasterii, et Templi, et eiusdem tituli, olim ad hos pertinentium*. A. 1712 in hunc librum congestae.

⁴⁷⁾ MZAB, G12 Cerroniho sbírka, book 231, *Diarium Reverendi Patris Rectoris Collegii Olomucensis*; MZAB, G10 Sbirka rukopisů Moravského zemského archivu, inv. nr. 187, *Historia Fabricae Templi Collegii Olomucensis S. I. Sub Rectoratu P. Ioannis Miller*.

⁴⁸⁾ MZAB, E49 Minoritě Brno, book 90 (microfilm), *Liber Almi Conventus Olomucensis ad Sanctum Iacobum*; ZAO-O, Arcibiskupství Olomouc, inv. nr. 2071, sign. Bb89.

⁴⁹⁾ For a detailed analysis of the devotion of St. Pauline and her relics in Olomouc since their arrival in town in 1623 see Miroslav HEROLD, *La venerazione di santa Paolina, patrona di Olomouc. Un caso concreto del culto di corpi santi catacombali*, Tesi di laurea magistrale, Roma 2010.

⁵⁰⁾ MZAB, G10 Sbirka rukopisů Moravského zemského archivu, inv. č. 223, *Controversiae Patres*, fol. 45. This document, the same briefly quoted by Navrátil, is dated 1640, yet the precise day and month are not mentioned.

provincial Daniel Kirchner, sent from Rome on 29th November 1636.⁵¹⁾ The Conventual rationale behind the dispute was supposedly a financial request. In 1639, the Conventuals asked Bishop Leopold Wilhelm von Habsburg to donate them the parish church of St. Peter as compensation, claiming that the original 1567 provisions had not been respected.⁵²⁾ Prusinovský had promised the friars a perpetual annual monetary contribution and a suitable renovation of the poorly preserved St. James' monastery.

In 1640 the controversy finally reached the court. The Conventual criticism was soon joined by the Poor Clares (whose monastery was on the opposite side of the street), the city hall magistrates, and the Olomouc chapter. Instead of absentee Leopold Wilhelm, in the first days of October 1640, the case was ruled in favour of the Jesuits in front of the bishop of Vienna, Philipp Friedrich Breuner,⁵³⁾ and the count Václav Bruntalský of Vrbna,⁵⁴⁾ allowing the chapels' erection.⁵⁵⁾

In the first phase of the controversy, the Jesuit legal argumentation did not include the myth of Jaroslav of Sternberg. The defence was formulated by the Olomouc Jesuit rector Paulus Anastasius (tenure 1636–1640). In his *responsio*, Anastasius first reported the accusation. The Conventuals considered to re-dedicate the old St. Francis church to the new rising Jesuit Saint Francis Xavier a disgrace. Anastasius replied that they had never planned to introduce the title of St. Francis Xavier; their goal was to restore the original title, the Assumption of the Virgin Mary. To demonstrate it, Anastasius relied on material and historical evidence. The main material item of evidence was a written text enclosed in a rusty globe, which had been found during the renovation of the church tower. In addition, the

⁵¹⁾ Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu (further ARSI), Antica Compagnia, Assistentia Germaniae, Provincia Bohemiae I/2, Epistolae Generalium 1623–1637, fol. 801.

⁵²⁾ According to this letter, written on 15th January 1639, in 1625 the Conventuals had to turn down the Olomouc chapter offer to move to this parish church, due to the lack of German preachers. MZAB, E 58 Premonstráti Nová Říše, inv. nr. 50, cart. 38 f, Historia Conventus, fol. 10v–11r.

⁵³⁾ "2a Octobris, 1640. [...] Commissio facta ab Episcopo in aula, presentibus nobis citatis, capitularibus decano, praeposito, et archidiacono, Franciscanis, procuratore Sanctae Clarae, et civitatis delegatis Schwannauer, Obeslavio, Smetanka in causa sacellorum. 3a Octobris. Partes omnes sensim ab Episcopo auditaе, accessit 5a nimirum dominus parochus ad Beatam Virginem Dominus Polinger propter prospectum. Canonici et omnes partes concesserunt nobis locum exceptis monachis, qui adhuc captiose absque ratione restiterant. 4a Octobris. Monachi conventuales negative scripto responderunt [...]." These entries were written under the rectorship of Johann Schönberger. MZAB, G 12 Cerroniho sbírka, cart. 231, Diarium Reverendi, fol. 187–188.

⁵⁴⁾ J. VYVLEČKA, *Príspevky k dějinám*, p. 36, 64.

⁵⁵⁾ Minor modifications were imposed by the Olomouc magistrates, regarding the city road conditions. MZAB, G10 Sbirka rukopisů Moravského zemského archivu, inv. nr. 223, Controversiae Patres, fol. 59–64.

Jesuits reported that, *ab immemorabili*, the holiday of their church was celebrated on the Sunday after the Assumption of the Virgin Mary (15th August), and not on 4th October, St. Francis' holiday.⁵⁶⁾ Sustained by the righteousness of their argumentation, or perhaps by the devotion of Breuner⁵⁷⁾ and Vrbna,⁵⁸⁾ the Jesuit project was approved. This symbolic embellishment and architectonical aggrandisement took place in a particular year for the Jesuit order, the jubilee of their foundation. However, the Jesuits were denied this triumph in June 1642, when Olomouc was conquered by the Swedish troops, who left the town only in 1650.⁵⁹⁾ During the Swedish occupation, most Jesuit material properties, including works of art and devotional objects, were stolen, or destroyed.

"23rd June, 1662 (it is by the hand of Father Bohuslav Balbín himself). [...] When the Tartars besieged Olomouc in the year 1241 after Christ, Jaroslav of Sternberg, who had entrenched in Olomouc with a small army of Bohemians (the Olomouc citizens united with them), preparing to attack the enemy in the night, in the city forum promised God that he would have erected a church in honour of the Blessed Virgin, if she had granted him the victory. Jaroslav triumphed, the Tartars were routed, and the Tartar general was killed at Jaroslav's hand. Thanks to this victory, the church of the Blessed Virgin was founded, as demonstrated by the historians Hajek in the Annales, Paprocky in the Diadocus and the Speculus Moraviae, and other historians quoted in the second part of the Diva Wartensis, where you will find the entire story narrated according to the historians' testimony."⁶⁰⁾ Upon their return to town, the Jesuits fo-

⁵⁶⁾ ARSI, Archivio della Compagnia di Gesù, Provincia Bohemiae 197, Fundationes II, Olomucense Collegium, Svidnicense Collegium, 1562–1747, fol. 97r–99r.

⁵⁷⁾ Philipp Friedrich Breuner was a patron of the Jesuits and a devout of St. Pauline, commissioning a sumptuous depository for her relics, completed in 1640. Helena ZÁPALKOVÁ, *Relikviář sv. Pavlína z pokladu olomoucké katedrály*, in M. Elbel – O. Jakubec (edd.), *Olomoucké baroko*, p. 211–218.

⁵⁸⁾ Václav Vrbna decided in that period (1639–1640) to secure a burial in the Jesuit church. In 1641 he and his wife donated to the statue of the Virgin Mary in the church a silver brocade dress and a large silk veil. J. VYVLEČKA, *Příspěvky k dějinám*, p. 40, 64.

⁵⁹⁾ For the Swedish occupation of Olomouc see Tomáš PARMA, *The Stormy Path to a Single Religion, 1600–1650*, in: A. Kalous (ed.), *Transformation*, p. 95–115.

⁶⁰⁾ "1662 23. Iunii (Est manus propria Patris Bohuslai Balbini). [...] Cum enim Tartari post annum Christi 1241 Olomucium obsedissent, Iaroslauus de Sternberg, qui se Olomucii cum parvo Bohemorum exercitu clauserat, hostem civibus Olomucensibus adiunctis aggressurus nocte, in foro Olomucensi DEO promisit se in honorem Beatissimae Virginis templum aedificaturum, si victoriam concederet. Vicit Iaroslauus et Tartari fugati, dux ipse Tartarorum manu Iaroslai interfectus. Ob hanc victoriam Beatissimae Virgini templum est conditum, ut asseverant historici Hagek in Annalibus, Paprocus in Diadocho et in Speculo Moraviae, alique historici citati in Diva Wartensi parte 2a ubi hanc rem totam ex historicorum fide narratam invenies." MZAB, G10 Sbirka rukopisů Moravského zemského archivu, inv. nr. 223, *Controversiae Patres*, fol. 86.

cused on more urgent matters than their church's title and the chapels' construction. At the same time, as the previously quoted paragraph in *Diva Wartensis* suggests, their expansive plans had only been postponed, waiting for the right moment to be resumed. This occasion came upon again in 1661, when the baron Jiří Valeřían Podstatský of Prusinovic donated 20 000 golden florins for the construction of a new church.⁶¹⁾ In June 1662, Balbín (in that period in Olomouc)⁶²⁾ prepared a historical argumentation based on his previously sketched "Marian" version of the Sternberg myth. Given the lack of material sources confirming the Sternberg's church foundation, Balbín relied primarily on written sources.⁶³⁾ From this moment onward, the Sternberg myth became a pillar of the Jesuit legal argumentation, together with the previously mentioned items of evidence (the rusty globe, the traditional devotion). The chapels' construction began in 1665 under another bishop, Karl of Liechtenstein-Castelkorn (elected in 1664).⁶⁴⁾ On 11th October 1665, an anti-Jesuit coalition composed of the Olomouc chapter, the city hall, the Conventuals and the Poor Clares, probably sanctioned by the new bishop, sent numerous villagers to the worksite, abruptly interrupting it.⁶⁵⁾

*"If this church is not dedicated to the Blessed Virgin Mary, how will (possibly) stand the ancient tradition and historians' truth that Jaroslav of Sternberg promised he would build a church in honour of the Blessed Virgin if he achieved victory against the Tartars? Consequently, either he did not fulfil his vow, or he did not obtain that glorious victory, which no one doubts."*⁶⁶⁾ In 1685, another phase of the controversy started, when the Jesuits temporarily succeeded in their plan to alter the church's devotional title, persuading bishop Liechtenstein-Castelkorn to modify the diocesan calendar. The *Dedicatio in Ecclesia S. Francisci Seraphici apud Patres Societatis Iesu* was to be removed from 15th August's entry. Similarly, the *Patrocinium apud Sanctum Franciscum Seraphicum* attributed to the Jesuit church was to be omitted from 4th October's entry. However, the Conventual protests forced the bishop to

⁶¹⁾ J. VYVLEČKA, *Príspevky k dějinám*, p. 61.

⁶²⁾ Antonín REJZEK, *Bohuslav Balbín T. J. Jeho život a práce*, Praha 1908, p. 169.

⁶³⁾ The Sternberg tombs mentioned by Paprocký in the *Zrcadlo* were not anymore preserved in 1662.

⁶⁴⁾ Contrary to Leopold Wilhelm, the new bishop resided in Moravia and was intensely involved in the diocesan pastoral care. Radmila Prchal PAVLÍČKOVÁ, *The Evolution of Catholic Identity, 1650–1700*, in: A. Kalous (ed.), *Transformation*, p.124–129.

⁶⁵⁾ MZAB, E 58 Premonstráti Nová Říše, inv. nr. 50, cart. 38 f, *Historia Conventus*, fol. 13rv.

⁶⁶⁾ *"Si hoc templum non est Beatissimae Virginis Mariae, quomodo stabit veritas antiquissimae traditionis et historicorum quod Iaroslavus de Sternberg voverit se (si victoriam contra Tartaros obtinuerit) templum honori Beatissimae Virginis aedificaturum? Et consequenter vel voto suo non satisfacit, vel victoriam illam gloriosam, de qua nemo dubitat, non obtinuit."* MZAB, G10 Šbirka rukopisů Moravského zemského archivu, inv. nr. 223, *Controversiae Patres*, fol. 137–139.

re-examine the case.⁶⁷⁾ The document quoted above, albeit undated, was used against the Conventuals in this third phase of the controversy (1685–1688). It reveals how crucial the theorhetorical value attached to the Sternberg myth had become in the Jesuit legal strategy: denying the Marian title of the church would have meant, for the Jesuits, also denying the miraculous Sternberg victory over the Tatars. Liechtenstein-Castelkorn, in reply to a Jesuit letter sent on 16th October 1685, explained there was no time to carefully scrutinise the Jesuit argumentation before printing the new calendar. Thus, on 20th October 1685, he halted any modification of it.⁶⁸⁾ After this decision, the Jesuit continued to pursue their plan, yet the bishop ultimately ruled against them in 1688.⁶⁹⁾

Regarding the fourth and final phase of the controversy (1712–1715), the *Controversiae* reveal that the Jesuit's dismay for their failure to restore the original title rapidly turned into an opportunity. The same bishop Liechtenstein-Castelkorn suggested to the frustrated Jesuits that the denomination and holiday could have been re-imposed by erecting a new church.⁷⁰⁾ Eventually, this project started in 1710, thanks to the legacy of the widow Iustina Thomasin from Opava, donated by her son, the Olomouc Jesuit Michael.⁷¹⁾ On 6th June 1712 (St. Pauline holiday), the church's founding stone was deposed, and the church publicly announced: "DEI-parae dicendam Virgini."⁷²⁾ Even this time, the Jesuits' project encountered strong opposition. The primary opponent to the Marian church's dedication was the Olomouc chapter, absentee Cardinal Wolfgang Schrattenbach (bishop of Olomouc 1711–1738).⁷³⁾ On 4th February 1714, the consistory denied the imposition of the devotional title of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary, claiming it belonged already to the nearby parish church of Our Lady and confirming the historicity of the Franciscan title. The reason behind the consistorial rejection was the Jesuit re-

⁶⁷⁾ Ibidem, fol. 141–142.

⁶⁸⁾ Ibidem, fol. 145.

⁶⁹⁾ Ibidem, fol. 143–144.

⁷⁰⁾ Ibidem, fol. 151–152, *Consilia Episcopi Olomucensis de tempore et modo, quo possit emanere titulus templi S. Francisci Seraphici*. 1688.

⁷¹⁾ Iustina left her substantial capital (about 38 000 florins) to her two sons. Michael donated part of his half to the Olomouc college, Henricus was a missing in action soldier. Not having received any information from his brother for many years, Michael decided to donate to the Olomouc college also part of the other half. NK ČR, Rukopisy Národní knihovny, rukopisy Pražské lobkowiczské knihovny, sign. C 104/2 (XXIII C 104b), Johannes Miller. *Historia provinciae Bohemiae Societatis Iesu ab anno 1555 usque ad annum 1723*. Liber IV, fol. 992–994. MZAB, G10 Sbírka rukopisů Moravského zemského archivu, inv. nr. 187, *Historia Fabricae*, fol. 11, 53.

⁷²⁾ Ibidem, fol. 32–33.

⁷³⁾ For more on Schrattenbach's tenure as Olomouc bishop see Martin ELBEL, *Consolidation, 1700–1750*, in: A. Kalous (ed.), *The Transformation*, p. 141–163.

quest to include the title in the diocesan calendar and obtain indulgences on its feast day.⁷⁴⁾

*"Having the Tartars invaded Moravia in the year 1141 with innumerable troops, or hordes, as they call them, they surrounded Olomouc".*⁷⁵⁾ The consistorial denial forced the Jesuits to revise their plans and change title; even in this case, the Sternberg myth remained a core part of their argumentation. In his *Historia Fabricae*, Johann Miller provides a detailed description of the events following the original title's rejection. Miller, inspired by an ancient statue of Madonna and Child preserved in the church, designed the peculiar title of the Most Holy Names of Mary and Jesus. The Jesuit Province pushed instead for the title *Regina Angelorum*, and later, under better circumstances, to re-impose the historical title of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary.⁷⁶⁾ In this context, to promote his superiors' vision, Miller wrote the manuscript *Anfang, und End der alten, wie auch der unter dem Titel, und Nahmen MARIAE Königin der Engel in dem Collegio der Gesellschaft IESU in Ollmütz neu aufgebauten Kirche. Beschrieben von P. NN. gemeldten Gesellschaft Priestern, im jahr 1714.*⁷⁷⁾ In this manuscript, to sustain the new title, he traced the origins of the Madonna and Child' statue to the times of Jaroslav of Sternberg.⁷⁸⁾ After the imposition of the new title of Our Lady of the Snows,⁷⁹⁾ Miller continued to adopt the Sternberg myth as theoretic argumentation in his *Historia Societatis provinciae Bohemiae*. As the quote above shows, Miller retro-dated the heroic

⁷⁴⁾ MZAB, G10 Sbirka rukopisů Moravského zemského archivu, inv. nr. 187, *Historia Fabricae*, fol. 88–89.

⁷⁵⁾ *"Cum anno 1141 Tartari [...] Moraviam innumeris hordis, ut ipsi vocant, sive turmis inundassent, Olomucium circumserunt [sic!].* NK ČR, Rukopisy Národní knihovny, rukopisy Pražské lobkowiczské knihovny, sign. XXIII C 104a, *Historia provinciae Bohemiae*, fol. 125–126., here fol. 125.

⁷⁶⁾ MZAB, G10 Sbirka rukopisů Moravského zemského archivu, inv. nr. 187, *Historia Fabricae*, fol. 89–91, 93–99, 101, 107–8.

⁷⁷⁾ This original title was later modified, and the epithet *Königin der Engel* struck through. Unfortunately, the current digitalised version of the manuscript does not include the front page with the title. ZAO-O, inv. nr. 5308, sign. 1737, *Anfang, und End*, fol. 1. <https://digi.archives.cz/da/permalink?xid=06E6CCF4549E11E49A600025649FE690&scan=2116ea246a33477780397a-c8f763bddb&parentType=10048>, last accessed 14. 4. 2023.

⁷⁸⁾ Kateřina HORNÍČKOVÁ, *A Unique Sign of True Faith. Medieval Marian Images and the Jesuit Construction of the Past*, in: K. Horníčková – M. Šroněk (edd.), *Jesuit Arts*, p. 125–191, here p. 147, 162.

⁷⁹⁾ Miller's successor Carolus Pfefferkorn on 16th February 1716, after an eight-month plague decimating Olomouc, gave the church its final title. For the popularity of this anti-plague Marian cult in Moravia. See Ondřej JAKUBEC, *Obraz SALUS POPULI ROMANI u brněnských jezuitů a obraznost potridentského katolicismu na předbělhořské Moravě*, in: Hana Jordánková – Vladimír Mañas (edd.), *Jezuité a Brno. Sociální a kulturní interakce koleje a města (1578–1773)*, Brno 2013, p. 77–98.

defence of Olomouc by one hundred years, confuting the consistorial claims that the Olomouc church title had always been that of St. Francis.⁸⁰⁾ Remaining unpublished, Miller's *Historia* did not succeed in quelling anti-Jesuit interpretations of the Sternberg myth and postponed forming its canonical version, achieved only with Schmidl.

"Then in fact, in the night, with his soldiers gathered for the battle in the square of Olomouc, he, with the lieutenants, went to the church of Corpus Christi, then a parish church, today part of the boarding school of the Society of Jesus. There, they consumed the sacrifice of the Mass, and, having received the Body of the Lord Jesus Christ, pledged themselves to live, or to die nobly."⁸¹⁾ The Jesuit theorhetorical contribution to the Sternberg myth, devised for its legal value, was soon followed by integrating the story into their pastoral activities, turning it into sacred topographies influenced by the Habsburg religious piety. In fact, not only was Jan Tanner's version inspired by the *pietas eucharistica*, paralleling Jaroslav of Sternberg with Rudolf I, the founder of the Habsburg dynasty, but also the two other hagiotopographies connected with the Tatar invasion of Moravia: Balbín's *Diva Montis Sancti* shows evident traits of *pietas Mariana*, while Matěj Tanner's *Hora Olivetská* reveals the influx of the *fiducia in crucem Christi*. As Marie-Elizabeth Ducreux has further investigated, historians and artists often merged the *pietas Austriaca* with local devotional traditions, employing *topoi* not necessarily linked with the Habsburg family. A relevant example is that of St. Wenceslas in Bohemia, connected to the Habsburg divine call to imperial dignity by Balbín and Jan Tanner.⁸²⁾

Jan Tanner was the first Jesuit to develop the Sternberg myth into a hagiotopography in 1661. Albeit aiming primarily to celebrate the Sternberg gentry and exalt the two young Sternberg pupils, Václav Vojtěch and Jan Norbert, Tanner also respected the sacred topography criteria. Indeed, he introduced in the description of the Olomouc Tatar siege the Eucharistic miracle, its relic (the surviving wooden

⁸⁰⁾ No founding chart of the Conventual church and the monastery have survived. Ondřej Jakubec advanced two hypothesis about the Conventual patron and church founder, either Albert of Sternberg († 1299) or Bruno of Schauenburg (Olomouc bishop 1245/7–1281), O. JAKUBEC, *Konventní kostel*, p. 38–49. Recent archeological findings have indicated the possible "existence of an early medieval parish Church of Our Lady in the area of the náměstí Republiky Square, near what is now the Church of Our Lady of the Snows" – thus before the Conventual settlement in Olomouc (estimated around 1230). Pavel ŠLÉZAR, *Archeologický výzkum u kostela Panny Marie Sněžné, Přehled výzkumů* 58, 2017, p. 97–127, here p. 127.

⁸¹⁾ "Tum enim suis nocte ad proelium in foro olomucensi congregatis, ipse cum tribunis ad templum CORPORIS CHRISTI tunc parochiale, nunc domesticum Convictus Societatis Iesu se confert, ibique peracto missae sacrificio, sumtoque Christi Domini Corpore sese ad generose vel vivendum, vel moriendum confirmavere." J. WULFF, *Vestigia Virtutis*, s. B3.

⁸²⁾ Marie-Elizabeth DUCREUX, *Emperors, Kingdoms, Territories: Multiple Versions of the „Pietas Austriaca“*, *The Catholic Historical Review* 97, 2011, p. 276–304.

table depicting the event), and its place of worship, the Corpus Christi chapel of Olomouc, above whose high altar the wooden table was placed. When Tanner wrote this version of the myth, the Corpus Christi chapel had been a part of the Olomouc Jesuit complex already for several decades. The chapel is located on the premises of the old Jewish synagogue. After the expulsion of the Jewish community from Olomouc in 1454, the synagogue was adapted into two residential houses.⁸³⁾ In 1591, these two houses were purchased by the Olomouc Jesuits, who built there their boarding school (in Tanner's words, the former parish church of the Corpus Christi indeed became *templum domesticum*).⁸⁴⁾

Recent historiographical research has questioned the originality of Tanner's version. Kateřina Dolejší and Leoš Mlčák argued that this version was circulating in Olomouc already at the beginning of the 17th century, printed on a single sheet.⁸⁵⁾ It had been loosely based on the Spanish miracle of Daroca, codified in its most famous version by Gaspar de la Cueva, in 1539.⁸⁶⁾ According to their hypothesis, the story of Daroca reached Olomouc, imported by a Spanish Jesuit, along with its devotional print made by Jacques Granthomme. A copy of this engraving had been discovered in the early 2000's by Jan Royt in an antique shop in Prague.

"However, Jaroslav's piety did not stop there; he was also determined to invoke the very Holy Mother of God, the Help of Christians, and when he arrived with the captains from the [Corpus Christi] church to the square, he solemnly declared to all the people, who were already shivering from the clash, with what confidence he would attempt an enterprise immense in scope, uncertain in the outcome, to attack such

⁸³⁾ Hedvika SEDLÁČKOVÁ, *Výsledky archeologického výzkumu v areálu bývalého Jezuitského konviku v Olomouci*, in: J. Fiala et alii, *Jezuitský konvikt*, p. 201–219, here p. 213.

⁸⁴⁾ A. KROESS, SJ, *Geschichte*, p. 530–531. For more on the background of the Corpus Christi devotion in Olomouc see Daniel SOUKUP, *The Alleged Conversion of the Olomouc Rabbi Moses in 1425. Contribution to the Host Desecration Legends in Medieval Literature: a Latin Report on the Conversion of Rabbi Moses in Olomouc*, *Judaica Bohemiae* 38, 2013, p. 5–38.

⁸⁵⁾ A version of this print, dated back by Dolejší and Mlčák to the early 17th century, was found without the engraving in the collection of Jan Peter Cerroni. MZAB, G 12 Cerroniho sbírka, sign. Cerr II, book 249/2, fol. 42. Another version was discovered, together with the engraving, in the diary of the Premonstratensian canon of Hradisko monastery, dated around 1725.

⁸⁶⁾ Gaspar Miguel DE LA CUEVA, *Historia del divino misterio del Santísimo Sacramento de los Corporales de Daroca que aconteció en la conquista del Reyno de Valencia y vino por voluntad divina a la ciudad de Daroca, en el reyno de Aragon*, Zaragoza 1590. The first edition of the *Historia* (Alcalá 1539) was reprinted several times (Zaragoza 1563, 1582, 1590, 1635). See Alexander Samuel WILKINSON, *Iberian Books. Books Published in Spanish Or Portuguese Or on the Iberian Peninsula Before 1601*, Leiden – Boston 2010, p. 160–161; Alejandra ULLA LORENZO – Alexander Samuel WILKINSON, *Books Published in Spain, Portugal and the New World or Elsewhere in Spanish or Portuguese between 1601 and 1650*, Leiden – Boston 2015, p. 328.

large hordes of Tartars with such a small handful (in fact, every single soldier had to face about 25 Tartars). He immediately ordered that everyone who was in the central square of Olomouc should kneel in supplication, and in the imminence of the battle, implore with an Ave Maria the Mother of God, Queen of Heaven, as Patron, [terrible as] an army set in battle array, so that with Her patronage they could be made terrible and invincible to the Tartars. He also, in a loud voice, which all could hear, made a vow to the Lord that he would build a temple to the Divine Mother Virgin if he successfully routed those barbarians."⁸⁷⁾ Concerning the textual priority of this "Eucharistic" version of the Sternberg myth, several elements point to Tanner's *Vestigia* rather than the allegedly early 17th-century text mentioned by Dolejší and Mlčák. A careful comparison of the two versions would reveal that most of the sentences in the allegedly early 17th-century text were extrapolated from the *Vestigia*. As the quote above indicates, Tanner's version is longer and more detailed than the other one; incipits and explicits of the *Vestigia*, digressions and embellishments are often omitted in the allegedly early 17th-century text, which is more concise and direct. Another aspect to consider is the lack of mention of the Sternberg myth in the first phase of the Conventual-Jesuit controversy (1635/1636–1641). The priority of the text now preserved in the Cerroni collection would imply that Balbin was not the first Jesuit author contributing to the Sternberg myth, as well as that he and Tanner copied this early 17th-century prototype mentioning both the Marian invocation and the Eucharistic miracle.⁸⁸⁾

Regarding the influence of the Daroca miracle's engraving on this "Eucharistic" version of the Sternberg myth, recent findings suggest a different explanation about the origins, diffusion, and impact of this print. In the *Vestigia*, besides describing

⁸⁷⁾ "*Sed neque hic stetit IAROSLAI pietas; ad ipsam [in the allegedly early 17th century version, "ipsam" is substituted with "Sancitissimam"] etiam DEIparam Christianorum Auxiliatricem confugiendum ratus, ubi cum Ducibus e templo ad forum venit, **palam omnibus iam praelium spirantibus declaravit, qua potissimum fiducia rem mole maximam, eventu dubiam aggredi, manuque tam exigua tantos Tartarorum cumulos (singuli enim militum 25 fere Tartaris opponendi erant) aggredi attentaret: mox enim omnes ut erant in medio Olomucensis Urbis foro genua supplex flectere iussit, ac DEIparam Coeli Reginam, [terribilem ut] **ordinatam castrorum Acie** praelio imminenti Patronam pie recitata Salutatione Angelica implorare, cuius videlicet patrocinio possent reddi Tartaris terribiles, et invicti. Ipse porro elata voce, quae posset ab omnibus percipi, votum vovit Domino aedem se Divae Matri Virgini positurum, si Barbaros illos feliciter profligasset.***" The parts in bold are the additions present in J. WULFF, *Vestigia Virtutis*, C; the rest comes from MZAB, G 12 Cerroniho sbirka, sign. Cerr II, book 249/2, fol. 42.

⁸⁸⁾ It should be noted that Balbin and Tanner worked on the same topics in a different fashion. While Balbin, attempting to style himself as a solid historian, reduced to the minimum any stylistic embellishment unsustained by sources, Tanner tended to enrich further what Balbin previously sketched. An example, besides the Sternberg myth, could be the legend of St. Wencelas, see M. DUCREUX, *Emperors, Kingdoms, Territories*, p. 297.

the Sternberg myth, Tanner included its devotional print, a drawing of the original wooden table preserved (according to him) in the Corpus Christi chapel made by Karel Škréta, engraved and printed by Daniel Wussim. Dolejší and Mlčák considered this print a copy of the original crafted in the first half of the 17th century by Granthomme, questioning the hypothesis of Petra Zelenková. According to Zelenková, while Tanner was the historiographer of the Sternbergs, developing a coherent narrative of their glorious deeds, Karel Škréta should be acknowledged as the “artist of the Sternberg myth,” designing the iconography of their power and status, including the engraving in the *Vestigia*.⁸⁹⁾

Apropos the obscure origins of the engraving of the Daroca miracle, a new hypothesis can be presented. The Flemish Jacques Granthomme and Thomas de Leu should be credited as printers, not authors. The engraving is probably a collage of two artworks, as the upper part of the image (depicting the crowned Madonna with Child and two Angels holding up the corporal with the six holy particles) was already in the frontispiece of Cueva's *Historia del divino misterio*. Granthomme and de Leu, despite their Reformed background and sympathies,⁹⁰⁾ were attracted in their youth to Paris and started their artistic career in the propagandistic circles of the Ligue, in a period of significant Spanish influence.⁹¹⁾ Throughout their lives, they entertained trade relations with each other and famous French artists.⁹²⁾ In the emerging and rapid-changing printing world, where engravings were altered, copied, and reprinted without crediting their author,⁹³⁾ de Leu, and Granthomme

⁸⁹⁾ Petra ZELENKOVÁ, „*Vidi stellas undecim...*“ Šternberské alegorie na grafických listech podle Karla Škréty, *Umění* 54, 2006, p. 327–342.

⁹⁰⁾ Three of de Leu's uncles were executed or banished from Oudenaarde (Flanders) and Lessines (Hainaut) because of their Calvinist faith. Pierre LELEUX, *Les origines familiales du graveur Thomas de Leu*, *Nouvelles de l'estampe* 262, 2019, p. 1–6. Granthomme died in Heidelberg. Peter FUHRING, *Shorter Notice: Isaac Leschevin: Embroiderer, Gardener and Printmaker*, *Print Quarterly* 18, 2001, p. 308. As other printers, publishers and artists, de Leu and Granthomme probably worked for Catholic committants despite their religious beliefs. Michiel VAN GROESEN, *The Representations of the Overseas World in the De Bry Collection of Voyages (1590–1634)*, Leiden – Boston 2008, p. 103–105.

⁹¹⁾ Denis PALLIER, *Recherches sur l'imprimerie à Paris pendant la Ligue (1585–1594)*, Genève 1976, p. 67, 129, 162.

⁹²⁾ De Leu is considered one the most talented artists in the late 16th-century Parisian scene, while Granthomme is generally perceived as a less original artist. Jean ADHEMAR, *Thomas de Leu et les portraits gravés d'Henri IV*, Maso Finiguerra, *Rivista della Stampa incisa e del libro illustrato* 2, 1937, p. 219–226.

⁹³⁾ An emblematic case is represented indeed by the engravings of the *XII Sibyllarum icones elegantissimi*, designed by the Dutch Crispijn de Passe in 1601, later copied by de Leu in 1605 and again by Granthomme around 1609. Agustina Rodríguez ROMERO – Almerindo OJEDA, *Sibilas en Europa y América/ Repercusiones del Sibyllarum Icones de Crispijn de Passe en los siglos XVII y XVIII*, *Archivo español de Arte* 88, 2015, p. 263–280.

furthered their artistic *cursus honorum* from drawing under larger publishing houses' commissions⁹⁴⁾ to setting up their own press.⁹⁵⁾ Their printing (*excudit*) of the Daroca engraving can be dated around 1585–1594,⁹⁶⁾ or after the Twelve Years' Truce in 1609.⁹⁷⁾

According to Verheggen, the Daroca engraving belongs to the category of devotional prints. Research has traditionally underestimated the context in which this kind of religious imagery was created and used.⁹⁸⁾ After the Council of Trent, a vast Catholic (mostly Jesuit) literature defending the salvific role of sacred images and promoting the value of inner spirituality emerged. In this context, as their German name (*Andachtsbilder*) indicates, devotional prints supported prayer and meditation. Devotional prints were generally employed by religious living women, who were less proficient in reading skills and far more numerous than their male counterparts. These religious images could accompany specific edifying sermons yet could also be taken from their original context, sold separately, and transferred into a new religious milieu.⁹⁹⁾

The Daroca engraving printed by de Leu was bound in a manuscript written around 1632–1636 by the Amsterdam beguine Aeltge Jans van de Poel. This manuscript includes eight devotional prints (five ascribed to de Leu) and several sermons by the Jesuit Leonardus Marius, spiritual director of the same beguineage. Interestingly, the devotional prints in the manuscript bear little or no connection with Marius' sermons.¹⁰⁰⁾ Marius promoted the Eucharistic devotion in the Amsterdam beguineage and linked the Eucharistic mystery to the local context. In 1639, he published the story of the Eucharistic miracle of Amsterdam in Antwerp.¹⁰¹⁾ According to the legend, in 1345, a man fell so ill that he called the priest to receive the Holy Communion, preparing to die. Then, he vomited the host in the

⁹⁴⁾ J. ROMAN, *Le Peintre Pierre Gourdelle*, Réunion des Sociétés des Beaux-Arts des Départements, douzième session, 1888, p. 268–289, here p. 274, 277–278; M. GROESEN, *The Representations*, p. 123.

⁹⁵⁾ Estelle LEUTRAT, *Feu honorable homme Leonart Gaultier, vivant maistre graveur a Paris. Nouveaux documents sur l'estampe en France au début du XVII^e siècle*, Documents d'histoire parisienne 18, 2016, p. 25–42, here p. 36.

⁹⁶⁾ This period was the apex of the Ligue propagandistic activities. D. PALLIER, *Recherches sur l'imprimerie*, p. 10.

⁹⁷⁾ After the truce, the Catholic presence in the Low Countries consolidated, and the Dutch primacy in the European book trade gained momentum. M. GROESEN, *The Representations*, p. 91, 97–98.

⁹⁸⁾ E. VERHEGGEN, *Beelden voor Passie*, p. 15.

⁹⁹⁾ Ibidem, p. 21, 27, 30–32, 35, 39, 80.

¹⁰⁰⁾ Ibidem, p. 111.

¹⁰¹⁾ Leonard MARIUS, *Amstelredams eer ende opcomen : door de denckwaardighe miraklen aldaer gescheid, aen ende door het H. Sacrement des altaers. Anno 1345*, Antwerpen 1639.



Devotional print of the “Los Sanctissimos Corporales de la ciudad de Daroca.” Author unknown; printer Thomas de Leu. It is bound in a manuscript written around 1632–1636 by the Amsterdam beguine Aeltge Jans van de Poel. Allard Pierson, University of Amsterdam, hs. XXV C 79.

fire, which remained miraculously intact. On the spot of the miracle, a chapel called Holy Stead was erected, becoming a popular devotion place soon. In 1578 the Calvinists forcefully closed it, halting liturgies and pilgrimages. Marius' version of the Amsterdam miracle, partially differing from the previous ones, spread rapidly and became a canon, even eliciting Reformed complaints against the "damnable effronteries" of the Catholics.¹⁰²⁾

Moving to the transmission of the Daroca devotional print, Tanner already provided in 1674 with a plausible explanation, which has not been considered in recent historiography. In *Historia Heroum de Stellis* (1674),¹⁰³⁾ Tanner affirms that the first Jesuit acknowledging the Olomouc Eucharistic miracle's paint (not anymore a wooden table) was the Flemish Jacob Hack.¹⁰⁴⁾ Hack (or Haick) was born in Gangelt, in the Duchy of Jülich. His family, both from his father's and mother's side (Gartzwiler), held influential political positions in the region and the Imperial court. He studied in Graz, was a novice in Brno in 1599–1600, and then started serving in various offices in several Bohemian and Moravian Jesuit colleges. During the Bohemian Revolt he was the confessor of Henri Duval, Count of Dampierre, and served as a military chaplain.¹⁰⁵⁾ His tenure as regent of the Olomouc convict and prefect of the students started in 1622.¹⁰⁶⁾

Given Hack's nationality, the presence of a copy of the engraving in the Amsterdam beguinage, and the dramatic condition of the Olomouc college after the Bohemian Revolt, a new hypothesis about the spreading of the Daroca devotional print in Olomouc can be presented here: Hack brought the devotional print himself by obtaining it in the Low Countries or during his tenure as a chaplain in the imperial army, abounding Spanish soldiers, officers, diplomats, and priests.

Regarding the impact of the Daroca miracle and its devotional print on the Sternberg myth, it should be noted that significant details of the Spanish story were ignored (consciously or unconsciously). Primarily, the miracle of Daroca did take place on a hill called Puch del Codol, nearby the castle of Chio, in the kingdom of Valencia. Preparing to launch an assault on the castle, the Christian forces com-

¹⁰²⁾ Charles CASPERS – Peter Jan MARGRY, *The Miracle of Amsterdam. Biography of a Contested Devotion*, Notre Dame 2019.

¹⁰³⁾ The original Latin manuscript is stored in Knihovna Národního muzea v Praze, sign. VII D 7, Pars II, Eorum in Boemia et Moravia gesta ordine Chronico descripta continens, Caput III: Jaroslai de Sternberg mirabilis Victoria adversus Tartaros, fol. 58.

¹⁰⁴⁾ Cfr. also its German translation. Jan TANNER, *Geschichte derer Helden von Sternen*, Prag 1732, p. 118.

¹⁰⁵⁾ Augustinus M. P. P. JANSSEN (ed.), *Jacobus Kritzaedt: Annales Gangeltenses*, Maastricht – Heinsberg en Sittard 2005, p. 232.

¹⁰⁶⁾ Ladislaus LUKÁCS (ed.), *Catalogi personarum et officiorum Provinciae Austriae S. I. II (1601–1640)*, Romae 1978, p. 682.

manded by Don Berenguel Dentença were caught by surprise by a large Moorish army. Dentença and five of his captains attended Mass in a tent and waited to take the Holy Communion on behalf of the entire army. The clamour of the approaching enemy forced the priest to interrupt the liturgy and depose the six particles in the corporals. He then hid the holy treasure under the rocks while Dentença and his soldiers fought the Moors. After the battle, the priest retrieved the corporals and noticed that the six hosts had miraculously changed color, partially turning into bloody red and adhering to them so firmly that they did not fall when exhibited. Later, Dentença and the captains discussed who should bring back the miraculous corporals: Daroca was picked by chance. The corporals were placed on a female donkey, eventually reaching the city alone.¹⁰⁷⁾ Since then, Daroca received the biblical motto, "He hath not done so for every nation."¹⁰⁸⁾

"So he placed those five Eucharistic particles in such a small ark and took that donkey with him into battle, with the priest accompanying it. It was indisputably an auspicious omen: as nobody can doubt the Palm and the Triumph, renewing already, before the battle, the memory of the triumphal glory of the Lord Jesus Christ, carried on a donkey to Jerusalem among the palm trees and the people's approval. Moreover, if the Children of Israel once proved that the Ark of the Covenant was worth so much in battles against the enemies of God, how could Jaroslav have doubted the victory, with this far nobler Ark occupying the position of commander among the troops?"¹⁰⁹⁾ Of all the mentioned aspects of the Spanish miracle, Tanner integrated into the Sternberg myth only the donkey (however, a male, thus changing the biblical reference)¹¹⁰⁾ and the particles (five instead of six). Setting the stage for the Sternberg myth in Olomouc, he ignored the presence of the tent, changing it with the Corpus Christi church. He also introduced the miracle of the exceeding holy particles, while in the Daroca miracle their limited number was due to the impossibility of communicating with the entire army. In Tanner's description, the donkey and the priest go to war, assisting Sternberg and the Christian troops. The miraculous victory is attrib-

¹⁰⁷⁾ G. CUEVA. *Historia del divino misterio*, fol. 10r-45v.

¹⁰⁸⁾ Ibidem, 45v. "Non fecit taliter omni nationi." Psalm 147.

¹⁰⁹⁾ "Huic ergo arculae illas quinque eucharisticas particulas imponit, asellumque illum comitante Sacerdote secum deducit in proelium. fausto profecto omine, ut qui non posset de Palma & Triumpho dubitare, cum iam, licet ante praelium, triumphalis inter Palmas & plausus Asello Hierosolymam vecti Domini IESU Gloriam memoriam renovaret. Et certe si Arcam Foederis adversus DEI hostes tantum valere in praelis olim experti sunt Filii Israël, quomodo de victoria dubitasset IAROSLAUS, Arca hac longe nobiliori, Imperatoris vices medio in Exercitu obtinente?" J. WULFF, *Vestigia Virtutis*, C.

¹¹⁰⁾ While Tanner clearly referred to the entrance of Jesus in Jerusalem (Matthew 21:5), already prefigured in Zechariah 9:9, the female donkey in the miracle of Daroca might refer to the female donkey of Balaam, speaking also in God's name (Numbers 22:21).

uted to the intervention of Corpus Christi and the Virgin, while in the Spanish miracle there was also a reference to Saint James, the “Moor-slayer.” After the Tatars’ defeat, the priest discovered that the hosts had increased in size and partially looked like real flesh, without mentioning their miraculous adhesiveness to the corporals. Ignoring the contention in the Spanish myth for obtaining the holy hosts, in Tanner’s description, the donkey autonomously went back to Olomouc and the church of Corpus Christi after the victory. In this sense, the hypothesis of an early 17th-century Olomouc adaptation of the Daroca miracle, imported by a Spanish Jesuit, seems less plausible than an original Tanner’s creation of this Eucharistic version.

If Tanner was the first Jesuit to structure the myth of Jaroslav of Sternberg according to the canons of sacred topography, he was not the only one. His friend Bohuslav Balbín (*Diva Wartensis*, 1665) and his brother Matěj Tanner (*Hora Olivetská*, 1667) further expanded the myth of the Tatar invasion of Olomouc, respectively linking it to the Marian pilgrimage site of Hostýn, and *via Crucis* in Kotouč. According to Balbín, the Virgin Mary performed two miracles in Hostýn: first, she created a water spring, saving the besieged Moravians from thirst, and then she repelled the Tatars by making rain stones over them.¹¹¹⁾ Matěj Tanner (postponing the invasion to 1253) mentioned a generic divine miracle, the inundation of the valley below the hill of Kotouč. The fascinating aspect of Tanner’s version, as its title hints, is the linking of the Tatar invasion to a hill called Mount Olives, where in Tanner’s times, the Jesuits celebrated the passion of Christ (Kotouč was part of the Jesuit domain of Štramberk). Despite not adding anything new to the figure of Jaroslav of Sternberg (the mythical hero did not take part in the sieges of the two holy hills), Balbín and Matěj Tanner’s sacred topographies were extremely important for the diffusion of the Sternberg in the Czech society.

The Jesuit versions of the Sternberg myth produced cultural consequences outlasting their legal attempts to alter the Olomouc church and their willingness to provide their sacred spaces with miraculous origins: eventually, the myth moved into the realm of cultural memory. The cultural penetration of the Jesuit versions of the Sternberg myth into Bohemian and Moravian cultural memory was presumably favoured by three intertwined factors: the popularity of the ritual pilgrimages to Hostýn and Kotouč, the recurring Ottoman threat and the Jesuit ability to parallel it with the mythical medieval Tatar invasion (for instance, in anti-Ottoman sermons *à la Knittel*), and the integration of the event in the *Sacri pulveres*, the sacred calendar designed Georgius Crugerius.

¹¹¹⁾ This water spring was believed to have miraculous healing powers. In 1700, a chapel was erected near it. S. BUČEK, *Obraz Svatého Hostýna*, p. 8.

Assimilation of past events into cultural memory depends more on ritual repetition of the past narrative (and its emotional appeal) than its artistic quality and philosophical/theological depth. Making pilgrimages and listening to sermons, the believers slowly became accustomed to the Tatar myth until it became a part of their identity, influencing their behaviour and their interpretation of the world.¹¹²⁾ Regarding the emotional appeal of the mythical Tatar invasion to the 17th-century Bohemian and Moravian society, it must be noticed that first in 1623,¹¹³⁾ and more dramatically in 1663,¹¹⁴⁾ Ottoman and Tatar troops invaded Moravia: the pillaging, enslaving, and brutality of these invasions certainly traumatised the Bohemian and Moravian society at all levels, activating defensive mechanisms such as the “discovery” of traces of the past.¹¹⁵⁾ Indeed, soon after the end of the Austrian-Turkish war (1664), the Jesuits developed two new versions of the Tatar myth, attributing anti-Ottoman features to existing pilgrimage sites, as it has been mentioned above. The survival of collective memory is also strongly dependent on dates designed or used for remembering crucial historical events.¹¹⁶⁾ In 1669, after placing it on the map and in historical books, the Jesuits included the Sternberg myth in the calendar, providing a date to commemorate this glorious event.¹¹⁷⁾

A valuable insight about the level of penetration of the Jesuit versions of the Sternberg myth into the Bohemian and Moravian cultural memory is represented by the influence of Caspar Knittel's sermon *The Christian Mars against the Sultan*. Published soon after the second siege of Vienna, the midst of the Great Turkish War, Knittel's particular version of the myth (itself an elaboration of Tanner's version) became so authoritative to be copied and modified even by the Conventuals. Two sources, one manuscript, the undated *Historia Conventus Sancti Francisci*, and one printed, the 1724 *Saeculum quintum*, describe Jaroslav of Sternberg's heroic defence of Olomouc. The minimal differences between the two versions indicate

¹¹²⁾ Hans J. MARKOWITSCH, *Cultural Memory and the Neurosciences*, in: A. Erll – A. Nünning (edd.), *Cultural Memory Studies*, p. 275–284, here p. 278.

¹¹³⁾ Josef POLIŠENSKÝ, *The Thirty Years War*, Berkeley – Los Angeles 1971, p. 155–157.

¹¹⁴⁾ Josef VÁLKA, *Dějiny Moravy II. Morava reformace, renesance a baroka*, Brno 1996, p. 119–120; Ivana ČORNEJOVÁ et alii, *Velké dějiny země Koruny české VIII*, Praha – Litomyšl 2008, p. 196–207.

¹¹⁵⁾ Studying the ancient Middle-East, Jan Assman observed that under circumstances of existential threat coming from another group, there was a strong push for cultural distinction and self-awareness. J. ASSMANN, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization*, p. 133.

¹¹⁶⁾ C. LINDE, *Working the Past*, p. 44, 47.

¹¹⁷⁾ František Palacký's celebre lecture for the 600th anniversary of the Tatar invasion of Moravia was pronounced on June 24th, 1841. František PALACKÝ, *Der Mongolen Einfall im Jahre 1241: eine kritische Zusammenstellung und Sichtung aller darüber vorhandenen Quellennachrichten, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Niederlage der Mongolen bei Olmütz*, Prag 1842, p. 371–408.

that one of them, probably the *Historia Conventus*, was the source for the second. The rationale for this Conventual revision of the Sternberg myth was probably to design a rhetorical tool for the controversy (in case the *Historia Conventus* was compiled before 1714) or for furthering their economic-religious interests. Indeed, in 1727 the Conventuals attempted again to obtain from the Olomouc chapter the parish church of St. Peter as compensation for the cession of their church and monastery to the Jesuits.¹¹⁸⁾

For instance, *the Marcomannian historian and the same reverend father Caspar Knittel of the Society of Jesus, in his Sunday academic orations, winter part, folio 179, on the prodigies of the Holiest Sacrament, reported that, in the year of our lord 1241, like a deluge, the Tartars had flooded all over Marcomannia and the very metropolis of Olomouc, which was already about to be submerged in blood. And here! The Bohemian king Wenceslaus Ottokar sent that hero Jaroslav Sternberg, who did not go but flew to Olomouc; [...] However, all weapons being ineffective without the support of God, Jaroslav went with his officers to the church of the Most Holy Corpus Christi (today part of the boarding school). There he expiated the confession with all his followers, received the holiest Body of Christ, and completed the sacrifice of the Mass officiated by a priest of the Conventual Minorites (as evidenced by the very ancient wooden tablet of this church), he pledged to live, or die. [...] And he made a vow to God: if he had won the victory against the barbarians, he would have built a church of the Divine Virgin Mother with a monastery for the disciples of the Seraphic. [...] Having won a victory against the barbarians, the triumphant veteran Jaroslav fulfilled his vow to God that he had pronounced before the battle, namely to build a convent and a church dedicated to St. Francis for the Minor Conventual friars, in which he wanted to be buried with all his descendants, as they were.*"¹¹⁹⁾ As the quote above indicates,

¹¹⁸⁾ ZAO-O, Arcibiskupství Olomouc, inv. nr. 2071, sign. Bb89, fol. 114r–128v, Acta Minorittas [sic!] Olomucenses et cessionem eorundem ecclesiae, et Monasteri Patribus Societatis Iesu anno 1569 cum petitione, obtinendi in recompensationem templi, et parochiae ad Sanctum Petrum Olomucii concernentia (1727).

¹¹⁹⁾ „Anno Domini 1241. Quemadmodum Historicus Marcommanus, et ex ipso Reverendo Patre Casparo Knitl [Knittel] e Societatis Iesu in suis concionibus Dominicae Accademicis parte Hiemali fol. 179 de prodigiis sanctissimi sacramenti refert, quasi diluvium Tartarorum universam Marcomanniam inundaverat et ipsa Metropolis Olomucium iam in sanguine submergenda erat. Et ecce! misit Rex Bohemiae Wenceslaus Ottogarus heroem illum Jaroslaum Sternbergicum, qui non ivit, sed advolavit Olomucium; [...] Cum autem arma omnia sine Deo sint inermia properat Iaroslaus cum suis Tribunis ad Templum Sanctissimi Corporis Christi (nunc Convictus) ac ibidem sacra confessione cum omnibus suis expiatur. Sanctissimo Corpore Christi reficitur, et peccato Missae sacrificio per sacerdotem Minorum Conventualium (uti antiquissima huius templi lignea demonstrat tabella) surgit ad moriendum, aut vincendum. [...] Deoque facit votum: se aedem Divae Matri Virgini cum Monasterio pro Seraphicis Alumnis positurum si contra barbariem reportaverit victoriam! [...] Victoria reportata contra barbariem triumphator Iaroslaus redux reddit do-

before engaging in battle, Sternberg and his captains attended Mass and wanted to receive the Holy Communion in the parish church of Corpus Christi. The priest celebrating the liturgy was indeed a Conventual. Having witnessed the first miracle of the exceeding particles, Sternberg vowed to erect a church dedicated to the Virgin Mary and a monastery for the Conventuals. Having obtained the miraculous victory, Sternberg fulfilled his pledge, erected a church, and donated it to the Conventual order, imposing the title of St. Francis.¹²⁰⁾

Circulating at the beginning of the 18th century, when the Conventual role in the controversy was declining, and the new Jesuit church was probably already constructed, this Conventual version represented for the Jesuits a cultural memory challenge rather than a legal issue. It could be assumed that the emergence of alternative interpretations of the myth furthered its spreading through society, as they urged a Jesuit response. In order to create a Jesuit canon of the Sternberg myth, a few years after the *Saeculum quintum*, Schmidl summarised the various Jesuit versions in the *Historiae Societatis Iesu Provinciae Bohemiae*. Given the eminent Jesuit role in Bohemian and Moravian society, particularly in youth education and the spiritual direction of confraternities, the publication of an official Jesuit version of the Sternberg myth rapidly disseminated through the various strata of the society. Schmidl's endeavour, harmonising one hundred years of Jesuit interpretations of the mythical Tatar invasion of Moravia, ultimately failed in the harsh context of the Josephinian reforms and the Jesuit order suppression. When, in the early 19th century, the Sternberg myth started becoming a crucial issue for Czech nationalism, the Jesuits were not anymore its (foremost) custodians.

Conclusion

This article has attempted to describe the whereby and causes for the Jesuit order to alter the late-medieval Sternberg myth, employing it in the realms of theorhetorics, sacred topography and cultural memory. By analysing the origins, development, and dissemination of the Jesuit versions of the myth, it has also attempted to con-

mino votum, quod ante pugnam voverat, videlicet aedificando pro Fratribus Minoribus Conventualibus conventum, et Ecclesiam Sancto Francisco dedicatam, in quo ipse cum tota sua familia seu genealogia tumulare voluit, et tumulati sunt." In bold, the parts quoted verbatim from Knittel *Conciones Academicæ*, p. 179–180. The rest was included in the manuscript MZAB, E58 Premonstrāti Nová Říše, inv. nr. 50, cart. 38 f, *Historia Conventus*, fol. 4v–5r and in the printed *Saeculum quintum*, p. 39–40.

¹²⁰⁾ Based on several documents of the Conventual-Jesuit controversy, it could be assumed that the church of the Virgin Mary indicated in these two documents was the parish church of Our Lady on the Předhradí.

tribute to recent historiographical research on this topic. Regarding the origins, this article has stressed the role of Balbín's *Diva Wartensis* as the first Jesuit contribution to the story,¹²¹ furthering the recent research efforts by Tomáš Somer. Through the analysis of several unedited sources, in primis the manuscript *Controversiae Patres Societatis IESU inter, et Patres Conventuales Olomucii* written by Johannes Miller, this article has argued that Balbín's contribution was primarily theorhetorical, aimed to sustain the Olomouc Jesuits in a legal quarrel over the rights of their church against the Conventuals. This rhetorical use of the Sternberg myth continued until the fourth phase of this controversy (1711–1715), with after-effects in Miller's unpublished *Historia provinciae Bohemiae Societatis Iesu*.

On the development, this article has focused on the “Eucharistic” version crafted by Jan Tanner, examining the hypothesis of Kateřina Dolejší and Leoš Mlčák that his contribution was inspired by an early 17th-century version: this antecedent version was influenced by the medieval Spanish Eucharistic miracle of Daroca and its devotional print, brought to Olomouc by a Spanish Jesuit. By comparing the content of the Daroca miracle and its devotional print with the Sternberg myth, this article has argued that Tanner crafted an original version, modelled after the genre of sacred topography and influenced by the *pietas eucharistica*. His contribution provided the Olomouc Corpus Christi chapel with miraculous and epic origins. The authorship of the Daroca devotional print is uncertain, probably connected with the Spanish influence in the Low Countries and France. It was later printed by the Flemish Jacques Granthomme and Thomas de Leu and presumably sold separately. Few elements of the Spanish miracle were included in the Sternberg myth, which could be derived from an iconographic reading of the print. This article also hypothesised that the Daroca devotional print was brought by the Flemish Jesuit Jacobus Hack.

On the dissemination, this article has analysed the influence of Caspar Knittel's anti-Ottoman sermon *Mars Christianus contra Sultatum*, shedding additional light on the Jesuit role in adopting the Sternberg myth in the Bohemian-Moravian, and later Czech cultural memory. Through the analysis of two Conventual sources, modelled after Knittel's sermon, this article has disputed that the Jesuit medial and ritual activities surrounding the Sternberg myth favoured its penetration into cultural memory, making the Jesuit version so popular that even their “rivals” followed it. A crucial role was played by the sacred topographies connecting the myth to the pilgrimage sites of Hostýn and Kotouč, along

¹²¹ Indeed, the Jesuit Julius Solimanus was the first to employ the Sternberg myth as an aedifying example for the young Bohemians in his oration *De Bohemorum ad eloquentiam ingenio*, performed in 1626 in Prague. Raphael UNGAR (ed.), *Bohuslai e S. I. Balbini Bohemia Docta, opus posthumum I*, Pragae 1776, p. 130–131.

with the designation of a date for commemorating the event (25th June). Due to the emergence of this alternative Conventual version, Johannes Schmidl attempted to create a Jesuit canonical account of the Sternberg story, defending it from external revisionism, succeeding whereas Johannes Miller had failed. Schmidl's endeavour, albeit soon crushed in the late 18th-century anti-Jesuit atmosphere prevailing in the Czech Lands, furthered the dissemination of the myth throughout different social echelons, ultimately paving the way for its re-emergence at the beginning of the 19th century in the context of the Czech national revival.

Andrea T r e n t a

TEORÉTORIKA, POSVÁTNÁ TOPOGRAFIE A KULTURNÍ PAMĚŤ.

Jezuitské příspěvky k mýtu o Jaroslavu ze Šternberka (1655–1747)

SHRNUTÍ

Jezuitský řád měl zvláštní vztah k minulosti. Historie byla považována za odvětví rétoriky zaměřené především na objevování božích zásahů v lidských osudech. Tato koncepce formovala řádovou pedagogiku, zbožnost, uměleckou produkci, a dokonce zasahovala i do argumentace v rámci právních sporů. Tento narativ se později stal součástí jezuitské kulturní paměti. Jejím výmluvným příkladem i ukázkou celkového jezuitského přístupu k minulosti je proměna legendy o tatarském obléhání Olomouce v roce 1241, která vznikla kolem poloviny 14. století a vyprávěla o hrdinské obraně města vedené Jaroslavem ze Šternberka. Jezuité se začali tomuto mýtu věnovat v roce 1655 a to díky Bohuslavu Balbínovi, který tuto událost pozměnil v zakládací legendu olomouckého jezuitského kostela. Balbínova adaptace sloužila olomouckým jezuitům jako zásadní důkaz v soudním sporu, který vedli proti františkánům, bývalým majitelům kostela. Kolem roku 1636, kdy jezuité plánovali zřídit v rámci chrámu nové kaple a udělit mu mariánský titul, byli františkány obviněni z hanobení jejich řádu a z porušení několika zákonů. Od roku 1662 až do roku 1715 se stal šternberský mýtus zásadním prvkem jezuitské právní argumentace v této kontroverzi.

V duchu sakrální topografie, kterou užívali například i Habsburkové, spojovali olomoučtí jezuité události moravské historie s posvátnými místy, zejména pak s těmi, která spravovali oni sami: roku 1661 tak spojil Jan Tanner šternberský mýtus o eucharistickém zázraku s olomouckou jezuitskou kaplí Božího Těla. Roku 1663 navíc vtrhla osmanská a tatarská vojska na jihovýchodní Moravu, traumatizovala společnost svým pleněním a brutalitou a vyvolala obranné mechanismy včetně zdůrazňování historických paralel. Bohuslav Balbín a Matěj Tanner poté spojili šternberský mýtus také s poutními místy Hostýn a Kotouč, a zvýšili tím jejich oblibu. Díky neustálému opakování v řádové literatuře i v dalších médiích se jezuitský výklad šternberského mýtu stal v české a moravské společnosti natolik dominantní, že i tradiční rivalové jezuitů, františkáni, nakonec jednu z verzí mýtu okopírovali a následně pozměnili. Zároveň vznikaly stále nové alternativy legendy. Její jezuitskou verzi upravil roku 1747 Johannes Schmidl do kanonické podoby, aby čelil

těmto alternativním interpretacím (jeho předchůdce Johannes Miller v tom neuspěl). Další cirkulaci mýtu poznamenalo měnící se kulturní, politické a duchovní klima českých zemí na konci 18. století. Zrušení jezuitského řádu roku 1773 však neznamenal, že by osobnost Jaroslava ze Šternberka upadla v zapomnění; jeho památka byla udržována při životě a nabývala na síle v kontextu národního obrození. V průběhu 19. století se stala jedním z bodů národnostní identifikace.