

# GREAT POMBALINE HISTORIOGRAPHICAL WORKS

*Introductory Studies  
Diagnoses and Doctrines for Reforming Portugal*

VECHTA - LISBOA - ARACAJU



# **GREAT POMBALINE HISTORIOGRAPHICAL WORKS**

*Introductory Studies  
Diagnoses and Doctrines for Reforming Portugal*

**José Eduardo Franco  
José Esteves Pereira  
Leonel Ribeiro dos Santos  
Pedro Calafate  
Ricardo Ventura  
Viriato Soromenho-Marques**

VECHTA – LISBOA – ARACAJU



# GREAT POMBALINE HISTORIOGRAPHICAL WORKS

*Introductory Studies. Diagnoses and Doctrines for Reforming Portugal.*

**Authors:** José Eduardo Franco, José Esteves Pereira, Leonel Ribeiro dos Santos,  
Pedro Calafate, Ricardo Ventura, Viriato Soromenho-Marques

**Editorial Reviewer:** Aida Sampaio Lemos

**Design:** Carolina Grilo

**Cover Photograph:** Bernardes Franco

**Translation:** Pedro Augusto Ferreira

**Digital ISBN:** 978-3-00-074130-2

2022, VECHTA – LISBOA – ARACAJU

**Europäische Geschichte  
vom 17. bis zum 19. Jahrhundert**

**Universität Vechta**

Fakultät III Geistes- und Kulturwissenschaften

Fach Geschichtswissenschaft

Driverstr. 22

D-49377 Vechta

**Coleção E-Pomb@l**

**Cátedra Marquês de Pombal (Camões, I.P./UFS)**

Cidade Universitária Prof. José Aloísio de Campos - Av. Marechal Rondon, S/N - Jardim Roza Elze

Tel.: (79) 2105-6404 / 6408 - FAX: (79) 2105-6474

CEP: 49100-000 - São Cristóvão / <https://catedramarquêsdepombal-ufs.online/index.html>

**Editora Criação**

Rua Deputado Matos Teles, 9 – Conjunto Médiçis II – Sala 3 . Bairro Luzia, Aracaju, Sergipe, Brasil.

Fine: (79) 99824-0106 (Whatsapp) / E-mail: [criacaoeditorame@gmail.com](mailto:criacaoeditorame@gmail.com) / <https://editoracriacao.com.br/>

**Theya Editores – CEG-CIPSH-UAb**

**Editorial Supervisor:** Susana Mourato Alves-Jesus

Instituto Europeu de Ciências da Cultura Padre Manuel Antunes – IECCPMA

Rua Ladislau Patrício, 8, 1.º A | 1750-136 Lisboa | (00351) 969 977 702

[theyaeditores@gmail.com](mailto:theyaeditores@gmail.com) | <http://theya-ed.org/>

Centro de Estudos Globais/Cátedra CIPSH de Estudos Globais – CEG-CIPSH-UAb

Palácio Ceia: Rua da Escola Politécnica, 147 | 1269-001 Lisboa

[ceg.estudosglobais@uab.pt](mailto:ceg.estudosglobais@uab.pt) | <https://sites.uab.pt/ceg/>



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## **PREFACE**

**History rebuilt, the foundation of the new age of Enlightenment**

JOSÉ EDUARDO FRANCO AND VIRIATO SOROMENHO-MARQUES

4

## ***COLLECTION OF PONTIFICAL BRIEFS AND ROYAL LAWS AND BRIEF ACCOUNT***

RICARDO VENTURA

12

## ***CHRONOLOGICAL AND ANALYTICAL DEDUCTION***

PEDRO CALAFATE AND JOSÉ ESTEVES PEREIRA

41

## ***COMPENDIUM OF THE UNIVERSITY OF COIMBRA'S STATE***

LEONEL RIBEIRO DOS SANTOS

104

# PREFACE

## HISTORY REBUILT, THE FOUNDATION OF THE NEW AGE OF ENLIGHTENMENT

*“It was the enlightenment discourse of our 18<sup>th</sup> century that introduced the subject of our decadence, the decadence of seiscientismo, thus giving rise to the counter-polarity between light and darkness, whose tension proved to possess a dynamism indispensable to its project’s assertion [...]. This thesis shares the dynamics in ancient myths, such as that of the fall and regeneration or of the restoration of time, in this case the restoration of our 16<sup>th</sup> century’s glories, then obscured by the Jesuits’ malice, who would have schemed to stifle the zeal and the cries of the wise [...]”<sup>1</sup>*

*Le mythe jésuite, figure fantasmatique du pouvoir absolu, redoutable et fascinant, est, d’abord, de nature politique: il appartient, en ce sens, au monde moderne; il demeure inséparable des formes naissantes de la politique, de la liberté [...], il constitue l’obstacle, le négatif d’un pouvoir laïque [...]”<sup>2</sup>*

The Pombaline reformist policy, marked by an intense, until then unrivalled legislative production in the history of state building in Portugal, was accompanied by an investment in the revision and reconstruction of historical knowledge so that this could serve as legitimising and justifying ballast for the reforms underway. There was a greater increase in particular in the production of historiographical writings when it became strategic to justify serious and radical measures, such as the unprecedented case of the progressive measures including limiting the scope of action, partial expulsions, closure of colleges and then the general expulsion of the Jesuits from the metropolis and all Portuguese domains.

It was in this context that the most emblematic historiographical works were produced, concerning the long and short duration of the Society of Jesus’s action in its relation to the history of Portugal. These historiographical writings based on a massive work of research, compilation, selection and analysis of historical documentation constitute an important component of the intellectual production promoted by the Pombaline gov-

---

<sup>1</sup> Pedro Calafate, Pedro Calafate, «Portugal tematizado pela cultura portuguesa», in *Colóquio Identidade Nacional e Identidades Regionais na Península Ibérica*, Braga, 1996, pp. 9-10.

<sup>2</sup> Michel Leroy, *Le mythe jésuite: de Béranger à Michelet*, Paris, PUF, 1992, pp. 6-7.

ernment with a strongly apologetic tone, turning history<sup>3</sup> into a powerful tribunal, but also a place for defining and clarifying the political doctrine with a view to situating and affirming the foundations and the ideological horizon's lines of understanding on which the political project of the Josephine-Pombaline government was based, which aimed to build a new society framed by a reinforced State.<sup>4</sup>

In this context, through the Marquis of Pombal's initiative and under his supervision and inspiration, fundamental works were produced, through which the idea of the State and the philosophical-theological doctrine on which he based himself are ideographically established, focusing on the identification, characterisation and extirpation of a negative, its main enemy and its henchmen. Therefore, these works may also be considered as anti-Jesuitical and doctrinal Pombaline catechisms, given their programmatic significance, the condensation of arguments, the definition of a discursive style, their assumption as an inspiring reference, their national and international dissemination, as well as their reception and impact on the Portuguese culture of the time and subsequently.

At the levels of political-religious philosophy, ecclesiology, economic and social praxis, legal configuration of institutions, moral theory and practice and pedagogical methodologies and conceptions, these works shape and operate the Pombaline foundation of the mythicized image of the Society of Jesus. The architecture of the reasons for the governmental combat developed against this religious order is evident and carried out through them, which is always presented as the holder of a hyperbolized, even superhuman power, situated in the dark and conspiratorial side of history. All of them are permeated by the anti-Jesuitical obsession, which constitutes the Jesuits and Jesuitism as the enemy par excellence and the diabolical causality of the country's evils.

In fact, these works structure the ideological vectors that systematise the anti-Jesuit doctrine which gave origin to the fabulous myth they conjure up. To that extent, they are paradigmatic works, defining the canon and the style of Pombal's anti-Jesuitical ideology, which is shaped with a great mimetic tendency in all the plethora of combative documents produced against the Society of Jesus (laws, pamphlets, sentences, diplomatic memories, petitions, accounts, epistolography, theses, treaties, regiments, iconography...) in this period, and lasting beyond it, so as to hurt this order's prestigious image.

On the other hand, the evidence and testimonies by his contemporaries, connected to his circle of advisors, make it evident that these paradigmatic works bear the stamp of Carvalho e Melo, as they were written under his collaboration and revision, or were directed by him. At his service, the minister had a team of well-prepared intellectuals with a

---

<sup>3</sup> On the role and perception of the past and the construction of history in the Enlightenment see, among others, Ulrich Im Hof, *A Europa no século das luzes*, Lisbon, Presença, 1995; Pierre-Yves Beaurepair, *Les Lumières et le monde: Voyager, explorer, collectionner*, Paris, Belin Éditeur, 2019.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Pedro Calafate (dir.), *História do pensamento filosófico português*, vol. III, Lisbon, Caminho, pp. 45 and ff.

proven track record, who worked on his orders to provide his books with a prolix erudite, and argumentative apparatus, although all of them came to light either anonymously or under a borrowed name, or even with institutional or collective authorship. That is, with an indication of authorship that hid the decisive influence of King José I's prime minister in their preparation process. The unity of authorship or inspiration that the stylistic and ideological unity denounces is confirmed by a series of historical testimonies that have been gathering to highlight Pombal's omnipresent hand.

Even if Pombal was not the redactor of all the works, he was undoubtedly their modeller, the inspirer and always the reviser, since nothing came to light without falling into his hands. Therefore, Carvalho e Melo is the implicit author, or the tutelary author who imprints the hermeneutic direction that should preside the choice and the reading of the data presented.<sup>5</sup>

Its rhetorical aim was to produce a persuasive impact on the reader, so as to convince of the Jesuits' wickedness, and to form a model opinion about the Order of Loyola, highlighting the dark side of its history and loading it with the most derogatory colours. The author/mentor of these catechisms seeks to demonstrate, at the same time, their "patriotic" usefulness, that is to say, this intellectual anti-Jesuitical work was presented as a service of denunciation and of combat against an evil that was ailing the nation, and was therefore given as a valuable service rendered to the State, for its liberation from the yoke that prevented it from fulfilling itself. The implicit author is here not only the writer or the director of the work, but also the heroic protagonist who combats an adversary so fearfully figured. It is him who plans and executes the combative and prophylactic strategies to exterminate the enemy and its influence, always said to be highly nefarious, and inaugurate a new time, a true illuminist *renovatio temporum* through the multisectoral reforms in progress operated by his government.

In this set of works, selected by us as the most significant in Pombaline indoctrination, the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* (*Chronological and Analytical Deduction*) stands out as the pontifical work, which is the model and founding point of departure as well as the arrival point of the mythical edifice of the Pombaline vision over the Society of Jesus. This major work, together with the other also remarkable yet minor satellite works, establish an official image of the Society of Jesus and the legitimising motivations/reasons concerning the structural Pombaline reforms in question, namely, administrative and economic reforms in the colonial domains, especially in Brazil, educational reforms, reforms of the institutions strengthening the power of the State centred on the person of

---

<sup>5</sup> On the notion of implicit author or model author, which we adapt here to the case of tutelary author, marking the idea of implicit author as the one who inspires and models the work, see Umberto Eco, *Six promenades dans les bois du roman et d'ailleurs*, Paris, Grasset, 1994, p. 25; and R. Fowler, "The rhetoric of direction and indirection in the Gospel of Mark", *Semeia*, vol. 48, 1989, pp. 115-134.

the King and his agents, reforms of social and religious control institutions, as is the case of the Inquisition.

The works presented here, which we term historiographical works with an anti-Jesuitical slant, became decisive in establishing a breakaway vision regarding an entire past classified as obscurantist, and promoted the inauguration of a new time, one of lights, progress and civilisation according to Enlightenment standards.<sup>6</sup> This dichotomous vision between past, present and promise of an enlightened future has permeated Portuguese culture over the following centuries, almost to the present day.

These fundamental works in Pombaline doctrine are characterised by a literary style which, together with the hermeneutical model they institute, is reproduced in a vast series of other legal, historiographical, poetic, juridical, theological, panegyric, pedagogical, pastoral texts, etc. This tangled discursive architecture tries to cram into a single sentence so much information and invectives that it renders the reader almost breathless. The style is prolix and monotonous, redundant, heavy and convoluted, loaded with ramified and metaphorical, adjectival use. All is geared towards intensively characterising and distinguishing two irreconcilable worlds: the world of light and the world of darkness, the world of good and the world of evil, the world of sickness and the world of health, the filthy world, along the lines of what was theorized by Gilbert Durant and Michel Leroy, which would have been fabricated by the Jesuits' and their cohorts' harmful action, by counterfeiting the sweetened world idealized by the Pombaline reforms.<sup>7</sup> This style and doctrine conveyed by Pombaline literature manically splits the vision of a past that one wants to erase, of a present that one wants to purify and of a future that one wants to illuminate.

Produced in the context of the greatest absolutist exacerbation in Portugal, these works reflect the demonisation of the institution that dared to criticise and challenge the ideology and politics that sustained the assertion of royal power, while revealing the absolutist consciousness that state power lies above all criticism. Whoever dared to make an attempt on the king's authority, the embodiment of the authority of civil power, should subject himself to the fate of a traitor.

These works were structuring for the Pombaline doctrinal core and indeed found a peculiar literary style with apologetic nature. Such literature forms a true ideological-discursive and hermeneutic school within the Portuguese culture; it creates an interpretative scheme and establishes principles guiding the reading and perception of the socio-polit-

---

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Ana Cristina Araújo, *A cultura das Luzes em Portugal: Temas e problemas*, Lisbon, Livros Horizonte, 2003, pp. 19 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Gilbert Durand, *Les structures anthropologiques de l'imaginaire*, 12th ed., Paris, Dunod, 1969; and Michel Leroy, *Le mythe jésuite: De Béranger à Michelet*, Paris, PUF, 1992.



ical, cultural, religious and educational reality, calling for an urgent reformism oriented towards the establishment of a new society.

The argumentative scheme is simple (or rather, simplistic, and one of the most reductionist that we know of in the history of Portuguese culture) and uncompromising, splitting history in a twofold manner, with no possible reconciliation, between light and darkness, between progress and decadence, and between the protagonists of one or the other pole: the promoters of progress and the promoters of decadence. It then divides the history of Portugal into two major periods: a glorious and prosperous period, from the genesis of nationality until 1540; and a second period, of gradual decadence and progressive obscurantism, which runs from the establishment of the Society of Jesus in Portugal until the time of Pombal.

In this period, the Jesuits' action would have resulted in the degeneration and extinguishing of the lights of reason and progress in the country, establishing an environment of fanaticism, atavism and extreme ignorance. Under such a corrosive effect, Portugal would have regressed and known a great discrepancy at all levels in relation to a Europe of progress and scientific, cultural and economic enlightenment, thus losing the influence and prestige it once had enjoyed. This model of mythical reading of the past, combined with an opening of the present to the utopia of the future that would spring from it, is reflected in the laws and in most of the writings, inspired by such model documents, that were produced. This hermeneutic scheme's influence is expressed by some stories, relations and news drawn up within the religious orders, with the aim of preparing and promoting the reform of regular life, stimulated by the government, in the light of its official reformist ideology.<sup>8</sup> Therefore, in the ideological perspective underlying the Pombaline

---

<sup>8</sup> Among many others, the following works may be cited here as examples: *Notícia dos estragos que em seus estudos litterarios lamenta a provincia de Santo Antonio n'este reino de Portugal extrahida do cartorio, e mais memoriais que conserva em seu archivo, sendo provincial o m. r. p.m. ex-leitor Fr. Luiz da Anunciação no anno de 1771*, Biblioteca Pública de Évora, cod. CXIV/2-24, no. 27; *Notícia dos religiosos da dita provincia que movidos de estudioso affecto que tinham às sciencias mostraram, ainda com a imperfeita, que na mesma provincia receberão, que serão perfeitamente sabios se não achassem os funestos estragos que em seus estudos litterarios lamentarão no fim do anno proximo de 1771*, Arquivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo, Santo António dos Capuchos, maço 6; frei Eusébio de Mora (secretary of the province); *Relação por onde consta clara e distintamente o estabelecimento e progresso que entre os menores da observância de São Francisco da Província de Portugal tiveram os estudos e a decadência que neles experimentaram depois da entrada dos Jesuítas neste reino* (Biblioteca Pública de Évora, cod. CXIX/2-24, no. 9); *Breve narração que manifesta o estado em que estavam na província da piedade de Menores Descalços as virtudes e letras quando no ano de 1540 entravam em Portugal os padres da Sociedade de Jesus e os horrorosos estragos que nas mesmas fizeram desde o seu ingresso até que foram expulsos* (Biblioteca Pública de Évora, cod. CXIV/2-24, no. 6); *Epitome da história literária dos Cónegos Regulares de Portugal: 1.º Princípio e progressos dos seus estudos até ao estabelecimento dos Jesuítas no reino; 2.º da ruína que causou nos estudos dos Cónegos Regulares a perniciosíssima escola dos Jesuítas e das hostilidades que estes lhes moveram quando os Cónegos os desampararam na última restauração das letras* (Biblioteca Pública de Évora, cod. CXIV/2-8); *Compendio histórico, em que pelos felizes progressos que a Ordem de São Domingos fez em Portugal desde 1717 em que nele entrou e pelo brilhante esplendor (...) que conservou*

anti-Jesuitical doctrine, the Jesuits' destructive action in Portugal was a total one, covering all sectors of Portuguese society. Hence, the reforms justified in this light, namely the educational reform, should also have a totalizing, flawless breadth.<sup>9</sup>

The systematic and obsessive anti-Jesuitism that characterises this ideological-discursive school founded the negative Jesuit myth,<sup>10</sup> and the reformism to which it appeals founded its reverse, the Portuguese nation's utopia of the age of enlightenment<sup>11</sup>, which was to spring from Pombaline political measures.

On the level of a discourse that produces two official images radically placed in absolute confrontation, in which one is affirmed as the overcoming of the other, the Jesuits and their influence are the passive engine of the reforms instituted by the active mode, that is, the sovereign's and his minister's enlightened and rational will. However, in these typical anti-Jesuitical works, the combat against the Jesuits stands out as being the dominant content, obsessively evoked, reverberated and anathematized, almost always obscuring the emphasis that was expected to be given to the new society's configuration which that combat came to legitimize, and that extremely emerges through the process of negating their work.

In fact, the central implicit and explicit aim of forever incinerating the memory of the mythicized Jesuitical evil is emphasized, above all, in these works. As Cassirer wrote, helping us understand these mythification processes and their functionalities, "myth is not only distant from this empirical reality; it is, in a certain sense, in flagrant contradiction to it. It seems to construct an entirely fantastic world. Despite this, myth has a certain "objective" aspect and a definite objective function. Linguistic symbolism leads

---

*nas ciências até ao reinado de D. João, se fazem conhecer os horríveis estragos que nela fizeram os Jesuítas* (Biblioteca Pública de Évora, cod. CXIV/2-17); e a *Epítome da história literária da congregação dos Cónegos Regulares de São João Evangelista, estado dos seus bons estudos, decadência deles depois da introdução dos denominados Jesuítas nestes reinos* (Biblioteca Pública de Évora, cod. CXIV/2-24, no. 3).

<sup>9</sup> Thus, in the same way, new study programmes and reformist statutes were subsequently prepared, always following the tutelary model of the Pombaline reformist legislation (v.g., Arquivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo, Manuscritos da Livraria, cod. 634). The model and ideology of the Pombaline reform for the University of Coimbra also served as a guide for the new statutes and regulations that established the religious orders' studies reform, with its desire to extirpate the Jesuit "hydra" of ignorance; among others, the "statutes for the studies of the Province of Nossa Senhora da Conceição do Rio de Janeiro, ordered according to the dispositions of the Statutes of the new university" (*Estatutos para os estudos da Província de Nossa Senhora da Conceição do Rio de Janeiro, ordenados segundo as disposições dos Estatutos da nova universidade*, Lisbon, 1774) were revealing.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Michel Leroy, *Le mythe jésuite, De Béranger à Michelet*, op. cit.

<sup>11</sup> On the utopian Enlightenment in its revolutionary perspective see Jonathan Israel, *Idées révolutionnaires : Une histoire intellectuelle de la Révolution Française*, Paris, Alma, éditeur et Libella/Buchet-Castel, 2019.

to an adjectival use of sensory impressions; mythical symbolism leads to an objectivation of feelings".<sup>12</sup>

The Pombaline discourse typical of these works gives rise to the idea that a new era was beginning in Portugal, led by King José and his Minister Pombal. This government would be raising the country out of the extreme decadence into which it had fallen, lending it the light of progress and renewing its prestige before an enlightened Europe.<sup>13</sup>

The great measure presented to mark this inauguration of a new era, that is, the restoration of the golden age before the entrance of the Society of Jesus into the kingdom, is precisely the expulsion of the Jesuits and their eradication from Portugal, and then from the face of the earth. This was presented as a necessary action in order to eradicate the evil that was preventing the kingdom from rising from the ashes into which the Ignatians had allegedly plunged it, an evil that risked affecting the balance in much, if not in all of the world.

These topics structure a thesis, which is intended to be historiographically based, founding the Pombaline anti-Jesuitical doctrine. These works define the paradigm in which the myth and its scheme for a reading of history are rooted, unifying the whole Pombaline written production against the Society of Jesus - the laws, the regiments, the pastorals, the pamphlets, the historical compendiums, the deductions, the petitions, the iconography, the epistolography, etc. - and constituting the fundamental hermeneutic vector for its understanding.

These texts, considering their explanatory intention regarding the kingdom's evils, sought to determine a unique causality to grant their scope of understanding/explanation of the configured malignant reality with operative content. We are facing a typical case of diabolic causality formation, along the lines of what Léon Poliakov theorized, which is one of the structuring foundations of history's conspiracy myths<sup>14</sup>, as is common in similar mythification processes, namely the myths of the Jewish, Masonic or Templar plot. In these processes, an attempt is made to supply with a simple explanation for complex problems and to offer individually simplified solutions for the problems of a given country, to the detriment of concerted and global solutions.<sup>15</sup> Here we can see one of the paradoxical expressions of Enlightenment discourses in which the proclamation of reason as the measure and criterion of all knowledge yields to propagandistic constructions that

---

<sup>12</sup> Ernest Cassirer, *O mito do Estado*, Lisbon, Eds. Europa-América, 1961, p. 67 (our translation).

<sup>13</sup> Cf. José Eduardo Franco, *A Europa ao espelho de Portugal: Ideia(s) de Europa na cultura portuguesa*, Lisbon, Temas e Debates/Círculo de Leitores, 2020, pp. 97 and ff.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Léon Poliakov, *La causalité diabolique. Essai sur l'origine des persécutions*, Paris, Calman-Levy, 1980, pp. 7 and ff.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. José Eduardo Franco, *O mito dos Jesuítas. Em Portugal, no Brasil e no Oriente (séculos XVI a XX)*, vol. I: *Das origens ao Marquês de Pombal*; vol. II: *Do Marquês de Pombal ao século XX*, Lisboa, Gradiva, 2006 e 2007.

undermine the rational support they claim to guarantee. It is worth recalling here what Umberto Eco observed about the hermeneutic care that should be taken in the appreciation of this type of discourse: “Réfléchir sur les rapports complexes entre lecteur et histoire, entre fiction et réalité, constitue une forme de thérapie contre tout endormissement de la raison, qui engendre des monstres”.<sup>16</sup>

*José Eduardo Franco*  
*Viriato Soromenho-Marques*

---

<sup>16</sup> Umberto Eco, *Six promenades dans les bois du roman et d'ailleurs*, *op. cit.*, p. 150.

# COLEÇÃO DOS BREVES PONTIFÍCIOS E LEIS RÉGIAS E RELAÇÃO ABREVIADA

(COLLECTION OF PONTIFICAL BRIEFS  
AND ROYAL LAWS AND BRIEF ACCOUNT)

**Ricardo Ventura**

## INTRODUCTION

The day of September 3, 1759, one year after the attempt on the life of King Joseph I, was the date symbolically chosen for the issue of royal documents relating to the expulsion of the Society of Jesus from the kingdom of Portugal and its overseas domains. Besides the expulsion decree<sup>1</sup> and a letter addressed to the Patriarch of Lisbon<sup>2</sup>, in which the reasons of the ponderous decree were explained, the king also issued a charter<sup>3</sup> in which he ordered the compilation, printing and deposit, in the Torre do Tombo and in all the courts and chambers of all the cities and towns of the kingdom, of a collection of all the papers “that left the Secretariat of State, and returned to it, since the first representation that on the eighth of October of the year one thousand seven hundred and fifty seven it made to the Holy Father Benedict XIV, about the insults by the Regulars of the Society called

---

<sup>1</sup> *Collecção dos breves pontifícios e leys regias, que foraõ expedidos, e publicadas desde o anno de 1741, sobre a liberdade das pessoas, bens, e commercio dos indios do Brasil; Dos excessos que naquele Estado obraram os regulares da Companhia denominada de Jesus; das representaçoens que Sua Magestade Fidelissima fez á Santa Séde Apostolica, sobre esta materia até a expedição do Breve que ordenou a reforma dos sobreditos regulares; Dos procedimentos que com elles praticou o eminentissimo e reverendissimo reformador; dos absurdos em que se precipitaraõ os mesmos religiosos com o estímulo da sobredita reforma até o horroroso insulto de 3 de setembro do anno de 1758; das sentenças que sobre elle se proferiraõ; das ordens reaes que depois da mesma sentença se publicaraõ; das relaçoens que a filial veneração de el Rey fidelissimo fez ao papa de tudo o que havia ordenado sobre o mesmo insulto, e suas consequencias; e da participaçam que o mesmo monarca fez ao eminentissimo, e reverendissimo cardeal reformador, e mais prelados diocesanos destes reinos, das ultimas, e finaes resoluções que havia tomado para expulsar dos seus reinos, e dominios os ditos regulares* (from now on referred to as *CBPLR*), Lisbon, Secretariat of State, 1760, nr. XIX.

The quotations of the documents follow the criteria of edition update defined in the scope of the project POMBALIA - Obra completa pombalina.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibidem*, Nr.. XVII.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibidem*, Nr. XX.

Jesus”<sup>4</sup>. With this order, signed by the Count of Oeiras, Sebastião José de Carvalho e Melo, the Kingdom’s Secretary of State and future Marquis of Pombal, the king intended to make present to all officials and authorities the facts which led to the order expelling the Jesuits from the kingdom and the resulting dispositions, in order to avoid any deviation from the royal will.

The volume we analyse in the present study, *Coleção dos breves pontifícios e leis régias* [...], which from now on we will refer to as the *Coleção*, printed in 1760 in the Kingdom’s Secretariat of State “under His Majesty’s Special Command”, is said to have resulted from this royal charter. It constitutes the first great compilation of Josephine and Pombaline ruling documentation concerning the Society of Jesus and its expulsion from the Portuguese domains, in which an attempt is made to legitimise this measure, at the same time as guidelines concerning a political project for the kingdom and the empire are defined and presented. To this extent, the *Coleção* initiates a series of major historiographical works stemming from the Josephine period, to which the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* and the *Compêndio histórico da Universidade de Coimbra* also belong.

In the book’s frontispiece, the graphic presentation given to the long and descriptive title of the *Coleção* suggests a division for the 21 pieces that make it up into four main nuclei:

- Pontifical briefs and royal laws that were issued and published from the year 1741 on the freedom of persons, goods and commerce of Brazilian natives;
- Texts concerning the excesses committed by Jesuits and Joseph I’s representations to the Pope on this matter, up to the dispatch of the pontifical brief that ordered the Society of Jesus’s reform;
- Documents that testify the procedures of the Cardinal Patriarch in the context of this reform, the offences into which the priests of the Society of Jesus would have plunged in reaction to these measures, including the attempt on the life of Joseph I; and also the court sentences passed and the accounts made by the king to the Pope about such acts;
- Accounts made by Joseph I to the Reforming Cardinal Patriarch and to the bishops of the kingdom and orders concerning the expulsion of the Society of Jesus from the kingdom of Portugal and its overseas domains.

Right from the start, it is clear that the compilation goes beyond what was stipulated in the royal charter of September 3, 1759, and several documents have been added prior to the date of October 4, 1757, as well as the royal determinations regarding the expulsion of the Society of Jesus. The gravity of these measures imposed the constructing as solid an argumentative basis as possible, so the person or persons responsible for the organising the work would have used the months between the royal charter, which foresaw the

---

<sup>4</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 3.

*Coleção*, and its publication in 1760, to refine the compilation and formulation process of a thesis that had begun some years before.

Although at first glance the *Coleção* appears as a mere compilation of a dispute's documentation, without the speculative apparatus of the voluminous works that succeeded it, such as the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* or the *Compêndio histórico da Universidade de Coimbra* (*Historical Compendium of the University of Coimbra*), it resulted from a meticulous elaboration and organization work on argumentative topics. This effort is visible not only in the pieces produced by the Secretary of State or his collaborators, included in the compilation, but also through the paratext inserted throughout the work - the frontispiece, the explanatory titles and the side notes. The order attributed to the documents also sought to guide the reader along a historical-chronological path which was both a reasoning about the best form of government for the kingdom and a judgment, before which evidence of guilt was accumulated against those who opposed the royal determinations.

It is not surprising, therefore, that throughout the *Coleção* philosophical, political and legal stances emerge that had been established as guidelines for Josephine ruling since the early 1750s and which were to be enshrined and systematised over the following two decades. These positions conveyed throughout the compilation - concerning the concept of royal power, the relations between the State and the Church and between the State and its subjects, indigenous law and policies for the overseas domains, as well as the philosophy and anthropology that should guide the formulation and application of political measures - are articulated in an organic manner, resulting in a constant formulation and adaptation of a body of ideas to the concrete political situation. We can thus visualize them still in their not yet perfectly structured form, in a process of definition and affirmation, but already tending towards the formulation of a system, or mechanism, that aspired to encompass all areas of life in various territories around the globe. Furthermore, through the *Coleção*, we also witness a pivotal phase in the process of establishing the Society of Jesus as the Josephine ruling's main opponent, according to which its presence in Portugal and the overseas domains for over two centuries explained a good part of the kingdom's political, economic and cultural problems, and against which reformist measures would be defined.

In short, by revisiting this important early compilation of anti-Jesuitical propaganda an opportunity arises to better understand some of the main guidelines of Josephine and Pombaline ruling, placing them in their context and in the mentality framework of their time. In the following pages, we will try to frame these guidelines in the political and mentalities' environment at the end of John V's reign, and then reconstitute the first years of the dispute between the Josephine government and the Society of Jesus. This contextualisation will introduce the commentary on the four documentary nuclei that make up the *Coleção*.

## CONTEXTUALISATION: THE CENTRALITY OF COLONIAL POLICY IN THE BACKGROUND OF POMBALINE RULE (1749-1755)

In an important reflection on Pombaline ruling published in 1983, Borges de Macedo alerted to the need to approach it as “a political occurrence superior to ‘success’ or personal fortune, not uniformly superimposing the Pombaline influence on the government of D. José and not stipulating it as unitary, throughout the reign”<sup>5</sup>. According to this historian, for a better understanding of Pombal’s ascension and ruling, it was necessary to take “the social and political forces in presence” into account, the “available means” and the “projects that were being developed, both in the field of social and political life or external relations and culture”<sup>6</sup>. To this extent, a vision of this period that not only questioned the prominence or centrality of the Marquis of Pombal was required, in favour of a “team”, but above all understood Josephine “absolutism” in an “evolutionary” sense<sup>7</sup>, as a gradual response to the problems faced by state power.

These considerations are particularly instructive when we focus on the political reality towards the end of João V’s reign and the beginning of José I’s reign. In such a context, Sebastião José de Carvalho e Melo is part of what Marcos Carneiro de Mendonça, in a note he appended to a royal document from 1749, discreetly calls “the precious human chain”<sup>8</sup>. In that group, the author includes D. Luís da Cunha (1662-1749), ambassador in Paris, Marco António de Azevedo Coutinho (1688-1750), secretary of state for Foreign Affairs and War, Sebastião José de Carvalho e Melo (1699-1782), plenipotentiary minister at the court of Vienna, and Francisco Xavier de Mendonça Furtado (1701-1769), military officer, brother of Sebastião José de Carvalho e Melo, both cousins of Marco António de Azevedo Coutinho. This “chain”, composed of members coming from two generations, was united by friendship or blood ties, but also by ideological affinities, and extends to other personalities who would assume prominence during Pombaline ruling. It is not, therefore, too violent to see it as representing a kind of “party” that was gaining more and more pre-eminence from José I’s accession to the throne, already after the death of its oldest members.

With the exception of Mendonça Furtado, all the other mentioned personalities held diplomatic functions in European countries. Furtado would eventually compensate this

---

<sup>5</sup> Jorge Borges de Macedo, “Dialéctica da sociedade portuguesa no tempo de Pombal”, in AAVV, *Como interpretar Pombal?, No bicentenário da sua morte*, Lisbon / Oporto, Edições Brotéria / Livraria A. I., 1983, p. 18

<sup>6</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 16.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 18.

<sup>8</sup> Marcos Carneiro de Mendonça (ed.), *A Amazônia na era pombalina, Correspondência do governador e capitão-general do Estado do Grão-Pará e Maranhão*, Francisco Xavier de Mendonça Furtado (1751-1759), Brasília, Senado Federal, 2005, p. 58



shortcoming with the South American experience he gained as a military officer during the campaigns to rescue the Colonia del Sacramento (1736-1737), and with the close relationship he had with his brother, Carvalho e Melo.

In our view, this common thread that unites this “human chain’s” links - international experience - should not be hastily interpreted in the light of the concept of “*estrangeirado*”<sup>9</sup>, taking these personalities’ entire legacy as a mere loan or imitation of other European powers’ political and economic practices. On the one hand, this common trait situates such personalities as members of the petty nobility performing relatively bureaucratic - diplomatic - functions, gravitating close to spheres of power, searching opportunities for ascension<sup>10</sup>. But beyond this, it refers to the knowledge that these personalities had of the profound interdependence and competitiveness imposed by the 18th century international context of the war of nations and empires. To this extent, the aim of “equating Portugal with civilised and polished European nations”, one of the mottos repeated ad nauseam in the Pombaline government’s documentation, did not depend so much on a subjective preference or ideological inclination of these figures as on the realisation that the kingdom was under effective and growing external economic, but also military pressure, whose tackling required structural and comprehensive reforms - let us recall, for example, that in the mid-18th century, the Seven Years’ War was imminent, and that Portugal held an alliance with England, whilst its neighbour Spain was allied with France, England’s adversary. The great European powers were therefore not only beacons of progress and abundance: they also constituted explicit threats to the sovereignty of those states that did not follow this civilisational path.

The study and understanding of the ideas conveyed by this “human chain”, as well as their practical developments during Josephine and Pombaline ruling, should therefore, and in our view, bear this external conjuncture in mind, otherwise we may view them as mere attempts to arbitrarily import a mixture of mercantilist and enlightenment ideas<sup>11</sup>. Furthermore, this component, which one might say reactive, in Josephine reformism may also help us understand the strongly utilitarian and economist nature of these au-

---

<sup>9</sup> On the uses of this concept in Portuguese historiography, see for example: Onésimo Teotónio Almeida, “*Estrangeirados, Iluminismo, Enlightenment - uma reavistação de conceitos no contexto português*”, in *Portuguese Literary & Cultural Studies – The Eighteenth Century*, n.º 29, 2016, pp. 92-104; Jorge Borges de Macedo, *Estrangeirados: Um conceito a rever*, Lisbon, Edições do Templo, s.d.

<sup>10</sup> In this regard, see Nuno Gonçalo Monteiro, *Elites e poder. Entre o Antigo Regime e o liberalismo*, Lisbon, ICS, 2006.

<sup>11</sup> For a relevant analysis of the influence exercised by mercantilist and illuminist ideals on Pombaline ruling, see Francisco José Calazans Falcon, *A época pombalina (política econômica e monarquia ilustrada)*, São Paulo, Editora Ática, 1993.

thors' thinking, closer to the Jean Baptiste Colbert's or William Petty's reasoning<sup>12</sup> than to Newton's or Voltaire's intellectual endeavours.

As the present study is not the occasion to approach the mentioned "human chain" and its members' thought and action in a comprehensive way, let us focus on two essential aspects that guided Josephine ruling and that have a very close connection with the events narrated in the *Coleção*: the central and strategic role attributed to the settlement of colonial territories, namely Brazil, in the development and enrichment of the kingdom and the empire; and a new approach to State-Church relations, according to which the exemptions and privileges of religious agents should be limited in convergence with the State's interests.

Throughout the 18th century, for the Portuguese elite Brazil represented the vanishing point that enabled the application, in the kingdom of Portugal, of the mercantilist ideal according to which the wealth of a state corresponded to the size of its population and, inherently, to the size of the territory occupied. The undertaking implied, however, resources and economic and political measures that the Portuguese government took a long time to define and implement during the century's first half<sup>13</sup>. From the outset, it implied not only a better knowledge of the territory, its real dimension and features, but also the renegotiation with Spain of the limits between both imperial domains established since the Treaty of Tordesillas, concluded in the distant year of 1494.

Such was the reason why in 1722 the Portuguese ambassador to France, Dom Luís da Cunha, received royal orders to contact the French royal cartographer and order correct charts of the South American and African territories<sup>14</sup>.

Over the next two decades, a new and radical project simmered in D. Luís da Cunha's mind. In 1735-1736, together with his fellow diplomat Marco António de Azevedo Coutinho, he shared a plan that would only be published much later, according to which the king of Portugal should assume the title of "emperor of the West" and settle in Rio de

---

<sup>12</sup> On the influence of William Petty's thought on Pombaline policies, see: António César de Almeida Santos, "Aritmética política e a administração do estado português na segunda metade do século XVIII", in Andréa Doré e António César de Almeida Santos (org.), *Temas setecentistas: Governos e populações no império português*, Curitiba, UFPR/Fundação Araucária, 2009, pp. 143-152; "Aritmética política e governo no reinado de D. José I (Portugal, 1750-1777)", *VI Congresso Internacional de História*, 2013: [http://www.cih.uem.br/anais/2013/trabalhos/132\\_trabalho.pdf](http://www.cih.uem.br/anais/2013/trabalhos/132_trabalho.pdf) (Accessed on 4 September 2022).

<sup>13</sup> For a review of administrative reform at the time of João V, see: Subtil, "Pombal e o rei: Valimento ou governamentalização", *Ler História*, n.º 60, 2011: <https://journals.openedition.org/lerhistoria/1472> (accessed on 4 September 2022); Nuno Gonçalo Monteiro, *D. José. Na Sombra de Pombal*, Lisbon, Círculo de Leitores, 2006, pp. 236-240.

<sup>14</sup> Joaquim Romero Magalhães, "O projecto de D. Luís da Cunha para o império português", in *Estudos em Homenagem a Luís António de Oliveira Ramos*, FLUP, 2004, pp. 656.

Janeiro, to undertake a vast movement to populate that “immense continent of Brazil”<sup>15</sup>. Brazil’s strategic geographical position would, in the diplomat’s view, allow a harmonious articulation with African and Asian trade. On the other hand, this great settlement plan aimed at leveraging the massive development of agricultural production, which would make it possible to dispense with grain imports from North America<sup>16</sup>. It therefore implied a paradigm change, according to which Portugal would no longer base its economy on gold mining, but additionally on the production of agricultural goods. Consequently, the wealth and development resulting from this productive dynamic would create a flourishing domestic market and manufactures that would present valuable products to the external market.

This initial plan roughly converges with the content of the advice given by D. Luís da Cunha to José I in his Political Testament<sup>17</sup>. Here, the experienced diplomat takes lengthy considerations on the obstacles faced by the territory’s settlement policy. Many of these obstacles could be overcome with political and economic measures to be applied to the properties held by religious orders. Not daring to advance as much as the Josephine government would do years later, Cunha suggested that religious orders should be required to make their agricultural properties productive, cooperating with the national plan of promoting productivity and the common good<sup>18</sup>. However, the key point of a new Portuguese religious policy lay in the limits that needed to be imposed on the Inquisition’s operations, in order to convey to more people the confidence to reside, produce and invest in Portuguese territories<sup>19</sup>. This claim, which had in mind the inclusion and harnessing of the resources of the Jewish and New Christian populations, was by no means unprecedented. It recalls the proposals presented by Father António Vieira to John IV<sup>20</sup> around a century earlier, but this time within the framework of a project for the empire with a

---

<sup>15</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 657. See full text in Luís da Cunha, *Instruções* (critical edition and study by Abílio Diniz Silva), Lisbon, CNCDP, 2001.

<sup>16</sup> About the Portuguese dependence on imports from England, see H. E. S. Fisher, *De Methuen a Pombal. O comércio Anglo-Português de 1700 a 1770*, Lisbon, Gradiva, 1984; Susan Schneider, *O Marquês de Pombal e o vinho do Porto. Dependência e subdesenvolvimento em Portugal no século XVIII*, Lisbon, A Regra do Jogo, 1980. Carvalho e Melo dealt with the question of the English cereal monopoly in his “Compêndio histórico do que tem passado em Lisboa sobre a insistência de alguns negociantes ingleses e holandeses em diferentes ocasiões fazerem na mesma cidade um violento monopólio do pão” (BNP, PBA. 637 e 639), a text which he reworked at different stages of his political intervention.

<sup>17</sup> Abílio Diniz Silva, *Testamento político de D. Luís da Cunha*, Lisbon, BNP, 2013.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 108.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 114 and ff.

<sup>20</sup> *Obra completa Padre António Vieira*, Dir. de José Eduardo Franco e Pedro Calafate, t. IV, vol. III: *Escritos sobre os judeus e a inquisição* (coord. de Guilherme de Oliveira Martins, José Pedro Paiva e Joana Balsa de Pinho), Lisbon, Círculo de Leitores, 2014.

secularising tone, no longer based on evangelizing dynamics but rather on a civilising plan led by the state.

In fact, concerns about the settlement of the vast Brazilian territory echoed in the writings by the members of the aforementioned “human chain”, close to D. Luís da Cunha, and figures close to him.

In a letter written by Manuel Teles da Silva, the Count of Tarouca, to Sebastião de José de Carvalho e Melo in 1752, the plan to settle Brazil took on colossal proportions. Teles da Silva and Carvalho e Melo became friends during the latter’s stay at the court of Vienna, where Teles da Silva had gained pre-eminence as minister and advisor to Queen Maria Theresa of Austria. While advising the newly appointed Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and War, the Count of Tarouca did not hide his enthusiasm about the colonies’ future under the command of the new king and his friend. By taking advantage of its territorial extension and the wealth of its resources, it would be possible to build in Brazil an empire similar in size to that of China (!). Alluding to conversations held personally during Carvalho e Melo’s time in Vienna, Tarouca recalls the central importance of the colonies for Portugal to become a “maritime power”: “Let us therefore take care to save them in any way we can. Moorish, white, Black, Indian, Mulatto, or Mestizo, everything serves, they are all men, they are good if you govern them or rule them well and proportionately to the intent. [...] There should be many marriages and very few useless wombs”.<sup>21</sup>

To a certain extent, this position by Tarouca is a testimony to the developments that the issue of settlement was undergoing throughout the end of João V’s reign and the beginning of José I’s reign, in order to think about a reform of some population groups’ legal status, namely the natives, trying to integrate them in a new “civilising” momentum. Besides this, he also discreetly expresses this thinking’s secularizing aspect, proposing a control over the religious population. This does not imply, however, that Tarouca excluded the Society of Jesus from the plans for this new Brazil. On the contrary, assuming the loyalty of the Portuguese Jesuits to his Crown, he attributed them a relevant role in the containment of any Spanish pretensions in the inland regions.

The creation of the Goiás and Mato Grosso captaincies in 1748 also indicates the movement towards the middle of the South American territory. This advance allowed for a growing knowledge of the inland territory’s complex political situation, which it was

---

<sup>21</sup> Carlos da Silva Tarouca, “Correspondência entre o Duque Manuel Teles da Silva e Sebastião José de Carvalho e Melo, 1.º marquês de Pombal”, in *Anais – Academia Portuguesa da História*, II série, vol. 6, 1955, p. 325. On Tarouca’s plans for Brazil, see also: Eugénio dos Santos, “O Brasil pombalino na perspectiva iluminada de um estrangeirado”, *História: Revista da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto*, vol. 8, 1991, pp. 75-105.

hoped would be resolved by the Treaty of Limits, which was under negotiation between the courts of Lisbon and Madrid.

In the royal instructions sent in 1749 by Queen Mariana of Austria, wife of João V, to António Rolim de Moura, captain of Mato Grosso, the writer Marco António de Azevedo Coutinho reports the advances from the village of São Miguel by the Spanish Jesuit missionaries, who in 1743 would have founded another village, Santa Rosa, on the opposite bank of the Guaporé River, impeding navigation to the Mato Grosso miners. The solution indicated to the captain of Mato Grosso, until the conclusion of the new Treaty of Limits, would consist in the allotment of uncultivated land (*sesmarias*) that could occupy the territory and stop the villages' progress.<sup>22</sup>

When Sebastião José de Carvalho e Melo was appointed Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and War on 2nd August 1750, after the death of João V and the accession of José I to the throne, he did not hold the pre-eminence or the centrality that he would assume in the kingdom's political destinies in the following years. The position, however, imposed great responsibilities on the experienced diplomat. One of the main dossiers inherited by the new Secretary of State was the implementation of the Treaty of Limits, which had been signed between João V and Ferdinand VI of Spain at the Courts of Madrid on 13 January 1750. The treaty's most sensitive points were Articles XIII and XV, which provided for the concession of the Colonia do Sacramento and its adjacent territory by the Portuguese Crown to the Spanish Crown, and Articles XIV and XVI, which stipulated the delivery of a vast territory between the northern bank of the Ibicuí River and the eastern bank of the Uruguay River by the Spanish Crown to the Portuguese Crown, which implied the departure of all missionaries and natives, together with their movable property, to villages in the Spanish dominions.

In the "First top-secret letter"<sup>23</sup> sent on September 21st 1751 by Sebastião José de Carvalho e Melo to Gomes Freire de Andrade, governor of Rio de Janeiro, Minas Gerais and São Paulo and commander of the operations for the execution of the Treaty of Limits in Southern Brazil, the newly appointed Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and War sets out his reservations about the terms provided for in the treaty. This letter's confidential nature, which was attached to the royal instructions for the execution of the treaty, can be easily understood, given the seriousness of the considerations Carvalho e Melo made in it. According to the Secretary of State, Freire de Andrade should be prepared for "the case in which the Treaty of Limits will be reduced to terms of not being able to be implemented"<sup>24</sup>. Carvalho e Melo suspected that the Spaniards had signed articles XIII-XVI of the treaty hoping that, after the Portuguese had handed over the Colonia do Sacra-

---

<sup>22</sup> Marcos Carneiro de Mendonça (ed.), *A Amazónia na era pombalina*, I, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

<sup>23</sup> Arquivo Histórico Ultramarino, Conselho Ultramarino, Brazil - Rio de Janeiro, cx. 65, doc. 15192.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 14.

mento, a strong reaction from the indigenous settlements in the inland, about which almost nothing was known, would prevent their occupation by the Portuguese troops. The Portuguese Crown would therefore see the *quid pro quo* attributed to it in the treaty compromised. Assuming these “sinister intentions” and “hidden purposes”<sup>25</sup> of the Spanish Crown, the Secretary of State informed Gomes Freire that *Colônia do Sacramento* should only be handed over after the occupation of the inland villages. Meanwhile, the settlement effort should be continued, in order to create a network of towns and villages linking the Brazilian coast to the most remote inland regions. The frankness in Carvalho e Melo’s secret letter allows us to assume that there was a prior relationship of complicity between the secretary of state and the very experienced colonial governor.

With regard to the northern region of Brazil, the plenipotentiary envoy who would lead the work of executing the treaty was Carvalho e Melo’s most trusted one: Francisco Xavier de Mendonça Furtado, his brother, who had been appointed governor of the State of *Grão Pará* and *Maranhão* in April 1751.

In Codex 626, Pombaline Collection (PBA.) of the National Library of Portugal, which gathers several papers produced between 1751 and 1757 belonging to Carvalho e Melo regarding Brazil, there are two versions of the royal instructions that were to be sent to the new governor of *Grão Pará* and *Maranhão* on 31 May 1751, signed by the Secretary of State for Navy and War, Diogo de Mendonça Corte Real<sup>26</sup>. The first version consists of a draft dated 30 May 1751, which differs in some points from the final version, set the following day. This final version integrated contributions from two figures: on the one hand, the Italian Jesuit Gabriel Malagrida, who had returned to Portugal in 1750 after decades of missionary work in Brazil, in order to request from José I the authorisation and resources necessary for the foundation of houses of worship; on the other hand, Carvalho e Melo, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and War.

As regards Malagrida’s contributions, the writer of the “Instructions” attributes to him point 24, concerning the creation of seminaries destined to instructing the youth, to each of which the consignment of 200 thousand *réis* (reals) was attributed, and points 25 and 26, concerning the foundation of retreat houses and convents for nuns, for which no dispatch from the governor was expected. At the end of point 26 we can read: “as you will not lack prudent doubts, with which you may justly find these foundations, you will entangle them to give me an account, always consulting with the Bishop, from whom you will send me his opinion”<sup>27</sup>.

Carvalho e Melo’s proposals, in turn, can be read in a paper that precedes the two versions of the “Instructions”, entitled “*Reflexões sobre a Instrução particular*” (Reflexions on

---

<sup>25</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 2, 3

<sup>26</sup> Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal, PBA. 626, fls. 7-12v; 12-19v.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibidem*, fls. 17-17v.

Private Instruction)<sup>28</sup>. Even if most of his proposals were not included in the instructions' final version, the document proves that already in May 1751 Carvalho e Melo had in mind several measures that he would promulgate later, as the Kingdom's Secretary of State. For instance, regarding points 9 and 10 of the "Instructions", which recommend the governor to urge the missionaries and encourage the natives to cultivate the land, Carvalho e Melo proposes the granting of positions and honours to the natives and the listing of wages for the different trades in similar proportions to those that were practised in the metropolis. On point 11, in which the governor is asked to ascertain the need for slave labour in the State of Pará and Maranhão, Carvalho e Melo states that a National Company for the African Coast should be created in order to raise capital for the purchase of slave labour even if it was preferable that the natives cultivate their lands. Commenting on point 12, regarding the settlement of inland territory, in a formulation that would become recurrent in the following decades, Carvalho e Melo proposed prizes for "honourable" farmers and a "Correction House for vagrants", which "would show the People, that the greatest mechanism, and ridicule, that a Man can reach is to give himself to leisure to live at other people's expense with public damage"<sup>29</sup>. Finally, in relation to points 13-16, concerning missionarying and management of indigenous captivity, Carvalho e Melo makes several considerations: he recommends that religious people be persuaded of the need for the State to guard the territories, in order to guarantee their security, evoking the recent losses in India, in Salsette<sup>30</sup> and Vasai; he recalls that a July 13th, 1748 royal resolution ordered the suspension of captivity, the liberation of the natives and the withdrawal of the troops that were capturing them, so there would be no reason to continue regulating the captivity and distribution of the natives; and finally, he suggests that the natives be taught trades, since "we were all barbarians at the beginning; and today we do not need priests to guide us through the secular"<sup>31</sup>.

The final version of the "Instructions" addressed to the governor of the State of Pará and Maranhão would only include shy reflections of Carvalho e Melo's considerations: in points 13 and 14 the governor is instructed to clarify the missionaries about any doubts that might arise regarding the natives' freedom, and the bishop of Pará is charged with examining the religious people's compliance with the July 13th, 1748 royal resolution. The inclusion of these instructions foreshadowed a coordinated action between Francisco Xa-

---

<sup>28</sup> *Ibidem*, fls. 3-5v. Our attribution of authorship to this text to Sebastião José de Carvalho e Melo is based on the autographic numberings inserted in a side note (f. 3) and the presence of textual contents identical to those of Carvalho e Melo's letter addressed to Mendonça Furtado August 4, 1755 (cf. Marcos Carneiro de Mendonça (ed.), *A Amazônia na era pombalina*, II, *op. cit.*, pp. 470 and ff.).

<sup>29</sup> *Ibidem*, fl. 4.

<sup>30</sup> Carvalho e Melo focused more specifically on this issue in 1738, while still ambassador to England. See "Memória do Socorro de Salsete", Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal, PBA. 654.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibidem*, fl. 5.

vier de Mendonça Furtado and Miguel de Bulhões e Sousa, the bishop of Pará, which was to have remarkable effects.

It should also be noted that in the two versions of the “Instructions” there is no noticeable animosity towards the Society of Jesus’ action in Brazilian territory. On the contrary, in point 19 it is stated that the order to investigate the observance of the determinations from July 13, 1748, regarding the freedom of the natives, was aimed above all at the Franciscans from the Order of Saint Anthony, adding, in point 20, that the religious work in the new settlements within the State’s limits should be given to the Jesuit priests, for being “those who treat Indians with the greatest charity and those who best know how to create and preserve the villages”, even if it was recommended to “avoid as much as possible the Missionaries’ temporal power over the Indians, restricting it as much as seems convenient”<sup>32</sup>.

In short, the “Instructions” addressed to Mendonça Furtado on May 31st, 1751 can be seen as a transitional document. It was written by Diogo Mendonça de Corte Real, Secretary of State for the Navy and Overseas Territories, son of a former Secretary of State for the Kingdom of John V, a figure who may be associated more with continuity than with the disruptions later undertaken by the Josephine and Pombaline governments. In fact, years later he was dismissed and deported, in August 1756. But, on the other hand, these “Instructions” are a record of the way in which a set of ideas and projects that would later be amplified and established as governmental guidelines were insinuated and brought closer to concretion. The populating of Brazil’s inland under the control of the State, reclaiming the temporal power assumed by religious agents in various regions, the boosting of agricultural production and the prohibition of opening new gold mines, and the conversion of indigenous population into wage labour are some of this document’s guidelines, which are still expressed in a not yet too concrete form, coexisting with elements of continuity, among which, the presence of the religious orders and their central role in the functioning of the administration and of colonial society.

As several authors have pointed out, Sebastião José de Carvalho e Melo not only was a non-critic or a non-enemy of the Society of Jesus, but also maintained quite cordial relations with some of its members<sup>33</sup>. In fact, concerning the fulfilment of his plans for Brazil, by this time he would even count on the collaboration of Jesuit priests, considering the knowledge they had of the territory and the indigenous populations. Within a few months, however, Carvalho e Melo’s position on the Society of Jesus changed as his

---

<sup>32</sup> *Ibidem.* fl. 10v.

<sup>33</sup> António Lopes, *O Marquês de Pombal e a Companhia de Jesus : correspondência inédita ao longo de 115 cartas de 1743 a 1751*, Lisbon, Principia, 1999; Manuel Antunes, “O Marquês de Pombal e os Jesuítas”, in AA.VV., *Como interpretar Pombal?*, *op. cit.*, pp. 125-144.



brother Mendonça Furtado sent him information on Pará and Maranhão state and the surrounding areas.

The extensive family letter written by Mendonça Furtado to Carvalho e Melo on November 21st, 1751<sup>34</sup> can be seen as the first major anti-Jesuitical report by the Governor of Pará and Maranhão. In it Mendonça Furtado identifies the action of those religious agents as the main source of the serious problems facing the state and as the main obstacle to the application of the reforms for which he was mandated. According to the governor, those religious elements, relying on the Regiment of the Missions (*Regimento das Missões*), exercised a tyrannical and despotic power over the indigenous populations, outside the law of the State. By keeping the natives under their control and keeping them away from the Portuguese - even forbidding them to learn or speak Portuguese - the priests would keep these populations in perpetual captivity. This situation allowed them to capture a large labour force. The governor added that: "As the regulars saw themselves as absolute masters over these people and their villages; as they became masters of the largest and best farms in this State, they naturally came to absorb all trade, both in the *sertões* and in this particular city, and the royal duties and tithes fell, and consequently the State fell, with no remission"<sup>35</sup>. Furthermore, the tax exemptions granted to the regulars allowed them an 80% advantage in relation to the prices practised by secular traders, which constituted an unfair competition that led to their ruin.<sup>36</sup>

From then on, the governor would relentlessly ponder on the issue of religious orders in Brazil. In a letter written a few days later on November 28th, 1751, after proposing the royal approval of several measures that aimed to remove the missionaries' temporal power over the indigenous populations, Mendonça Furtado bluntly concludes: "this is a good occasion to begin to ruin this State's common enemy, that being the Regiment of the Missions with which these two great captaincies have fallen to the abyss and reduced them to the ultimate penury and misery, despite having so many and so precious drugs"<sup>37</sup>. In a letter dated December 29th of the same year, the governor also proposes that José I ask the Holy See for a brief prohibiting the regulars from engaging in trade, foreseeing that, even if a trading company of "large capitals" was created<sup>38</sup>, the competition by those religious agents would ruin it.

In this set of family letters written by Mendonça Furtado between November and December 1751, the fundamental contentious terms that would unfold in the following years

---

<sup>34</sup> Marcos Carneiro de Mendonça (ed.), *A Amazônia na era pombalina*, I, *op. cit.*, pp. 109 and ff.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 121.

<sup>36</sup> In this regard, see: Manuel Nunes dias, "Estratégia pombalina de urbanização do espaço amazônico", in AA.VV., *Como interpretar Pombal?*, *op. cit.*, p. 319.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 131.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 206.

were thus defined. In short, controlling part of the territory and its human and natural resources, the religious orders maintained a State parallel to the State, which compromised the Crown's plans for settlement and control over territory in inland Brazil. Bearing in mind that these plans were seen by Carvalho e Melo - as they had previously been by D. Luís da Cunha - as essential for the preservation of the kingdom and for its affirmation in the international political and economic framework, the creation of means for their pursuit and the persecution of those who obstructed them constituted imperious matters of state<sup>39</sup>.

In letters written to Carvalho e Melo in the following years, Mendonça Furtado developed arguments and devices against the “enemies” of the State. In his letter of October 25th, 1752, he reminds his brother of the history of disputes regarding the affairs of the Society of Jesus and informs him that he had learned of the papers that procurator Paulo da Silva Nunes had presented in 1728 or 1729 in Lisbon about such affairs and the damage they caused to the State<sup>40</sup>. In further missives<sup>41</sup>, we can even find Mendonça Furtado carefully reading Father António Vieira's writings, compiling arguments in favour of indigenous liberties, at the same time pointing out the disturbances that would lead to the priest's expulsion from the states of Maranhão and Pará in 1662<sup>42</sup>.

In his letter of November 8th of the same year, the governor stated that there was an accumulation of petitions from natives regarding their liberation from the priest's guardianship, and that he had argued in a missions board (*junta das missões*) for the liberation of

---

<sup>39</sup> In the words of Francisco de Xavier Mendonça Furtado, in a letter to Carvalho Monteiro, dated February 18, 1754: “as the Regulars are the most powerful enemy of the State, and for this very reason domestic, even more powerful and harmful, and as most of the strength of this formidable body consists of the income from its estates and the large and magnificent number of slaves kept therein; it is clear that it cannot but be most useful to the State to mitigate and extinguish the forces of this greatest enemy”, *Ibidem*, II, p. 114.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibidem*. p. 331. These papers would be the *Traslado das propostas das Câmaras do Maranhão e do Pará* presented by Paulo da Silva Nunes at the Court of Lisbon. Carvalho e Melo would also base on a compilation of documents made by Silva Nunes, which would prove the damages caused by the Jesuits to the State of Maranhão and Pará, to develop a compilation entitled *Terribilidades jesuíticas ou colecção das representações, propostas e providências sobre as ruínas que aos povos do Estado Maranhão e Grão-Pará fizeram os povos do Estado Maranhão e do Grão-Pará os jesuítas, até o fim do reinado do rei D. João V* (Arquivo Histórico Ultramarino, Conselho Ultramarino, Livros do Maranhão e Pará, cod. 485), but which in fact brings together documents produced up to 1755 (cf. Roberta Lobão, *A construção do discurso antijesuítico na Amazônia Portuguesa*, São Paulo, Livraria da Física, 2021, pp. 240-292). Around 1769, this compilation would be enlarged, no longer restricted to documentation coming from Maranhão and Grão Pará, with the intention of constituting a great collection of documents referring to the abuses by the Society of Jesus. However, this compilation would only be published at the end of the 19th century (*Collecção dos negócios de Roma do reinado de el-rei D. José*, Lisbon, Imprensa Nacional, vol. II, 1874).

<sup>41</sup> *Ibidem*. pp. 410 and 546.

<sup>42</sup> For a reconstitution of these events, see: *Obra completa Padre António Vieira*, Dir. José Eduardo Franco and Pedro Calafate, *op. cit.*, t. IV, vol. III: *Escritos sobre os índios* (coord. and introd. Ricardo Ventura), 2014.

an indigenous woman against the rector of the Society's college. Mendonça Furtado had based himself on Solorzano, while the rector had turned to Molina<sup>43</sup>.

The history of the Society of Jesus' actions in Maranhão and Pará, the authors who could best counter the priests' arguments, are central issues in the letters written by the governor to his brother, the Secretary of State, between 1752 and 1754, testifying to the pivotal and seminal role played by Mendonça Furtado in the conception of the Josephine and Pombaline anti-Jesuit apology.

Tensions would worsen between 1753 and 1754, during the preparation and beginning of the expeditions to execute the Treaty of Limits. According to Mendonça Furtado, while armed confrontations were expected in the south of Brazil, in the north the priests sabotaged the work, denying logistical support and supplies to the troops and cartographic teams.

In the early months of 1754, the governor was still envisaging a soft solution to the Jesuit problem, which would involve the State taking control over the Society's estates, transforming them into villages, assigning the priests with church rates to ensure their sustenance and the preservation of their colleges and welfare institutions<sup>44</sup>. This measure got as far as receiving royal approval, as Carvalho e Melo secretly reported in a letter sent to his brother on March 14th, 1755<sup>45</sup>. However, the conflict escalation in the south and the "political earthquake"<sup>46</sup> of late 1755 would lead the Josephine government to adopt increasingly extreme measures related with the Society of Jesus. In effect, the Sebastião José de Carvalho e Melo's ascension to the position of Kingdom's Secretary of State, as a consequence of the power vacuum caused by the catastrophic 1755 earthquake, but also in recognition of his services and his possible proximity to José I's ideals, provided more favourable conditions regarding the development of Mendonça Furtado's plans for Brazil.

---

<sup>43</sup> Marcos Carneiro de Mendonça (ed.), *A Amazônia na era pombalina*, II, *op. cit.*, p. 356.

<sup>44</sup> Letter of 18 February, 1754, *ibidem.*, p. 116. Days before, on February 8, 1754, Mendonça Furtado had sent Carvalho e Melo a memoir of the Society of Jesus' estates in the state of Maranhão and Pará (*Ibidem.*, pp. 97-102).

<sup>45</sup> *Ibidem.*, p. 320.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. José Subtil, "O terramoto político (1755-1759) – Portugal aflito e conturbado", in *História e Ciência da Catástrofe – 250º Aniversário do terramoto de 1755*, coord. de Maria Fernanda Rollo *et al.*, Lisbon, Edições Colibri, 2007, pp. 155-186.

# THE DISPUTE BETWEEN THE STATE AND THE SOCIETY OF JESUS AS A DEFINING ISSUE OF THE JOSEPHINE GOVERNMENTAL PROJECT

**1st nucleus: “Pontifical briefs and royal laws that were issued and published from the year 1741 on the freedom of persons, goods and commerce of Brazilian natives”.**

The first nucleus of documents inserted in the *Coleção* was intended to demonstrate that the Josephine governmental purposes thwarted by the Society of Jesus were based on determinations issued by the most eminent authorities: the Holy See and the King, who in turn was based on a body of laws issued by his predecessors, the spirit of which would have been consistently reiterated for almost two centuries.

The *Immensa Pastorum* Bull, issued by Benedict XIV on December 20th, 1741, is the first document included in the compilation, in its original Latin version, published in Lisbon in 1755, and in a Portuguese translation from 1757. In it, the Pope forbids the enslavement of natives, under penalty of *latae sententiae* excommunication irrevocably, addressing all those who, “especially in these Regions of Brazil”, “making profession of the catholic faith, live so entirely forgetful of the Charity infused by the Holy Spirit”<sup>47</sup>. The order extended to all Catholics, including members of “any order, or congregation, or the Society of Jesus, or any other religion, institute of mendicants, or non-mendicants, of monastics, or any military orders”<sup>48</sup>. Still according to Benedict XIV, the fulfilment of these determinations would also be aided by the temporal power, since John V had already assured him that he would order all his ministers and officers of his dominions to punish without delay the transgressors with the penalties foreseen in the laws in force.

The publication of the *Immensa Pastorum* bull’s Portuguese version was ordered by Dom Frei Miguel de Bulhões, Bishop of Pará, on 29th March 1757, some fifteen years after its issue. The publication and affixing of this papal bull inside the cathedral of Pará is part of a close collaboration and articulation between Governor Mendonça Furtado and the Bishop of Pará, who also held the position of acting Captain since 1754<sup>49</sup>.

The second document in the *Coleção* is the law regarding the freedom of indigenous people issued by José I on June 6th, 1755. Drawn up by Carvalho e Melo, this law maintains remarkable relations with the reflections developed by him and his brother, Mendonça Furtado, at least since 1751, enshrining and giving force of law to some of its main points. Anticipating by a few months the political transformations that led to the nomination of

---

<sup>47</sup> CBPLR, Nr. I, p. 7

<sup>48</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Robeilton de Souza Gomes, *Dom Miguel de Bulhões: o bispo entre duas espadas (1754-1759)*, Final Report presented to the Federal University of Amazonas ([https://riu.ufam.edu.br/bitstream/prefix/1507/1/PIB\\_H\\_041.pdf](https://riu.ufam.edu.br/bitstream/prefix/1507/1/PIB_H_041.pdf)) (accessed on 10 September 2022).

Carvalho e Melo as Secretary of State for the Kingdom, this is one of the documents that demonstrates that even before the “political earthquake” Carvalho e Melo’s and Mendonça Furtado’s plans for Brazil were taking shape and gaining the king’s support in the face of the serious conflicts unleashed by the expeditions to enforce the Treaty of Limits.

The text of the law begins with a heavy balance sheet on more than two centuries of indigenous policy in Grão Pará and in Maranhão. According to the writer, until then, “not only have the Indians of that State not been multiplied and civilised”, but “it has been very differently, that having descended many millions of Indians, they were always being extinguished, so that their number of settlements and inhabitants is very small; these few still live in such great misery, that instead of inviting and encouraging the other barbarian Indians to imitate them, they serve as a scandal to them to go into their wild dwellings with lamentable damage to the salvation of their souls, and serious harm to the State itself”<sup>50</sup>.

According to the writer, this serious problem would have been identified by several previous monarchs, who promulgated laws of freedom for natives in 1570 (Sebastian I), 1587 and 1595 (Philip I), 1609 and 1611 (Philip II), 1647 and 1655 (John IV), 1680 (Peter II), which would have been constantly violated or subject to exceptions. However, this time, in addition to the liberation of the “gentiles” and the prohibition of new captivity, the king would stipulate the establishment of devices to integrate the natives into the colonial social and productive system, which would observe the “reciprocal interests, in which the establishment, increase, multiplication and prosperity of all civilised and polite villages consist”<sup>51</sup>. As we have seen, these provisions had already been formulated by Mendonça Furtado and Carvalho e Melo at least since 1751: Introduction of salaries that would guarantee the indigenous workers’ sustenance according to their profession and in similar proportion to what was practiced in the kingdom; free usage guarantee over their goods; distribution, to the indigenous, of lands adjacent to the villages, according to the model practiced in the recently founded Vila Nova de São José do Rio Negro, and exhortation and incentives for them to devote themselves to farming; civil instruction of the indigenous populations living in the interior, so that they would conserve “their freedoms in terms of persons, goods, and commerce”<sup>52</sup>.

Like the previous Indigenous freedom laws, the law of June 6th, 1755 imposed drastic changes on the way colonial society operated and opposition to its enforcement was expected to be fierce. However, this law introduced a notable break with previous laws. This break relates, on the one hand, to the legal and philosophical tradition on which the Josephine law seems to be based. Referring to the previous laws rooted in the jusnatural-

---

<sup>50</sup> *CBPLR*, Nr. II, p. 1

<sup>51</sup> *Idem*, p. 8

<sup>52</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 11.

ist tradition from the Iberian School of Peace<sup>53</sup>, the law of 6 June 1755 seems to find in them mainly authority or jurisprudence arguments, to add some new contents, based on utilitarian principles, such as “increase, multiplication and prosperity”, as well as contractual notions, such as “mutual convenience”.

Thus, the break made by the Josephine law in relation to the previous Portuguese laws on indigenous people is also related to a clear intention of secularising practices, envisaging a reconversion of those religious agents’ role in colonial spaces.

By this time the conditions that would allow the suspension of the Regiment of the Missions of 21 December 1686, which since then functioned as a kind of organic law concerning the management of the indigenous villages under the tutelage of the religious agents<sup>54</sup>, and its substitution by the *Diretório dos índios* (*Directory of the Indians*), prepared by Mendonça Furtado in 1755 and promulgated in 1757, would not be fully created. The third and last document of the first nucleus of the *Coleção*, the Charter of 7 June 1755, is another step in this direction. It provides for the derogation of the Regiment of the Missions’ first chapter, which gave the missionaries temporal power over their churches and missions, delegating the government of the villages to their principals (*caciques*) and recommending that the natives be preferred in the access to the positions of judges, town councillors and justice officers of their villages. Also written by Carvalho e Melo, this charter is a kind of addendum to the law signed the day before, aiming to create conditions for its execution, and a step closer to the Regiment of the Missions’ annulment project.

**2nd nucleus: “On the excesses committed in that State by the regulars of the Society called Jesus; on the representations which His Most Faithful Majesty made to the Holy Apostolic See on this matter up to the dispatch of the brief which ordered the reformation of the said regulars”**

The opening text of the *Coleção*’s second nucleus, entitled “ Main Points to reduce the abuses with which the Religious of the Society of Jesus have usurped the domains of Portuguese and Spanish America”<sup>55</sup> may be seen as a first draft of an accusatory libel. Although we do not have exact data on date, authorship and place of production, it appears to have been produced in the context of the conflict escalation in the southern region in 1754, focusing on earlier aspects of the dispute between the State and the Society of Jesus

---

<sup>53</sup> In this respect see: AA. VV., *A Escola Ibérica da Paz nas Universidades de Coimbra e Évora (séculos XVI e XVII)*, vol. I: *Sobre as matérias da guerra e da paz*, Dir. de Pedro Calafate, Coimbra, Almedina, 2015; vol. II: *Escritos sobre a justiça, o poder e a escravatura*, Dir. Pedro Calafate, Coimbra, Almedina, 2015; vol. III: *De restitutione: Sobre a propriedade e o poder civil*, Dir. Pedro Calafate and Ricardo Ventura, Coimbra, Almedina, 2020.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Karl Heinz Arenz, “Entre supressão e consolidação: Os aldeamentos jesuíticos na Amazônia portuguesa (1661-1693)”, in Suely de Almeida *et al.* (org.), *Políticas e estratégias administrativas no mundo atlântico*, Recife, Editora Universitária – UFPE, p. 334; see also José Oscar Beozzo, *Leis e regimentos das missões: Política indigenista no Brasil*, São Paulo, Loyola, 1983.

<sup>55</sup> *CBPLR*, Nr. IV, p. 1.

largely denounced by Mendonça Furtado in his letters to his brother. To that extent, it is also likely that the drafting of these points, even if not executed by Mendonça Furtado, was conducted by him, with the support of someone versed in legal topics.

The main sources cited - Solorzano and Pufendorf - also allow us to relate this text to the reflections developed by Mendonça Furtado in his epistolary work and, later, in the *Directório dos índios*: Solorzano, an author of the second wave of scholasticism, provided elements for critical reflection on specific elements of indigenist policy, while Pufendorf inspired a conception of natural law and the rights of peoples that allowed for various convergences with the Josephine political ideology under construction.

The text is structured in five points, each one corresponding to a usurpation perpetrated by the priests of the Society of Jesus.

The first point - "Usurpation of the Indians' freedom" - accuses the Jesuits of considering the natives as barbaric peoples and slaves by nature, a concept that would be refuted not only by modern natural law (according to Pufendorf, in his *Direito natural e das gentes* - On The Law of Nature and Man), but also according to the doctors of natural and divine law (Solorzano), the pontifical decrees by Alexander VI, Paul III, Clement VIII and Benedict XIV, and the Portuguese and Spanish royal laws.

Deriving from the first point, the second point is entitled "Usurpation of the property of the same Indians" and appeals to the same authorities to claim the right of the Indians to the possession of their lands, "as natural, primary and previous inhabitants and occupants of them before they were conquered"<sup>56</sup>.

The third point - "Usurpation of the perpetual cure of the same Indians' parishes" - is centred above all on Solorzano and on pontifical determinations to advocate that secular clerics should be in charge of the religious assistance to the natives, being permitted only to regular clerics in cases where the former were not in sufficient number. According to the drafter, this precept had become even more urgent in view of the recent rebellions, which Solorzano had not been able to foresee in his time.

The fourth point - "Usurpation of the temporal government of the same Indians" - is also based on Solorzano to advocate that "the Government of their principals, and *caciques*, is the most convenient, most accommodating to their genius, and most conformable to reason, the customs and the royal laws and orders"<sup>57</sup>, and in Reinhardt Bachovius (1544-1614), German Calvinist theologian and jurist, to counter the idea attributed to the priests that "the Indians are senseless, and incapable of political government"<sup>58</sup>.

The fifth point - "Usurpation of land and sea trade of the same Indians" - is the longest, probably because it deals with central issues of the dispute between the Josephine ruling

---

<sup>56</sup> *CBPLR*, Num. IV - "Pontos Principais", p. 2.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 5.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibidem*.

and the Society of Jesus. Starting by recalling several pontifical and royal dispositions that prohibited religious agents from engaging in commerce, except for the sale of surplus production and the purchase of necessary goods, the redactor accuses the Society of Jesus' priest of maintaining "rigorous negotiations"<sup>59</sup> that far exceeded what was stipulated. He also responds to the missionaries' arguments, who advocated that these activities were aimed at negotiating the expeditions concerning the descending of natives to the urban areas, the ornamentation of churches, the dressing of natives and the provision of medical care, claiming that these needs were not really provided for and that, when they were minimally provided for, the costs were borne by the State.

The terms used to describe the situation in the American territory are expressive. According to the writer, the regime of "slavery", of "monopoly", of "tyranny" imposed by the priests allowed them to hoard "all the substance" from the Indigenes, portrayed as "unfortunate rationals". This blunt rhetoric would become, henceforth, a hallmark of the anti-Joséphine and Pombaline Jesuit discourse.

Without the detail and the proximity of later texts, "Main Points" was probably the first pamphlet containing a frontal attack on the Society of Jesus published by the Joséphine government. It is not clear today what were the specific objectives and the context of its writing and publication, but it is known that the compilers understood there were enough demonstrative qualities in it for its inclusion in the *Coleção*, as well as in the "Evidence" of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* (Evidence LVIII).

Fortunately, we have much more information about the history of the production and dissemination of the second document included in the second nucleus of the *Coleção* and in the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* (Evidence LXI): The *Relação abreviada da república que os religiosos jesuítas das províncias de Portugal e Espanha estabeleceram nos domínios ultramarinos das duas monarquias, e da guerra que neles tem movido e sustentado contra os exércitos espanhóis e portugueses; formada pelos registos das secretarias dos dois respetivos principais comissários e plenipotenciários* (Brief Account of the republic that the Jesuit religious of the provinces of Portugal and Spain established in the overseas domains of the two monarchies, and of the war they have waged and sustained therein against the Spanish and Portuguese armies; formed by the records of the secretariats of the two respective main commissioners and plenipotentiaries)<sup>60</sup>.

Published by the end of 1757, the pamphlet was first distributed in Lisbon on December 3, Saint Francis Xavier's feast day<sup>61</sup>. However, having earned a print run of 20 thousand copies, a wide circulation was certainly foreseen also in the overseas domains. Furthermore, the pamphlet could also respond to the European curiosity about the mysterious

---

<sup>59</sup> *Ibidem.*, p. 6.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibidem.*, Nr. IV – *Relação abreviada*.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. José Eduardo Franco, *O mito dos Jesuítas. Em Portugal, no Brasil e no Oriente (séculos XVI a XX)*, vol. I, *op. cit.*, pp. 477-478.



Jesuit republics in the inlands of South America, about which the fanciful narrative by King Nicholas<sup>62</sup> had been circulating at least since 1751.

The *Relação abreviada* can thus be seen as the first product of the broad, Europe-wide campaign<sup>63</sup>, undertaken by the Josephine and Pombaline ruling against the Society of Jesus. It witnesses a change of government strategy, after the ascension of Carvalho e Melo to the position of the Kingdom's Secretary of State, according to which the conflict with the Society of Jesus ceased to be an internal issue, for which negotiations and compromises between both parties could be thought of, to be presented as a problem that should concern all "civilised" nations and call for intervention by the Holy See.

By looking up the papers in box PBA. 757 of the National Library of Portugal, confirmation of the important role played by Carvalho e Melo is made possible regarding the conduct of this campaign and his intervention not only in the process of writing the *Relação abreviada*, but also, later, in the conception of the *Coleção*<sup>64</sup>. Among these papers, there are three handwritten versions of the *Relação abreviada*: a preparatory and still incomplete version<sup>65</sup>, with numerous cuts and additions handwritten by the Kingdom's Secretary of State; an already complete version, closer to the final one, which also includes autographic interventions by Carvalho e Melo<sup>66</sup>; and an Italian translation of the full text, from which it was translated into other European languages, circulating around the world.<sup>67</sup>

In fact, from the beginning Carvalho e Melo sought to keep himself well informed about the progress of the expeditions regarding the execution of the Treaty of Limits. Besides official letters, the Secretary of State and the governors and commissioners plenipotentiary of the treaty's execution, Mendonça Furtado in the north and Freire de An-

---

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Anonymous, *Histoire de Nicolas I, roy du Paraguai, et empereur des mamelus*, 1751. On this subject see also José Eduardo Franco, *O Mito dos Jesuítas*, p. 422.

<sup>63</sup> In an important study - *Guerra aos Jesuítas. A propaganda antijesuítica do Marquês de Pombal em Portugal e na Europa*, Lisbon, Temas e Debates, 2017 -, Christine Vogel reconstructs and analyses this campaign as a "media event with European dimension" (p. 8).

<sup>64</sup> Despite the entry of item 757 in the Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal's Pombaline Collection inventory stating that it contains "Papeis varios sem importância e truncados" (*Inventario - Secção XVIII - Collecção Pombalina*, Lisbon, Bibliotheca Nacional, 1889), it consists of a box containing an important collection of papers belonging to Carvalho e Melo, relating to the expulsion of the Society of Jesus. Among these are official notes and letters concerning the expulsion of the apostolic nuncio, three versions of the *Relação abreviada*, private correspondence with Francisco Almada de Mendonça and Francisco Saldanha, among other documents. Starting on fl. 301, the box also includes a compilation of documents whose contents and numbering coincide, to a large extent, with those of the *Coleção*, proving Carvalho e Melo's direct participation in the conception of the volume.

<sup>65</sup> Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal, PBA. 757, fls. 90-114v.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibidem*, fls. 282-308v.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibidem*, fls. 319-339v.

drade in the south, exchanged private letters<sup>68</sup> in which they more secretly analysed the events and planned strategies to approach the Jesuit question. This communication also had the intention of collecting and compiling documents that could serve as evidence on the amazing events in the inland of South America. By the time the *Relação abreviada* was written, Carvalho e Melo and his closest circle of collaborators already had documentary elements and a version of the facts drawn up in convergence with their intentions.

The pamphlet's main thesis, stated in the explanatory title, is that the Society of Jesus' priests had secretly established a republic in the far reaches of South America, that of Uruguay and Paraguay, which maintained and enriched itself from the exploitation of enslaved indigenous labour, encroaching domains from the Portuguese and Spanish crowns. The editors proposed, therefore, to expose this "absolute monopoly of bodies and souls"<sup>69</sup>, finally uncovered by the execution operations of the Treaty of Limits, and to narrate the resulting conflicts.

To try to reinforce the credibility of the accounts, the reconstitutions of the first confrontations in 1753 and 1754 is accompanied by quotes taken from reports by Freire de Andrade and the Marquis of Valdelirios, commander of the Spanish troops. The violence committed by indigenous people against the demarcation teams is said to have originated in a policy promoted by the priests, of promoting fear and hatred against the "whites". The infantry weapons available to the republic's troops, as well as the buildings in which they were fortified, testified to vast resources, acquired through trade and agriculture, and careful preparation for confrontation.

The account of the battles fought between 1754 and 1756 is curiously brief. The war would come to an end after the occupations of the villages of São Miguel, São Lourenço and São João, between May and June 1756. Among the spoils of the village of São João, Freire de Andrade would find the documents that were translated and placed as an appendix to the *Relação abreviada*, which aimed to prove the role played by the priests in the command of the uprisings and illustrate the doctrines of hatred against the Portuguese disseminated by them among the natives<sup>70</sup>.

After the narration of the warlike events to the south, the report focuses on the events in the north. Based textually on Mendonça Furtado's letters, it denounces the obstacles placed in the way of preparing the expeditions and the control exercised by the priests over the natives, restricting the use of the Portuguese language and prohibiting Portuguese officials from entering their villages. At one point, we read a paragraph summarising the thesis of the five usurpations set out in "Main points"<sup>71</sup>. The uprisings would have

---

<sup>68</sup> Cf. BNP, Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal, PBA. 626.

<sup>69</sup> CBPLR, Nr. IV – *Relação abreviada*, p. 3.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 9.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 13.

multiplied as expeditions and measures to settle the interior advanced. For example, it is reported that in 1756 in the village of Borba, Anselm Eckart and Anton Meisterburg, German Jesuits, were responsible for various disorders in response to the erection of the village of Borba-a-Nova, in Amazonas, on the village of Trocano, previously under the guardianship of the Society of Jesus<sup>72</sup>. These and other events in the state of Pará and Maranhão, less serious than the conflicts in the south, added to them, configuring a Jesuit conspiracy that also encompassed the Portuguese, Spanish and Pontifical courts. The *Relação abreviada* closes with the announcement of the royal laws of 6 and 7 June 1756 and the publication, by the bishop of Pará, of the pontifical bull of 20 December 1741, measures that sought remedy for the complaints of the States of Pará and Maranhão's inhabitants, but that were still insufficient to contain the "seditious machinations"<sup>73</sup> by the priests.

The next step in the Josephine campaign against the Society of Jesus was to contact the Pope about the events in Brazil, in order to ask him for measures to limit the action of the religious agents. The third document in the second nucleus of the *Coleção* is the "Instruction" sent by José I to the Portuguese ambassador at the Roman Curia, Francisco de Almada de Mendonça, on 8 October 1757.

This "Instruction" had attached the *Relação abreviada*, through which Rome could know and prove the "detestable excesses"<sup>74</sup> committed by the priests. Almada de Mendonça is also provided with a summary of the arguments hitherto compiled by the Josephine government: the briefs and laws preventing religious from engaging in trade are mentioned; the "usurpations" are denounced; and the pontifical briefs and royal laws concerning the liberties of the natives are recalled. In this sense, the ambassador's efforts should be aimed at obtaining from the supreme pontiff provisions that would return the priests to the exercise of their spiritual functions, in imitation of their "glorious" founders, Saint Francis Xavier and Saint Francis of Borja, "removed from all interference in political affairs, and in temporal and mercantile interests"<sup>75</sup>. Finally, Almada de Mendonça is also instructed to evoke the trial of the Knights Templar as an example of a pontifical intervention which repressed the rebellion of a religious order against the legitimate temporal power of a Catholic king.

---

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Karl Heinz Arenz, "O 'tapuitinga' Anselm Eckart e os índios na Amazônia portuguesa: Representações e mediações (1753-1757)", *ANPUH-Brasil – 30.º Simpósio Nacional de História*, Recife, 2019: [https://www.snh2019.anpuh.org/resources/anais/8/1564786482\\_ARQUIVO\\_OtapuitingaAnselmEckarteosindios-daAmazonia\(KarlArenz\).pdf](https://www.snh2019.anpuh.org/resources/anais/8/1564786482_ARQUIVO_OtapuitingaAnselmEckarteosindios-daAmazonia(KarlArenz).pdf) (accessed on 13 September 2022).

<sup>73</sup> *CBPLR*, Nr. IV – *Relação abreviada*, p. 23. The term "machinations" recurs in Josephine and Pombaline documentation to refer to the alleged conspiracies or intrigues hatched by the Society's priests. Among the most notable examples of this term is the large manuscript compilation of texts by Father Antonio, now in the Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal, ordered by the Marquis of Pombal, which was given the title "Maquinações de António Vieira jesuíta". Cf. José Eduardo Franco, *O mito dos Jesuítas. Em Portugal, no Brasil e no Oriente (séculos XVI a XX)*, vol. I, *op. cit.*, pp. 544 and ff.).

<sup>74</sup> *CBPLR*, Nr. V, p. 2.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 6.

Almada de Mendonça was Carvalho e Melo's cousin and deserved his full confidence. In the family letters exchanged between them during this period, the complicity that existed between them is obvious. However, his mission as ambassador faced various difficulties, mainly due to the opposition of Cardinal Corsini. In the letter of 5 January 1758, Almada de Mendonça proposes the writing of a new "anonymous" account that he could provide to the "public"<sup>76</sup> to dispel all doubts about the abuses committed by the Jesuits in Brazil.

The reply that came from Lisbon, the "Instruction"<sup>77</sup> addressed to Almada de Mendonça on 10 February 1758, the fourth document of the second nucleus of the *Coleção*, took into account some of this proposal's aspects. However, from then on, the strategy to be followed would no longer be based on the disclosure of anonymous news, but rather on the presentation of the conflict with the Society of Jesus as a State matter, explicitly taken up by the Josephine government before the "public" and the European courts. To that extent, in this new "Instruction", the editors no longer focus on the events occurring in Brazilian territory, but extend to the abuses allegedly perpetrated by the priests in the kingdom over the previous two years: preaching and conspiring against the Society of Pará and Maranhão, spreading prophecies that interpreted the 1755 earthquake as a divine punishment brought to the kingdom by the Josephine ruling, inciting a popular riot in the city of Oporto in 1757 against the newly created Company of the Wines of the Upper Douro<sup>78</sup> and spreading the rumour that the king intended to abolish the Portuguese Inquisition. The "Instruction" would follow to Rome accompanied by a copy of the sentence handed down by the Oporto Court, which would prove the involvement of the Ignatian priests in the Oporto riot.

The new strategy of international disclosure of a matter of state, undertaken by Carvalho e Melo, and the diligence by Almada de Mendonça seem to have had an effect. On April 1st 1758, Benedict XIV issued a bull in which, given the "disorders, and abuses, of which almost all the powers, and nations of Europe are informed by the small stamped book"<sup>79</sup>, appointed Cardinal Francisco Saldanha Apostolic Visitor and apostolic reformer of the Society of Jesus in Portugal. This document, which closes the second nucleus of the *Coleção*, reproduced in the Latin original and in its Portuguese translation, introduces a new phase of the dispute between the Society of Jesus and the Josephine government, in which the central stage of the disputes would definitely be transferred to the kingdom.

---

<sup>76</sup> "I would have had a clear notice of the irregular progress of the Society in Pará, Aldeas altas of Rio Negro, and Maranhão. I would have by now given the public a printed (anonymous) Account, which would have enabled the public to know the falsehood of what the said Fathers are spreading", Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal, PBA. 757, fl. 269v.

<sup>77</sup> *CBPLR*, Nr. VI.

<sup>78</sup> On this mutiny, see: Francisco Ribeira da Silva, "Os motins do Porto de 1757 (novas perspectivas)", in AA. VV., *Pombal revisitado*, Lisbon, Editorial Estampa, 1984, pp. 247-283.

<sup>79</sup> *CBPLR*, Nr. VII, p. 2.

**3rd nucleus: “On the procedures practiced by the most eminent and reverend reformer against them [the members of the Society of Jesus]; on the absurdities into which the same regulars rushed at the stimulus of the aforesaid reformation until the horrendous insult of September 3rd of the year 1758; on the sentences that were passed about it; on the royal orders that were published after the same sentence; on the accounts that the most faithful King’s filial veneration made to the Pope about everything that he had ordered about the same insult, and its consequences”.**

Cardinal Saldanha was close to Carvalho e Melo, and his appointment as Visitor and Reformer of the Society of Jesus presaged close cooperation. On 15 May 1758, from his residence in Lisbon Saldanha issued a decree forbidding Jesuit priests, under penalty of *latae sententiae* excommunication, to engage in any kind of commercial activity, in compliance with several pontifical decrees. The decree was to be read and recorded communally in all Ignatian houses, so that no priest could allege ignorance about it<sup>80</sup>.

This document, which opens the third nucleus of the *Coleção*, is followed by an official letter of 7 June 1758<sup>81</sup> by the Cardinal Patriarch of Lisbon, D. José Manuel da Câmara, suspending the Jesuit priests from the exercise of confession for an indeterminate period, until further instructions. In response, the father general of the Society of Jesus presented a memorial, trying to impugn the Patriarch’s letter. This memorial and the opinion issued by the Congregation, favourable to the patriarch, were also included in the *Coleção*<sup>82</sup>.

However, the plan to reform the Society of Jesus suffered a serious setback. On 3 May 1758 Benedict XIV died, to be succeeded by Clement XIII, elected on 6 July of the same year, who was known to be sympathetic to the Ignatian cause.

In a swift reaction to these events, Cardinal Francisco Saldanha was appointed Patriarch of Lisbon on 25 July 1758, consolidating a strategy of proximity between the State and the Church and seeking to strengthen the cardinal’s authority as visitor and reformer of the Society of Jesus.

The attempt on the life of Joseph I, which occurred on the night of September 3rd, 1758, would definitively change the course of events. The royal decree for the investigation of the ambush’s culprits was issued on December 9th, 1758<sup>83</sup>. Sentencing would take just over a month. The long ruling of 12 January 1759 exposed a supposed conspiratorial network that included several members of the Portuguese aristocracy with affinities to the Society of Jesus. One of the alleged three heads of the conspiracy, the Marquise Leonor de Távora, had Fathers Gabriel Malagrida, João de Matos and João Alexandre as spiritual guides<sup>84</sup>. According to the sentence, the priests would not only have encouraged

---

<sup>80</sup> *Ibidem*, Nr. VIII, p. 10.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibidem*, Nr. IX.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibidem*., Nr. X.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibidem*., Nr. XI.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibidem*., Nr. XII, p. 5.

the nobles with their slanders against the Josephine government, but would have actively participated in the planning of the attack. However, the judgment did not foresee penalties for the religious figures, who were protected by ecclesiastical immunity.

The first royal punitive measures concerning the Jesuit priests would be issued on January 19. To the Chancellor of the Casa da Suplicação (Court of Appeal) and to the Chancellor of the Court of Appeal of Oporto were sent decrees to proceed to the seizure of the goods held by the Society of Jesus, to inventory them and to lease them in public auction for a period of one year<sup>85</sup>. To avoid further disagreements, the king also decreed the detention of the religious agents and their lay coadjutors and their concentration in each city's or town's main houses. Attached to these decrees were copies of the sentence of 12 January, authenticated by the Kingdom's Secretary of State.

Besides these decrees, a letter was also sent to the Portuguese prelates in which the king succinctly explained the reasons that led him to impose punitive measures on the religious of the Society of Jesus and communicated the sending of a copy of the authenticated sentence and a text in which the doctrinal errors propagated by the Jesuit priests were exposed.

This text, entitled “Erros ímpios e sediciosos que os religiosos da Companhia de Jesus ensinaram aos réus que foram justicados, e pretenderam espalhar nos povos destes reinos”<sup>86</sup> (The impious and seditious errors taught by the religious of the Society of Jesus to the kingdoms, which had been judged, and which they intended to spread in the nations of such kingdoms) is demonstrative of a new approach to Josephine ruling, in which not only the actions of the Jesuits present in the kingdom and its domains targeted, but rather a whole body of doctrines associated to the Society of Jesus. Thus, not only would some Jesuits be at stake, but Jesuitism itself, as a conspiratorial doctrine that put at risk the security of all European kingdoms.

In a formulation that owes much to Jansenist anti-Jesuitical thought<sup>87</sup>, four errors are listed - slander, legitimating murder, lies and secrecy - which the casuistry cultivated by the Jesuits would supposedly legitimise in order to carry out their “machinations”. Denouncing “this play on words, and puerile, scholastic distinctions” with which “not only Christian and Evangelical morals were ruined; but even the very ethics of the Gentile philosophers, in whom the power of natural reason had dominion”<sup>88</sup>, “Erros ímpios” may

---

<sup>85</sup> *Ibidem.*, Nr. XIII, p. 5

<sup>86</sup> *CBPLR*, Nr. XIV

<sup>87</sup> On this subject, see José Eduardo Franco, *Em Portugal, no Brasil e no Oriente (séculos XVI a XX)*, vol. I, *op. cit.*, pp. 81 and ff. On the important role played by Jansenist circles in the translation and dissemination of Jesuit and Pombaline texts, see also Christine Vogel, “A campanha portuguesa e a sua difusão na Europa”, in *Guerra aos Jesuítas. A propaganda antijesuítica do Marquês de Pombal em Portugal e na Europa*, *op. cit.*, pp. 134-169. See also: Cândido dos Santos, *O Jansenismo em Portugal*, Oporto, FLUP, 2007.

<sup>88</sup> *CBPLR*, Num. XIV, p. 11.

be considered one of the first expressions of Pombaline anti-Scholasticism, which would have wide repercussions on cultural and university policy in the following decades.<sup>89</sup>

In the explanation of the fourth error, we also find the editors well acquainted with the history of the contestation against the Society of Jesus by other ecclesiastical writers, the reservations expressed by the archbishop of Mexico, Juan de Palafox y Mendonza, Melchor Cano, Arias Montano and Jeronimo Baptista Lanuza being mentioned.

With this document, Josephine ruling made clear to the Portuguese prelates its determination to intervene in the definition of the philosophical or doctrinal lines according to which they should be governed, which also meant greater authority and more intense participation by the State in defining ecclesiastical affairs.

The next step in this royal campaign was to communicate its latest measures to the supreme pontiff. The first approach consisted of a “Supplication”<sup>90</sup> addressed on 15 April 1759, in which the king asked Clement XIII to judge the religious involved in the attack at an ecclesiastical court. Reinforcing the arguments of the first missive, the king would send on April 20 a letter<sup>91</sup> in which he presented copies of his determinations, as well as a long “Dedução, ou pró-memória” (Deduction or *pro memoria*), in which the main events that occurred between the issuing of the Papal Brief of December 20, 1741 and the disclosure of the “Impious Errors” to the diocesan prelates were reconstructed. In short, the “Dedução, ou pró-memória” traces a chronological path analogous to the one in which the *Coleção* is structured, based on series of documents that would confirm the veracity of the facts and the legitimacy of the measures taken by the Josephine government.

**4th nucleus: “And on the participation that the same monarch made to the most eminent and reverend cardinal reformer and more diocesan prelates of these kingdoms, on the last and final resolutions that he had taken to expel the said regulars from their kingdoms and dominions”.**

As we mentioned at the beginning of our study, January 3, 1759, exactly one year after the attack on Joseph I, was the day symbolically chosen for the issuing of the decree expelling the Society of Jesus from the kingdom of Portugal and its domains<sup>92</sup>.

Signed by the king and by Carvalho e Melo, who in the meantime had taken on the title of Count of Oeiras, the decree of 3 January 1759 finally stipulated the expulsion of the priests, confiscation of all of the Society of Jesus’ goods in Portugal and the death penalty for anyone who allowed priests of this religious order to enter the kingdom. Given the gravity of the measure, the decree is surprisingly brief and less verbose in style than previous texts.

---

<sup>89</sup> On Pombaline antischolasticism, see: Paula Carreira, *O mentor remoto da crise de Portugal: a recepção de Aristóteles no século XVIII*, PhD dissertation in Philosophy presented to Faculty of Letters, University of Lisbon, 2019.

<sup>90</sup> *CBPLR*, Nr. XVI.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibidem*, Nr. XV.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibidem*, Nr. XIX.

In the royal letter to patriarch Francisco Saldanha<sup>93</sup>, written that same day, and which opens the fourth nucleus of the *Coleção*, the king explains that, after having informed Clement XIII, in previous April's missives, of the serious recent events, he felt he had fulfilled his duty before the Holy See, so he would no longer postpone the determinations he saw as necessary to punish the abuses perpetrated by the Jesuit priests. To that extent, he communicated the important decree issued that day, "given the demonstrations, which as king (which in the temporal should not recognize, nor recognizes in the Higher land) I found myself needed, both by the divine, natural, and people's laws, and the examples of the most pious monarchs of Europe, and the kings of my religious predecessors"<sup>94</sup>. José I was thus unequivocally exposing some of the pillars on which the immense leap forward brought about by the decree of 9 September was based: a regalist conception of royal power; a perspective on natural law and the rights of nations which, as we have seen, was guided by utilitarian and contractualist principles; the example of European monarchs and their Portuguese predecessors.

In the *Suplemento*<sup>95</sup> to the *Coleção*, also published in 1760, the Kingdom's Secretariat of State compiled the documents relating to the contacts between the Portuguese court and the Holy See between April 1759 and July 1760, which would eventually result in a breakdown of diplomatic relations that would last for about ten years.

## CONCLUSION

The path we have traced has sought to situate the *Coleção* and the texts it contains in the context of the political changes that took place between the last years of João V's reign and the first ten years of the Josephine government. To try to better understand the close antecedents<sup>96</sup> of the Pombaline anti-Jesuitical campaign and the process of formulating topics and devices from that campaign, we focus on the action and ideas of a group of men whom we call "human chain", as Marcos Carneiro de Mendonça's expression put it.

This approach made it possible to fix two common features in these authors' thinking: on the one hand, their experience abroad, which was the basis for a deep knowledge on the ongoing dynamics of the war of nations; on the other hand, the mercantilist convic-

---

<sup>93</sup> *Ibidem.*, Nr. XVII.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibidem.*, Nr. XVII, p. 30.

<sup>95</sup> *Suplemento à Collecção dos breves pontifícios, leys regias, e officios que se passaram entre as cortes de Roma, e Lisboa, sobre os absurdos em que no reino de portugal, e seus dominios, se haviaõ precipitado os regulares da Companhia denominada de Jesu: Nelle se contem a continuação do que passou entre as referidas duas cortes depois das representações que elRey fidelissimo mandou fazer ao papa em vinte de abril do anno proximo passado de Mil Setecentos Cincoenta e Nove, como foram compiladas debaixo dos numeros xv e xvi da dita Collecção até o mez de junho do presente anno de Mil Setecentos e Sessenta*, Lisbon, Printed at the Secretariat of State, 1760.

<sup>96</sup> For a complementary approach to more distant antecedents, see José Eduardo Franco, *O mito dos Jesuítas. Em Portugal, no Brasil e no Oriente (séculos XVI a XX)*, vols. I e II, *op. cit.*



tion that the only possibility for Portugal to compete in this context would be to populate Brazilian territory and consequently take advantage of its resources and potential.

As we follow the beginnings of the formulation of the Pombaline anti-Jesuitical thesis by Mendonça Furtado and its developments documented in the *Coleção*, we witness, therefore, a dynamic process in which the dispute between reformist ruling and the modes of colonial management regarding the Society of Jesus became a state matter, transferring itself from the colony to the kingdom, and from the kingdom to Europe, and ultimately terminally conditioning the reformist governance project of the entire kingdom and its dominions.

Throughout this journey, we intentionally tried to abstain from making judgments about the truth or the correctness of the measures taken by the Josephine government, and even less about the justness of the judgments made by Mendonça Furtado or Carvalho e Melo about the action of the Society of Jesus. Returning to Borges de Macedo's reflection, we have tried "to consider the motivations, the enunciation of the resources and possibilities of the time, to find its precarious rules and above all to avoid, as a rule, followed to exhaustion, the court-history"<sup>97</sup>. We also exempted ourselves from approaching the Ignatian side of the dispute, focusing on understanding the formulation process of the anti-Jesuitical thesis in the early years of Pombaline ruling.

This eminently descriptive and expository mode of approach, attentive above all to discourses and documents, as well as to the historical process from which they immediately result and in which they immediately participate, avoids an idealist or nominalist approach, which seeks the more or less direct and faithful adequacy of an idea or a movement - such as mercantilism, enlightenment, regalism, etc. - to the figures, facts, or historical processes in question.

More than a "peripheral enlightenment"<sup>98</sup> or a "paradox of enlightenment"<sup>99</sup>, the Pombaline case can thus be seen as a historical process in which it becomes particularly evident that the enlightenment ideals, under the discursive guise of the liberation of humanity<sup>100</sup>, also drove and legitimised a global dynamic of exploitation and imposition of Eurocentric concepts such as "human" and "civilisation".

---

<sup>97</sup> Jorge Borges de Macedo, "Dialéctica da sociedade", *op. cit.*, p. 16.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. Charles W. J. Withers, *Placing the Enlightenment. Thinking Geographically about the Age of Reason*, Chicago/London, University of Chicago Press, 2007.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. MAXWELL, Kenneth, *The Marquis of Pombal [Paradox of Enlightenment]*, Lisbon, Presença, 2001.

<sup>100</sup> We recall in this respect the pressing question posed by Foucault in his commentary on Kant's article entitled "Was ist Aufklärung?": "Faut-il comprendre que c'est l'ensemble de l'espèce humaine qui est prise dans le processus de l'*Aufklärung*? Et dans ce cas, il faut imaginer que l'*Aufklärung* est un changement historique qui touche à l'existence politique et sociale de tous les hommes sur la surface de la terre. Ou faut-il comprendre qu'il s'agit d'un changement qui affecte ce qui constitue l'humanité de l'être humain?" (Michel Foucault, "Qu'est-ce que les Lumières?", in *Dits et écrits*, t. IV, 1984, pp. 562-578: <https://foucault.info/documents/foucault.questcequeLesLumieres.fr/> (accessed on 18 September 2022).

# DEDUÇÃO CRONOLÓGICA E ANALÍTICA

## CHRONOLOGICAL AND ANALYTICAL DEDUCTION

**Pedro Calafate and José Esteves Pereira**

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The *Dedução cronológica e analítica*<sup>1</sup> (1757-1758) is one of Pombalism's most relevant treatises on political philosophy, as it sets out the foundations of the absolute state, following an expository method that exacerbates the counter-polarity between light and darkness, progress and decadence, so that its authors and proposals could be presented before the country in a messianic framework of national salvation.

Although António Pereira de Figueiredo, in a letter dated 27 April 1771, states that “this is the Marquis' masterpiece”,<sup>2</sup> to the extent that he would have been “its author”, he did not fail to previously stress, in the Preface to the *Compêndio da vida e acções de João Gerson* (*Compendium of the Life and Actions of João Gerson*) (1769)<sup>3</sup> that this same *Dedução* was an “immortal work” by José Seabra da Silva. In contrast, if we look at the opening page of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, it states that it was “given the green light” by the same jurist José Seabra da Silva, in the sense that it was published by him, which is not the same as saying that he was its author.

This plurality of disparate references leads us to conclude that it is probably the result of a teamwork, closely followed by Pombal, as it happened with the *Compêndio histórico do estado da Universidade de Coimbra* (1771), published by the *Junta de Instrução Literária*

---

<sup>1</sup> Quotations of documents follow the criteria of edition update defined in the scope of the project POMBALIA - Obra completa pombalina.

<sup>2</sup> Joaquim Heliodoro da Cunha Rivara (org.), *Cartas de Luís António Verney e António Pereira de Figueiredo aos padres da Congregação do Oratório de Goa*, Nova Goa, Imprensa Nacional, 1858, p. 15.

<sup>3</sup> António Pereira de Figueiredo, *Compêndio da vida e acções do venerável João Gerson, cancellario da Universidade de Pariz. Chamado por antonomasia “O Doutor Christianissimo”. Formou-o dos seus mesmos escritos, e das Actas do Concilio de Constança, e de outros Documentos Originaes*, Lisbon, at António Vicente da Silva's workshop, 1769.

(Board of Literary Instruction), appointed by the powerful minister of King D. José, since both are an expression of his views and of his main lines of thought<sup>4</sup>.

As the title makes clear, the narrative on the past is here conducted in the light of the global offensive of geometrism, that is, deductively and with pretended criteria of evidence and uniformity. It is a matter of a chronological deduction, that is, of the application to history of evidence criteria, with the chimerical pretension of presenting unappealable conclusions, based on the certainty of the facts, whose objectivity it is believed to be able to determine, within the scope of a desired theoretically neutral reading of experience.

Ultimately, the aim was to subject the learning of history, thought and life to a triumphant model of rationality and to the unitary empire of a notion of philosophy. As the team of Pombaline theoreticians who wrote the Statutes (*Estatutos*) of the University of Coimbra (1772) would later explain, “the luminous exactitude” of the geometric method lay in its capacity to “superiorly enlighten the understanding in the study of any discipline, showing a practice of the most perfect example of treating a subject with order, precision, solidity and closed, united enchainment of some truths with others”<sup>5</sup>

This is also the paradigm throughout which the authors of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* dwell, a paradigm that had been prepared and consolidated for at least two centuries,<sup>6</sup> also erecting key words that, according to the Latin lexicon of modern philosophy, allow to identify terms or key words such as *via*, *ratio*, *ordo*, in the case of nouns; *recta*, *certa*, *brevis*, in the case of adjectives; *dirigere*, *progridere*, *invenire*, in the case of verbs.<sup>7</sup> But if among the humanist theorists of the 16th and 17th centuries it was a question of an ideal of clarity with a view to the efficacy of teaching and the rigours of the method, in the case of Pombalism this ideal was placed at the service of the “doctrine police”.

From here on, a set of ruptures, articulations and active correspondences with epochs and doctrinal traditions was established, depending on whether they were close to or far from the previously chosen standard of benchmarking, within the framework of a propensity to view history in the light of a static tendency, that is to say, in the light of a conception of reason that was identical for every thinking subject, for all nations, all epochs and all cul-

---

<sup>4</sup> In fact, in the preparatory handwritten versions of the three parts of the *Dedução cronológica*, present in codices BNP, PBA. 444-446, there are several additions and corrections made by the hand of the Marquis of Pombal.

<sup>5</sup> *Estatutos da Universidade de Coimbra* (1772), Book III, Part II, Lisbon, at the Regia Officina Typografica p. 142.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Neal Ward Gilbert, *Renaissance Concepts of Method*, London, Columbia University Press, 1963; Pedro Calafate, *História do pensamento filosófico português*, vol. III, part III, ch. II: “O conceito de método”, *op. cit.*, pp. 207-245.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Jean Marie-Poussier «La distinction de la «ratio» et de la «methodus» dans le Novum Organon et ses prolongements dans le rationalisme cartésien» in Maria Fattori (coord.), *Francis Bacon. Terminologia e fortuna nel XVII secolo*, Roma, Olschki, 1984, p. 202.

tures, thus imposing an ahistorical imprint,<sup>8</sup> given an absent evolution concept with the systematicity and projection that would characterise it in the following century.

Therefore, the analysis of historical discourses by the Enlightenment's theoreticians does not so much provide us with knowledge on the past in the light of a scientifically-driven study, or of what would later be called knowledge-history, but rather the construction and affirmation of a system of knowledge and of a model of rationality at the service of intervening man in society, with a markedly pragmatic and valuative purpose, which led its authors to sometimes come up with facts in order to better support their theses, namely those that referred to the Jesuit participation in the pro-Philippine conspiracies against national independence, or the participation of the same Jesuits in the death by drowning of several hundred clergymen in the Tagus River.

In the specific case of Pombalism's Enlightenment project, history's interpretation was conducted on the basis of a radical rupture with the immediately preceding century, the Jesuitical, baroque, scholastic, therefore decadent 17th century. It contrasted it with the revival of classical antiquity in the first half of the 16th century, whose *lights* had been abruptly interrupted by the pernicious action of the so-called "Society of Jesus", after the "taking" of the *Colégio das Artes* (College of Arts) in Coimbra, 1555, signalling the inflexion of King John III's cultural policy.<sup>9</sup>

In Pombalism's philosophy of history there is a cyclical conception of time and history, stressing the axiomatic value of antiquity which was followed by a natural decadence with particular intensity from the 9th century onwards, extending until the end of the 15th century. From then on, a renaissance of classical literature and the intensity of the Enlightenment of knowledge that gripped Europe as a whole began, which was barred in Portugal, however, by a fateful event that marked the beginning of a "new Carthage". In fact, the handover of the *Colégio das Artes* in Coimbra to the Jesuits and the consequent sacking of the Portuguese humanist advance guard, led by the Bordeaux masters, had been the turning point and the beginning of a decadence that was no longer due to the "lack of enlightenment in the centuries" but rather to the perverse and intentional action of the Jesuits.

The *Dedução cronológica e analítica* is, therefore, the first and most systematic anti-Jesuitical libel of Pombalism's political and ideological indoctrination. It has also performed this function across borders to the extent that it has known a considerable number of translations<sup>10</sup>, namely the Latin translation by António Pereira de Figueiredo, who was, in all probability, one of this work's most active authors.

---

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Ernst Cassirer, *La Philosophie des lumières*, Paris, Fayard, 1966, p. 41.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. José Sebastião da Silva Dias, *A política cultural de D. João III*, Coimbra, Universidade de Coimbra/ Instituto de Estudos Filosóficos, 1969.

<sup>10</sup> On the translations into Italian, Spanish, French and German, and also on the summary in Chinese commissioned from Friar Juan Rodriguez, see José Eduardo Franco, *O mito dos jesuítas*, *op. cit.*

In fact, within the framework of the alliance between Enlightenment and politics that took place in Portugal in the second half of the 18th century, once the country's line of "advancement" and salvation had been defined, with the much sought-after clarity of geometric demonstrations, once men were aware that with modern Enlightenment it would be possible to free the country from the past's errors and aberrations, reorienting it in the context of Europe's most prosperous peoples, as had happened in the 16th century, it was now a matter of consolidating the absolute state that would confront past demons, avenge the historical epochs with which it wanted to be linked and implement, via a path legitimised by "reason", the necessary reform of the present, marking its presence with fire.

It is thus interesting to verify the coexistence of this empire of reason or nature - understood as reason's inner voice - with a discourse that is to some extent irrational, since it emanates above all from the passion with which reason is defended and converted into a combat weapon, in an essentially polemical context.

By dint of claiming to be the age of reason, the 18th century ended up generating within itself countless passions of reason, as well as a dangerous fanaticism for good causes, expressed in the intense way in which sympathy and hatred were cultivated, and truth and error, light and darkness were delineated.

We are therefore dealing with mythical ages linked to archaic beliefs, such as those of the regeneration of time.

The light/dark, light and darkness structure necessarily interferes with the traditional apogee and fall myths, with the belief in a state of perfection, opposed in the 17th century by its main protagonists, who played here the role of a diabolical causality,<sup>11</sup> allowing the triggering of the most characteristic processes in myth formation: a force of investing sensibility and a constant affective aggravation of the data, whose repetition becomes more and more obsessive.

The *Dedução cronológica e analítica* is, therefore, the most successful example among the Portuguese culture of a court-history, a pragmatic history at the service of a reforming purpose, demonstrating the "damages", "atrocities" and "moral impossibilities" supposedly carried out by the Jesuits in Portugal (Part One) and by the permanent usurpation of the prerogatives of temporal or political power by the Catholic Church (Part Two). It is followed by a third part, in the form of a documentary appendix, which submits to history's tribunal the theses' and assertions' so emphatically underlined "evidence".

It thus gives us access to a second-degree history in which the image or narrative that is offered to us of the past is at stake, converted into a system of knowledge and triumphant ideology, ultimately transforming the past into an extension of the present.

The *Dedução cronológica e analítica* thus moves within the framework of a regressive historical methodology, tracing continuities and ruptures whose radicality transpires,

---

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Leon Poliakov, *La causalité diabolique. Essai sur l'origine des persécutions*, Paris, Calmann-Levy, 1980.

erecting a history in which, as Lucien Febvre said, “the past obliges”, in this case through a negative path of rupture, distancing and condemnation, from which a project of society and state reform is justified.

It is therefore a challenge of the greatest interest, since it is not our task to seek in it the knowledge of the past, especially of the previous two centuries, within a framework of methodological rigour and critical discipline, but to dismantle this discourse on the past in order to uncover in it the foundations of royal absolutism.

In this sense, the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* is a true “bible of political Pombalism”, which reveals such fundamental theses as the immediate divine origin of secular power, the denial of the right of active resistance, the reduction of courts to a merely supplicative role, the implementation of regalist ideals, render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s and unto God what is God’s, thus conveying principles with Episcopalian and conciliarist nature, whose aim was the secularisation of society and the spiritualisation of the Church’s action, eliminating any factual powers that might hinder the urgent reform of human life in society. Although the aim of the *Compêndio histórico do estado da Universidade de Coimbra* (1771) and the *Estatutos da Universidade de Coimbra* (Statutes of the University of Coimbra) (1772) was to reform the University by radically banishing scholastic philosophy, in the case of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, the goal was more specifically to counter the scholastic theses on the reconciliation between the divine and popular origins of civil power, which had led Jesuit teachers like Luis de Molina and Francisco Suárez, supported by Thomas Aquinas, to consider that civil power, although originating in God as the author of man’s social nature, was naturally rooted in human communities once constituted, based on natural law, which is why democracy was the most natural form of government, although not necessarily the most perfect. Bluntly criticising this thesis was the main objective in Part One of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*.

The purpose of the work’s Part Two was to complementarily counter theocracy’s decretalist tradition, as well as the theses on the pope’s indirect power over temporal affairs for the spiritual end, by giving special attention to the question of book censorship and the corresponding expurgatory indices, as well as to how the two powers should harmonize on this level, without consenting to the invasion of the temporal sphere by the church’s spiritual power, revealing strong regalist and Gallican roots. The purpose was, as is often repeated in this Second Part, to render unto God the things which are God’s and unto Caesar what is Caesar’s.

The third part of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* takes the form of a documentary appendix under the name of “evidence”, in order to sustain the various theses previously expounded on the supposed rigour of the facts.

*Pedro Calafate*

## 2. PART ONE OF THE *DEDUÇÃO CRONOLÓGICA E ANALÍTICA*

### 2.1. The *Dedução cronológica e analítica* as a regalist and anti-Jesuitical doctrinal treatise

#### 2.1.1. PRELIMINARY REMARKS

The First Part of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, published in 1767, is an anti-Jesuitical indictment with defined political aims and, due to its content, it is also an essential work for understanding much of the Pombaline political programme. In the immediate term, although not in an avowed manner, it serves as justification for the proscription and concomitant expulsion of the Jesuits by the Law of 3 September 1759, but it is also an instrument aimed at promoting the extinction of the Society of Jesus, which was to occur by means of the *Dominus ac redemptor* brief by Clement XIV, from 21 July 1773.

The *Dedução cronológica e analítica* is organized through a methodology that can be found in other Pombaline texts but which, in this case, is procedural in nature, with legal design, outlined through an evidential eagerness, which mobilizes historical incidences of legislation, namely of canonical nature, along with an immense source of Portuguese and foreign authors, documents, pamphlets, without neglecting to take advantage *pro domo sua* of its own Jesuit historiographical production.

The work's motivation should not be understood, however, in a context limited to Portuguese Josephine space and time. The organisation of a text justifying Pombaline action cannot be understood without placing it in the context of the Lisbon, Madrid and Paris Courts' action, being developed in the sense of Rome proceeding with the extinction of the Society of Jesus. This is proven not only by the versions of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* that were made in Latin, French, Spanish, Italian and German, but also by the intentional way in which the Petition of Appeal was written to be presented to King José I, in public audience, by the Crown's Procurator, José de Seabra da Silva (1732-1813).<sup>12</sup>

The extensive work, as an enterprise of justification and political intention, also involves a well-defined action programme where multiple affirmations of the Pombaline power mechanisms converge near their peak. From the chronological discourse that has been constructed, a historical interpretation emerges in which the Society of Jesus' "damages" are highlighted in the time span going from King John III's reign to the condemnation and execution of Father Gabriel Malagrida on 21 September 1761.

---

<sup>12</sup> José de Seabra da Silva, *Petição de recurso apresentada em audiência publica à magestade de el Rey Nosso Senhor pelo doutor Joseph de Seabra da Sylva, Desembargador da Casa da Supplicação e Procurador da Real Coroa do mesmo senhor. Sobre o último, e crítico estado desta monarquia depois que a Sociedade chamada de Jesus foi desnaturalizada, e proscripta dos domínios de França, e Hespanha*, Lisbon, at Miguel Menescal da Costa's Workshop, 1767.

The theory of the Josephine state at the time of the appearance of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* is based on the consolidation of regalist positions such as the definition of *sacerdotio* and *imperio* with the avocation of unrestricted regal supremacy in matters of temporal nature, expressively stressing its independence from the spiritual nature. In the argument developed throughout the text it is asserted that power emanates directly from God to the prince, while insisting on the devaluation of the decisions of the Courts, outrightly rejecting the *omnis potestas a Deo per populum* principle. The refusal to consider power and its exercise as coming from the popular will thus become evident. There is also an underlying consideration regarding a principle of lack of differentiation from vassal to the prince, thus diminishing the traditional status of political representation by the kingdom's orders. And the more theological considerations that had been presented in the works by António Pereira de Figueiredo (1725-1797), who translated the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* into Latin, are now folded into a concatenation that is both historical and jus canonical. These coordinates structuring the discourse of Pombaline power will be further discussed.

#### 2.1.2 THE WORK'S INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

When the *Petição de recurso* (Petition of Appeal) proclaims the need for effective measures to achieve “the public peace of the peoples” it does not only allude to the concerns of power in Portugal, but also to the concerns of “all of Europe's sovereign monarchs and princes”<sup>13</sup>. In this respect, it is important to bear in mind that the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* appears in the year in which the expulsion of the Ignatians from Spain and its colonies and dominions took place, at the beginning of April. In France, between 1762 and 1764, the Jesuits had already been banished, even if without physical coercion, and all the European courts were following with special attention the consequences of the expulsion decision taken in Portugal in 1759.

Although the fundamental reasons for the expulsion concerted by the Courts of Lisbon, Paris and Madrid, at least apparently,<sup>14</sup> must be framed in more structural reasons that stem from the affirmation of political and politico-religious conceptions, we cannot fail to consider nearby circumstances that were occurring on the international scene and which gave rise to the complex anti-Jesuitical process that unfolded even before the Pombaline decision.

Louis XV (1710-1774), unlike his predecessors, did not hold the Society of Jesus in any particular esteem and became sensitive to the anti-Jesuitical animosity of the minister Duke of Choiseul (1719-1785) and the king's mistress, madame de Pompadour (1721-1764). The Christian monarch, despite the prudence employed, would eventually back the Parliament of Paris' decisions, strongly dominated by Jansenists and Gallicanists. Follow-

---

<sup>13</sup> *Ibidem*.p.1.

<sup>14</sup> Jean Lacouture, *Jésuites*, Paris, Seuil, 1991, pp. 437-477.



ing the negative and aggravated response of the Parisian parliament to the Ignatian appeal against the condemnation of the court of Marseille concerning the financial bankruptcy of the Jesuit priest Antonio Lavalette (1708-1767) in Martinique, an entire condemnation process that went beyond matters of commercial and criminal law was amplified. Despite the support of high Church dignitaries and the very suggestion of a possible Gallicanisation of the Society, the closure of colleges, the prohibition of books and the banishment of the priests of the Society ended up happening<sup>15</sup> although the priestly ministry of those who did not emigrate would in any case be subsidised and framed within the episcopal authority. The *Dedução cronológica e analítica* will give due emphasis to these events, especially with regard to the prohibition of books by Jesuit authors, an action that translated into identical condemnations by the Royal Censorial Bureau (§ 642) in Portugal.

In Spain, the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1767 by order of Charles III (1716-1788), with the diligence of the minister Count of Aranda (1719-1798), would have decisive consequences for the future extinction of the Society of Jesus, despite the lack of immediate visible motives. Politically, neither the fact of alignment with France nor the possible little sympathy of the illustrious monarch towards the Ignatians seemed to justify such a drastic measure.<sup>16</sup> In turn, with the repeated persuasion of Bernardo Tannuci (1698-1783), Ferdinand I's minister, the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies and Malta would also expel the Society. The same happened in the Duchy of Parma in 1768.

Due to the coming-together of interests and, above all, of assumptions with political foundations, the subsequent strategy to achieve the extinction of the Society was prepared, with the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* constituting an important indictment to this end, alluding to measures taken in France and clearly proving the strategic alignment that was intended to be followed.

After the death of Clement XIII (1693-1769), however, the diplomatic efforts by the Catholic Cortes pointed towards the election of a new pontiff who would attract the "vote of the crowns". After a complex conclave in 1769, this aim was achieved by the Franciscan Vincenzo Antonio Ganganelli (1705-1774), raised to pontifical office as Clement XIV (1769-1774), who, with much delay and hesitation, signed the *Dominus ac redemptor* brief on 21 July 1773. On the date of extinction, as we have already said, Portugal was experiencing the Pombaline period, with the Reform of the University being the keystone thanks to the new Statutes of 1772. The *Dedução cronológica e analítica* in 1767, the *Compêndio histórico do estado da Universidade de Coimbra* in 1771 and the *De sacerdotio et imperio* (1770)

---

<sup>15</sup> In the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, § 639, the expulsion of Jesuits from France between 1594 and 1603 is highlighted more than once in connection with the alleged Jesuit involvement in the attempt on Henry IV. Hereinafter the reference § shall indicate the matter quoted in Part One of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*.

<sup>16</sup> Jean Lacouture, *Jésuites*, *op. cit.*, pp. 459-462.

academic dissertation by António Ribeiro dos Santos (which would later be significantly re-censored by the Jansenists *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques*<sup>17</sup>) had, in addition to their doctrinal value, also played an instrumental role, both internally and externally.

### 2.1.3. AN ARGUMENTATIVE ITINERARY

Before characterising the regalist and jusdivinist theoretical presuppositions, it is appropriate to point out some moments in the historical argumentative course of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*<sup>18</sup>. We do not intend to elaborate a summary but only to select some of the most significant points that can assist a reading of the text. From the outset, the generalised respect, explicit or implicit, for royalty in all circumstances should be highlighted, even if it is less positive in terms of the decisions taken. Whether the Avis dynasty's monarchs, the *Áustria* from the *União Pessoal* period or the *Bragança* monarchs, respect for the royal person's safety is unquestionable. This is certainly a well thought out attitude and a fundamental prevention to the essential relevance attributed to absolute royal authority alongside the devaluation of representation by the Kingdom's traditional orders.

#### 2.1.3.1. From João III to the Restoration

With John III (1502-1557), the long chronological itinerary essentially Judaic in nature begins. The reign of the Pious One is seen in an ambivalent way. It begins by witnessing the praise for good government, the promotion of humanism and the flourishing of the Arts and Sciences, which the pages of the *Biblioteca lusitana* by Diogo Barbosa Machado (1682-1772) are used to illustrate. Emphasis is also placed on the prosperous successes in Navigation and Trade, as reported in the three volumes of *Ásia Portuguesa* (1666-1675) by Manuel Faria e Sousa (1590-1649). For the authors of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, from the institutional and political point of view, it was a time of harmony with the *Priesthood* and the *Empire* (*Sacerdotio et Imperio*). However, in the programmatic and accusatory texture of the Pombaline text, the exaltation of the first epoch of the "flourishing and glorious state" is succeeded by something that Rome was preparing under pious purposes but in reality foreshadowing "fatal and disgraceful ruins" (§ 16). The somewhat veiled reference to the means by the Roman curia also presupposes, *ab initio*, the denunciation of

---

<sup>17</sup> *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques pour servir à l'histoire de la Constitution Unigenitus, pour l'année MDCCLXXXII* [Utreque], Art. Lisbonne, 1782, pp. 17-20.

<sup>18</sup> The diachronic construction of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* also includes a certain teleology, typical of the works that were to be produced in Portugal, referring to golden periods which would be followed by a process of decadence, but which pointed to a horizon of salvific redemption. Taking not exactly the reign of King John III as the term *ad quo*, but that of King Manuel and the *Pombaline revolution*, as one of the moments *ad quem*, which foreshadowed a regeneration in national life, we find a significant example in the first volume of the *História da Revolução de 1820* (1886) by the positivist historian José de Arriaga (1844-1921).

an interventionism that we will see repeatedly associated with the actions by the Society of Jesus.

In 1540, Simão Rodrigues de Azevedo (1510-1579) and Francisco Xavier (1506-1552) arrive in Portugal. As the text states, the missionaries were recommended to the pious royal couple by Pedro de Mascarenhas (1484-1555), ambassador to Paul III, so that they could be used for the missionary work in East India in the spirit of Saint Ignatius of Loyola, who appears to be expressively and unreservedly exalted. However, the fleeting panegyric of the figure of the new order's founder, together with the admiration for Francisco Xavier, who in 1541, "rejecting greatness" (§ 19) heads for India, is immediately overshadowed by different considerations regarding Simão Rodrigues who "takes the route of the land" (§ 20)<sup>19</sup>. We cannot fail to counter to this danger attributed to Loyola's companion with what historically came to actually constitute the new order's success under Father Simão Rodrigues' initial guidance. The Society of Jesus with humanist inspiration and open to the world deserved, in fact, significant acceptance and soon established itself along the Kingdom with special relevance in Lisbon, Coimbra and Évora. However, in order to devalue the Jesuit advance, the Pombaline text emphasizes some initial resistance, among which from the city of Oporto (§§30-40). Now, as we know, the Jesuits benefited from a growing sympathy since their introduction in Portugal by the will of King John III. Therefore, it is not surprising that the religious, educational and charitable work by the Ignatians justified the creation of the first Order's Province. The *Dedução cronológica e analítica* does not fail to allude, however, to the sympathy and support by Infante Dom Luís, the King's brother, and to the significance of Dom Teotónio de Bragança (1530-1602) joining the Jesuit order, albeit in complex circumstances, as the reader will see (§§50-55). But what the Pombaline indictment really wanted to point out in these mentions was the growing influence of the priests at court.

The *Dedução cronológica e analítica's* considerations about this brilliant early period of the Society and the court's involvement also focus on the special attention given to King Sebastian's education and spiritual direction. The "delicate job" (§ 63), as the office of master and confessor is considered, will not fail to be well scalped throughout the Brigantine reigns, from King John IV to King Joseph V, in order to censure the excessive religious influence in the minds of princes and future monarchs. As far as Prince Sebastian is concerned, the Pombaline narrative tells us that Queen Catherine recommended her Dominican confessor Br. Louis of Granada (1505-1588) or the Augustine Br. Louis of Montoia (1497- 1569), Don Sebastian's confessor, to take charge of the Desired's education. This clashed with the opinion of those who preferred a more secular pedagogy, which could have fallen on the respected tutor of the young prince Aleixo de Meneses (?-1569), a figure recurrently extolled in the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* as a model of wise counsel in

---

<sup>19</sup> Cf. §§ 17-26.

the training of princes. In any case, the choice ultimately fell on the Jesuit Luiz Gonçalves da Câmara (1519-1575), who, alongside his brother Martim, would have a preponderant influence throughout the Sebastian reign. We need to take into account that at the heart of the issue we are dealing with here are the implications arising from the existence of two political currents. One was more closely linked to the interests of Castile, led by the widowed Queen Catherine of Austria (1507-1515). Catherine of Austria (1507-1578) and another one was more conservative, in which Henry (1512-1580), who was to assume the regency through the *Cortes* of 1562, could be included. In the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, it is stated that the infante cardinal “did not remain governing’ (...) “, but rather that he ‘understood that he was governing’” (§ 71). The Pombaline assessment of the “deceived prince’s” regency, safeguarding the reservation concerning the unquestionable respect for the person of Henry, is not very positive, especially with regard to the exercise of power and the defence of the Crown’s temporal sovereignty. In this context, there were concerns regarding the unrestricted acceptance of the determinations coming from the Council of Trent (1545-1563). It was pointed out that, if the acceptance of decisions in the spiritual sphere could not be questioned, the introduction of “diverse points of secularity” (§ 75), disturbing “the mutual and reciprocal independence of the Priesthood and the Empire” (§ 76), would already constitute a manifest abuse.

The assessment made in the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* of Jesuit intervention during the Sebastianist reign is devastating, at a time when the post-Tridentine fundamentalist positions were becoming consolidated. In this regard, it alludes without reservation to a harmful interference in the University in which the institutional aspects are listed through the denunciation of several charters by virtue of which the Society would have benefited, bringing to the fore court clerk Martim Gonçalves da Câmara (1502?-1552). In a letter from this priest addressed to the Rector of the Conimbrian cloister, in the midst of various matters of property and its use, Gonçalves da Câmara alludes to the advantage of behaviour and doctrine, which in these times should have been more Christian and Catholic, even if less Latin (§ 106). It is clear that the admonition is related to a position that goes beyond the Ignatian’s personal opinion, who was also Rector of the University between 1563 and 1564. What was happening is that the University, with its privileges diminished and increasingly dependent on the growing royal centralisation through the *Mesa da Consciência e Ordens* (Board of Conscience and Orders) (1576) and not infrequently in conflict with the Society, would also have to necessarily reconciling the humanistic training, which came from the Johannine period, and the spirit of Trent.<sup>20</sup> In this sense, and in a similar way to what would happen in Ignatian pedagogy, the University did not cease to be necessarily attentive to the theological and religious component that the coun-

---

<sup>20</sup> On the transition of humanism from the time of King John III to the time of King Sebastian, see J. S. da Silva Dias, *A política cultural de D. João III*, t. II, vol. II, *op. cit.*, pp. 912 and ff.

ter-reformism demanded with the sacrifice of some subjects that would become references of modernity. Which would not prevent the Jesuits, for example, from materialising a notable renewal of scholasticism in which Pedro da Fonseca (1528-1599) emerges as an unquestionable philosophical authority and author who is read and followed not only in Catholic Europe. Yet, the underlying pedagogical and doctrinal incidences obviously could not refrain from being attached to the argumentation accompanying the attack on the pernicious Jesuit hegemony and the propaedeutic *Colégio das Artes*, from 1561, and which had been in the hands of the Society of Jesus since 1555.

However, in a reign effectively scarred by many shadows, such as the reign of the Desired King, Pombaline historical argumentation shall involve the Jesuits in the successive marriage hypotheses that brought to Portugal Cardinal Alexandrino (Michelle Bonelli, 1541-1588), in addition to the Portuguese participation in the Christian League against the Ottoman Crescent, to enable the eventual marriage of King Sebastian to Margaret of Valois, brother of Charles IX, which was followed by other matrimonial hypotheses, in the entangled game of political convenience of the time. In the *Dedução cronológica e analítica's* opinions, the frustration shown about the conjugal intentions by a “defenceless victim” could only be the result of excessive religious education. For the thickening of the dreadfulness of the Sebaastic era the 1569 pandemic and the recurrent use of calamities as a punishment of the people shall not be forgotten and the opportunity is seized to denounce the fanaticism that was emerging and the imprudent abandonment of the Court as the centre of power and the expected provision of necessary measures by the King. Regardless of the possible measures that were provided, however, what was most important in the Pombaline argument was to allege the physical absence of the authority of an ill-advised power.

Finally, as a prime example of bad counselling, the fatal involvement and support of the Society in the King's obsessive idea of going to war in Northern Africa in defence of the faith is visible. This, as is known, took place on 24 June 1578 and resulted in the fatal defeat of 4 August at El-Ksar el Kebir. The Pombaline narrative did not forget this, nor failed from symbolically recalling the presence of the fathers Gaspar Maurício and Alexandre de Matos (who raised the crucifix in the heat of the battle) or the fact that “all of the Monarchy's substance” (§ 173) had been buried there.

Portugal's defeat in Northern Africa, Henry the Navigator's brief reign, assumed in 1578, the 1580 Almeirim Court and the multiple incidences relating to the succession question are outlined, however, by a reading in which Jesuit ambiguity during the troubled situation of accepting a “strange king” (§ 235) with the subsequent handover of the Crown and occupation of the Kingdom by force (§§ 235-240) is highlighted. In this chronological context of extreme crisis Sebastianism and a liberating prophetism will emerge, then, as an issue of intense negative repercussions (§§ 199-220 and 250-252). In the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* a vast array of literature and events is cited.

### 2.1.3.2 Anticurialism

The Pombaline narrative is full of recurring anticurialist arguments, insisting on a permanent discussion about jurisdictions that are permanently difficult to resolve, with superior canonical appeal and in which the spiritual appeared tangent to the material as happened with the antecedents of the excommunication pronounced by the Papal Collector Octavio Accaramboni (1539-1634)<sup>21</sup> in the light of the *Bula da ceia*.<sup>22</sup> In the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* it is referred that “in this kingdom, it had never been accepted or published” (§ 268) having as obvious background the permanent claim of the prerogative of the regal consent<sup>23</sup> to counteract the eventual pontifical invasion. Francisco Suárez (1548-1617) became involved in these demands and advice through consultations and opinions requested from him. The case in question could not fail to concur with the vehement claim of the Pombaline position on this flagrant injury to the temporal independence of the Crown at a time when the existence of “a constant national government, solid and capable of rewarding the good, and punishing the bad” (§ 278) was lacking. In the wake of the damage mentioned, there is occasion to once again recall the independence of the supreme royal authority with regard to book censorship, with the exclusion of those dealing with matters of a spiritual or dogmatic nature, whose examination would belong to the ecclesiastical authority. In the sense of harmonisation of the Priesthood and the Empire, it would be up to the latter, in any case, to make up for the Church’s incapacity to impose temporal penalties and related sanctions on the circulation and commercialisation of books. Within a more objective historical perspective we should certainly not fail to note that the Holy Office, in effective articulation with the Crown and the Episcopate, exercised its authority in the fight against heresy, relying on the Society of Jesus to support the censorship campaign oriented by the Portuguese Indices, namely that of 1624.<sup>24</sup> It is in this context that the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* alludes to a “mortal blow to Portuguese Literature” (§ 273), using the refusal of an eclectic humanist renaissance worldview in the first five hundred years of the Arts College as a parameter.

---

<sup>21</sup> With the *União Pessoal* of the Crowns of Spain and Portugal the nunciature moved to Madrid and a collector remained in Lisbon in charge of collecting the royalties due to the Apostolic Chamber. However, the Collectors did not cease to exercise, practically, generic attributions of a nuncio (Cf. David Sampaio Dias Barbosa, “Nunciatura de Lisboa”, in *Dicionário de história religiosa de Portugal*, vol. J-P, Lisbon, Círculo de Leitores, 2000, p. 313). Octavio Accaramboni was in Portugal between 1614 and 1620.

<sup>22</sup> The *Bula da ceia* (Bull of the Supper) was the name used in Portugal for the annual publication, on Holy Thursday, of papal determinations on matters relating to the faith and cases of heresy. The beginning of the papal document contained the expression in *Coena Domini*, hence the common name. See below note to § 268 of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*

<sup>23</sup> The right held by the temporal power to grant or deny the circulation and execution in the Kingdom of conciliar decrees, apostolic letters and other ecclesiastical dispositions.

<sup>24</sup> On the epochal context cf. A.H. Oliveira Marques/João Alves Dias, *Nova História de Portugal*, vol. V: As realidades culturais, Lisbon, Editorial Presença, pp. 471-481.

In a long, at times tedious, reference to documents and the support of authorities of a regal nature, such as Paolo Sarpi (1552-1623), author of the controversial *History of the Council of Trent*, the reader can follow various incidents on the Philippine reigns in which modern natural law is invoked, although with little reference to Grotian-Pufendorfian jusnaturalism. In these pages, one is once again alert both to the disrespect for royal authority and to the curialist excesses, of which the incident with the Collector Alessandro Castracani (1583-1649)<sup>25</sup>, Bishop of Nicastro, who carried out a delicate mission in Lisbon, is a suggestive example. What was at stake was a question of jurisdiction and ecclesiastical immunity, in addition to the safeguarding of chapels (goods encumbered in perpetuity), which the Portuguese government claimed. Resistance resulted in the interdiction and excommunication of the Churches of Lisbon (§§ 309-326) with indefatigable papal support. At the end of Philippine rule, however, the attitude was to have no effect.

In the meantime, the Restoration cycle provided an opportunity for the authors of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* to evoke the shadow of Simão Rodrigues, whereby the Jesuit duplicity, personified in Father Nuno da Cunha (1593-1674), would be reiterated. According to the Pombaline interpretation, the reign of John IV is not immune to Ignatian influences. There is no hesitation in characterising the Society as a “Leonine society”, an effective monarchy, as soon as the spirit of the glorious Saint Ignatius was succeeded by the ambition of Diego Laynez (1512-1565). In the advocatory considerations, however, the question of prophetism returns, which we have just discussed in the wake of the disaster of El-Ksar el Kebir, if not before that (§ 346-360). A new personage will be chosen as the preferred target, appearing profusely invoked from then on: António Vieira (1608-1697). The anti-Vieira position, in addition to glossing over the preacher’s successes, reveals a disdain for a conceptualist style made up of “hyperbole and oriental comparisons” [...] without drawing from them any solid benefit for Christian life” (§ 360) and oppose the spirit of the Enlightenment in a patent interpretative anachronism. What also irritates the Pombaline perception are the tasks that John IV attributes to the Jesuit priest in political functions of the greatest responsibility. In the pages of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, Vieira’s disaffection is countered by the persecution and condemnation of the sensible and wise minister Francisco de Lucena (1578-1643)<sup>26</sup> who was to be replaced by Pedro Vieira da Silva (1598-1676), which will have significant importance in the development of the policy of the regencies and subsequent reigns (§ 373 and ff.). When we return to the question of the education of princes during D. Luísa de Gusmão’s difficult regency, we once again come across the problem of the Jesuit influence in the education of the heir Dom Teodósio de Bragança (1510-1563) and in that of D. Afonso, who came

---

<sup>25</sup> Alessandro Castracani was in Portugal between 1634 and 1640.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Luís Reis Torgal, *Ideologia política e teoria do Estado na Restauração*, vol. 1, Coimbra, Universidade de Coimbra, 1981, pp. 91-93.

to rely on the teachings of military engineer Joannes Cieremans (1602-1648) and André Fernandes (?-1660), the latter a confessor of D. João IV and D. Teodósio. In this context, the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* will not miss the opportunity to stress that the Prince was less influenced in his conscience by his spiritual directors and masters, at the same time as it takes advantage of this apparent independence of spirit to allude to the lucid choice of the Third Count of Castelo Melhor, Luís Vasconcelos e Sousa (1636-1720), the monarch's future favourite and court clerk. We will return to some incidents of King Afonso VI's reign in a while.

#### 2.1.3.3. The enemies of kings

At a certain point in the discourse contemporary to the early days of the Restoration, the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* inserted into the historical-analytical deduction of the domestic and European circumstances of the 15th to the 18th centuries events that may well help to understand the international objectives of the Pombaline initiative to which we referred earlier.

The uprising of the peoples that would have been undertaken with pontifical support during the reign of Henry III (1551-1589) so that the power be handed over to the Duke of Guise (1519-1563), an advocate of limiting royal power in favour of the Estates General, obviously means a circumstance that is at the antipodes of the jusdivinist conception of power as Pombalism conceived, theorised and practised it. The tumultuous reigns of Henry III (1574-1589) and Henry IV (1589-1610) and the attempts to resolve the religious conflicts between Catholics and Protestants through the supposed inculcation of fanatical mores shall be mentioned at the heart of Pombalism's argument. There are also references to the vast pamphleteering on the alleged Jesuit influence over the attacks and the regicide of Henry IV. In order to explain the events in France, it is no coincidence that an extensive note is inserted into § 413, which is a historical synopsis on the so-called practice of Fanaticism, the producer of wars, seditions, prophetism and the like, which will later serve as an operative concept for the anti-Ignatian diatribe in Portugal alongside the concept of monarchomachy. It is also not surprising that the last line of the extensive note quite intentionally refers to the night of September 3, 1758, when King José I was the target of the famous attack.

#### 2.1.3.4. The reigns of Afonso VI and Pedro II

The Pombaline approach to D. Luísa de Gusmão's regency, before D. Afonso VI took power, besides containing a significant eulogy of Count Castelo Melhor (§ 488), to which we have already referred, focuses on some essential aspects for the absolutist, regalist and jusdivinist rationale. In the recurring accusation we have seen, Vieira, again as the "infallible interpreter of all the canonical prophets" (§ 452), appears as an agent of Fanat-



icism, understood as absolutely offensive to the “Sovereign, anointed of God, Almighty, immediate to the divine omnipotence, and so independent that he did not recognise on Earth a Superior Temporal” (§ 441). With the help of readings from *Catástrofe de Portugal na deposição d’elrei D. Afonso VI* (1669) by Fernando Corrêa de Lacerda (1628-1685), this visit to the painful reign of the Victorious sees the confrontation between the desirable pure monarchy (hardly applicable then, in the prevailing conflict of parties and interests, diplomatic convenience and the search for conditions for peace) and the representation of peoples. It is also worth noting that, within the scope of this argument, reference is made to the intervention of the nobility, which was ill-advised and possibly not very responsible whenever its members denied the nature of their general condition as vassals. In the atmosphere preceding and accompanying the Cortes of 1668, the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* absolutely devalued the convocation, incrementing “democratic” tendencies, which certainly echoed the restorationist solution that had legitimated John IV. The Pombaline argument therefore denounces the unlimited power of the Cortes, which are mere “popular assemblies” (§ 526). In the foreshadowing of a culminating affirmation of the lack of differentiation of the vassal to the prince, the exploitation of circumstances, with references to behaviour and attitudes that are described on the convening of Cortes, reiterates an inaccessible distance from the supreme majesty of the throne signed in the Kingdom’s Fundamental Law. We are therefore faced with a way of thinking that certainly did not correspond to the reality of the time when the royal absolutism in practice faced significant limitations regarding the exercise of power. The “seditious absurdities of the deliberation of the Courts” (§ 590) of 1668, which are alleged, intersect within the Pombaline narrative with another issue that had to be considered: that of the deposition of the legitimate king in the case of the exercise of tyrannical power. Not to be forgotten in this context is the theory developed by Francisco Velasco de Gouveia (1580-1659) in *Justa aclamação do sereníssimo rei de Portugal D. João o IV* (1644), which for the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* is nothing more than an infamous book criminally attributed to the respected lecturer at the Faculty of Canon Law, to justify the deposition of the *Filipes* as sovereigns of Portugal.<sup>27</sup> However, the very complex and sensitive issue, like the problem of the King’s alleged impotence, brings us back to the situation arising from the transition of the governorship of Afonso VI to that of his brother, who would later decide to assume the majesty of power on the death of the inauspicious deposed and imprisoned monarch. The subject obviously requires a critical and thoughtful framing of the state of the question as it can be offered to us today<sup>28</sup> even because the allegation of the state of tyranny has not ceased to be discussed through more radical positions. However, what is of most interest to the Pombaline programme, of which we are trying to pinpoint the fundamental

---

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Luís Reis Torgal, *Ideologia política e teoria do Estado na Restauração*, op. cit., pp. 7-8.

<sup>28</sup> Ângela Barreto Xavier/Pedro Cardim, *D. Afonso VI*, Lisbon, Círculo de Leitores, 2006, pp. 208 et seq.

topics, through the chronological and argumentative meanderings that characterise the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, is to verify, and starting with the issue of the Cortes, how the problem of the nature of the Monarchy in Portugal emerges as “an Empire of one” with an etymological and conceptual reference endorsed by the authority of De Réal’s *Science du gouvernement*,<sup>29</sup> one of the authors reverently cited in the argumentation of regalist and jusdivinist content (§§ 604 et seq.). The denunciation of what might be the “supreme power of the third estate” (§ 606) goes hand in hand with the defence of pure monarchy and absolute independence and everything that might call into question its safety. In this sense, the question of *tyrannicide* associated with the ideas of the *Monarchomachians*, defenders of the constituent superiority of the people, with roots going back to Roman law itself, is problematized (§ 633). Several authors are quoted in this connection (§ 634 et seq.) In the constellation of monarchomachy, a term which, as I have already stated, is part of the Pombaline political lexicon, the “Jesuitical-Monarchomachian books” (§ 638) are also listed, in which those by Juan de Mariana (1536-1624) Roberto Belarmino (1542-1621) and Francisco Suárez (1548-1617) should be highlighted, alongside a large compendium of other authors and writings (§ 641) that came to be condemned, expurgated and banned following the expulsion of the Society of Jesus in France and Portugal.<sup>30</sup>

#### 2.1.3.5. The reign of João V, the Roman Curia and the Missions

In an extensive account dating from the regency and reign of Dom Pedro II we again come across the recurring accusation made against the Jesuits as solicitous mediators of the Roman curia but in a more specific context. This time the issues concerning the usurpation of the royal patronage (§ 776) and the excessive appeals to Rome, to the detriment of the Crown (§ 747), in the context of the extensive missionary activity of the Ignatians, stand out. The underlying episcopalism should be highlighted,<sup>31</sup> as a means of pressure on the Roman Curia. In this regard, the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* does not hesitate to quote the *Concordia sacerdotii et imperii*, by Pedro de Marca (1594-1662) and the *De Anti-*

---

<sup>29</sup> Gaspard de Réal de Courban (1682-1752) author of the aforementioned work, in 8 volumes. It consists of an extensive approach to political, moral and legal questions and is, above all, a fundamental reference and a recurring reference in the 18th century for the theorisation of power, in the sense of perfect, absolute and independent sovereignty.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Maria Teresa Payan Martins, *A censura literária em Portugal nos séculos XVI e XVIII*, Lisbon, Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, 2005.

<sup>31</sup> Although Febronist *episcopalism* is not expressly treated in the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* and no reference is made to Febronius (Johann Nikolaus von Honteim, 1701-1790), its main theoretician (*De Statu Ecclesiae et legitima potestate Romani Pontificis*, 1763, summarized in Portuguese by Miguel Tibério Pedegache Brandão Ivo in 1770), such a current of thought could not fail to underlie the mind of the Pombaline authors, insofar as it defended the reduction of the dogmatic and disciplinary primacy of the Pope. (Cf. J. S. da Silva Dias, “Pombalismo e teoria política”, *Cultura. História e Filosofia*, vol. 1, 1982, pp. 61-66.

*qua Ecclesiae disciplina dissertationes historicae* by Louis Ellies Dupin (1657-1719), though without any reference to Febronius (Johann Nikolaus von Hontheim). What was fundamentally at stake was the convenience of ecclesiastical causes being judged in the territorial proximity of the incidents occurring without the need to appeal to Rome, which, in turn, would always fight for the avocation and centralisation of its jurisdiction and apostolic privilege (§ 742 and ff.) counting on the dedicated intervention of its vicars. The insistent Pombaline anticurialist invective would go so far as to use, in the circumstances, the expression ecclesiastical monarchomachy (§ 743) at the same time as the knowledge and prudence of the Crown's Procurator Tomé Pinheiro da Veiga (1571-1656), defending royal interests, is praised and Father Nuno da Cunha, who under no circumstances forgot the obedience due to the "fourth vow",<sup>32</sup> is disqualified. The collision of interests and positions around the missionary action in the Portuguese overseas space will emerge at this moment of the Pombaline deduction in such a way that, regarding the alluded interference of the confessor priest Manuel Fernandes (1614-1693) in the making of the Regiment of the Missions of the State of Maranhão and Grão Pará, of 1686<sup>33</sup> is argued with what is expended in the Brief Account.

The same objection, from now on more incisively anti-missionary, takes the form of a vigorous attack on the ubiquitous congregation of *Propaganda Fide*<sup>34</sup> which intended "to conquer with no gunpowder, with no bullet, with no expenditure of foundations or endowments, no less than all the Conquests that the Crown of Portugal possessed" (§ 785) personifying an invading monarchy within the legitimate monarchy (§ 786).

#### 2.1.3.6. The reign of King João V

However, the "compendium of what happened" during the reign of King Dom João V, crowned on 9th December 1706, contains a differentiating analysis insofar as it distinguishes the times of the overwhelming and not very fruitful help of national and foreign Jesuit masters and confessors (§ 798) and the time when the king emancipated himself from Ignatian influence. The Pombaline text does not fail to recall, once again, the model educational paradigm always personified in the figure of D. Sebastião's uncle, D. Aleixo de Meneses. From a different consideration angle, the continuity of the curialist intervention is reproached, of the designated ecclesiastical monarchomachy under the temporal jurisdiction of the Pope (§ 685), regarding the project of erecting the Patriarchal church,

---

<sup>32</sup> In addition to the vows of poverty, chastity and obedience, the latter is reinforced by a commitment to mission, obedience to the Pope and full dedication to the universal Church.

<sup>33</sup> The *Regiment* sought to harmonise conflicting interests and remained in force and functional until the publication of the *Directory of the Indians* in 1757.

<sup>34</sup> Created in 1622 by Gregory XV with the purpose of directing and giving formation and support to missionary activity.

of the obscure “management of the Gold” in European financial markets, of the contributions to the Apostolic Chamber, constituted by annates and quinquennia, and other matters of incidence of jus canonical nature (§§ 808-809).

However, a different perspective of analysis is presented to us when a set of measures is mentioned that appear in opposition to serious “obreptions and subreptions” (§§ 825 and ff.). These include the replacement of the Jesuit confessors by members of the Saint Philip Neri Congregation and the subsequent benefit of the construction of the convent of *Nossa Senhora das Necessidades*, the establishment of the Royal Academy of Portuguese History in 1720 and the prominence given to the “zealous and well-educated” Luís António Vernei *Verdadeiro método de estudar* (True Method of Studying) referred to only as “barbadinho italiano” (§831), not forgetting the subsequent intense polemic of which significant information is given. In this continued praise there is a reference to the *Immensa Pastorum principis* bull addressed by Benedict XIV to the archbishops and bishops of Brazil and other overseas domains in which textually the severity of the punishment to be applied to all those who were “guilty of exceeding with (...) the Indians the meekness and charity prescribed by the dictates and evangelical precepts” (§ 836) is supported.

#### 2.1.3.7. The reign of King José I. From the coronation to the condemnation and execution of Father Malagrida

The emphasis on reorganising the state and concentrating all matters of government in the person of the King and his cabinet, as well as supreme jurisdiction on which the various royal offices depend (§ 840) is among the first notes that emerge from the considerations on King Joseph I.

The full affirmation of centralised royal sovereignty, together with the reference to the main incidences of the Pombaline indictment, will culminate in the decisive attack on the ever-reproachable Jesuit intervention (§ 871), which accompanied us throughout the last few pages. As far as the Josephine reign is concerned, it should be emphasised that we are no longer at the level of an interpretative reference, but rather a justification of the good procedures of the absolute power in force. These included the need to proceed with the effective application of the clauses of the Treaty of Madrid or Treaty of Limits, from 1750, which involved both the Amazon basin and southern Brazil and was signed by King João V and Ferdinand VI of Spain. To this end, Francisco Xavier de Mendonça Furtado (1701-1769), brother of Carvalho e Melo, was sent to the colony of Brazil to deal with the issue of the Missions of Pará and Maranhão (§ 845) and António Gomes Freire de Andrade (1685-1763) with regards to the consequences of border delimitation, which implied, amongst other things, the transfer of missions installed in territories under Spanish sovereignty to those that belonged to Portugal. The first commissioner, literally reproducing what is reported, faced the usurpation of the Kingdom’s overseas domains

(§ 846), also pointing out the condition of ignorance, punishment and banishment that the Indians suffered, referring to the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, for more information which is given in the *Relação abreviada*. Regarding Freire de Andrade's the field of action in the south, the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* focuses on the problem of Indian resistance in the Missions, amidst the understandings between the two Iberian crowns with the consequent displacement of communities due to the establishment of the Uruguay River's border. The resistance of the Indians after their relative defensive success led to a joint military intervention which, in January 1756 crushed with extreme violence the Amerindian community Christianised by the Society of Jesus.<sup>35</sup> The 1750 Treaty, with the accession to the throne of Charles III, was meanwhile annulled and the Seven Missions returned to Spanish temporal sovereignty, although the situation remained tense. The vehemence with which the subject of the powerful republic dominated by the Jesuits was approached denotes, without any beating about the bush, the Pombaline project of complete centralisation of power in the political and economic spheres.

However, even if the earthquake that occurred in 1755 generated a set of emergency measures that lead us to the *Memórias das principais providências, que se deram no Terremoto, que padeceo a corte de Lisboa no anno de 1755, ordenadas e offerecidas à magestade fidelissima de el Rey Dom José I. Nosso Senhor*, the "intended futures and greater punishments" (§ 867), in which the denunciation of the recurrent fanaticism that came from the antecedents of the reprehensible 17th century prophetism echoes and now intends to associate with the preaching of Father Gabriel Malagrida, are not left uncensored.

The foundation of the *Companhia Geral da Agricultura das Vinhas do Alto Douro* (General Society of Alto Douro Viticulture) is another notable point of reference in the exaltation of the Josephine reign of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*. This majestic company was established by royal charter on 10th September 1756 with the purpose, on an exclusive basis and exempt from taxes, of ensuring the production and distribution of Douro wines, carefully promoting their quality. But the creation of the monopolistic and privileged company encountered obstacles among the small Porto traders, provoking violently repressed riots (an action that the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* intends to minimize) That insurrection, from a Pombaline perspective, could not only be understood as stemming from Jesuit influence, but should also be associated with the attempted sedition that took place in Lisbon "when the other *Companhia do Grão Pará and Maranhão* was published" (§ 870).

Throughout the reign of King José I, the Society of Jesus was being definitively confronted and surrounded, with the successive interference by the power, a flagrant example of which is the recourse to Benedict XIV, in 1757 and 1758, on the state of the Society, through diplomatic steps taken by the ambassador Francisco de Almada e Mendonça al-

---

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Kenneth Maxwell, *Marquês de Pombal, Paradoxo do Iluminismo*, Rio de Janeiro, Ed. Paz e Terra, 1996, pp. 52-55.

ready on the eve of the expulsion decreed on 3 September 1759. Benedict XIV, a month before his death, effectively issued the *In specula supremae dignitatis* Brief and invested Dom Francisco de Saldanha (1723-1776) apostolic visitor and general reformer of the Society of Jesus to inquire “about the state of the same people and their life and customs” (§ 878). In the meantime, the Jesuits were forbidden by edict of the Cardinal Patriarch Dom José Manuel da Câmara (1686-1758), soon to be replaced in the Patriarchal dignity by the Papal Visitor Saldanha, to suspend the exercise of confessions and preaching in his area of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. It is important to note that the results of the papal enquiry concerning the accusations which motivated the appeal to Benedict XIV were not conclusive.

At the end of the long comminatory journey undertaken by the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, however, the issue on the questionable involvement of members of the Society of Jesus in the attempted assassination of King Joseph I is inserted and amplified as an organised conspiracy. The last pages concern the condemnation and execution of Father Gabriel Malagrida. The reader is confronted with a procedural description that assumes a lot of symbolic elements in this final Pombaline mention of an act (which Voltaire saw as *excès de l'horreur*) and which contains both a confident affirmation and a fearful prognosis as to how the future would turn out.

“Lastly, this was the saint, the prophet, the miraculous martyr, who after himself left in this Kingdom the Society called of Jesus. And this was the seal, with which divine providence confirmed, and provided, for perpetual memory of the centuries to come, the most just, and most provident law of perpetual proscription of the same Society” (§ 926).

## 2.2. A regalist and jusdivinist theorisation

### 2.2.1. JUSDIVINIST REGALISM

The *Dedução cronológica e analítica* from which we have just given the fundamental topics of chronological and argumentative follow-up does not present any systematic formulation with regard to theoretical presuppositions, which, however, emerge throughout the work in the midst of energetic and violent anti-Jesuitism.

When, between 1767 and 1768, the three volumes of the long Pombaline indictment appeared, the regalist theorisation had already been the object of a confrontation resulting from the inquisitorial refusal to a manuscript presented by the Judge of the High Court Inácio Ferreira do Souto,<sup>36</sup> in 1762, with the title *De potestate regia in clericos* (1762). The opinions by the Oratorians João Chevalier (1722-1801) and João Batista (1705-1761) were not positive, given the excessive regalist nature of the manuscript's pages. The clarifications requested on the process seem to have caused a serious disagreement between

---

<sup>36</sup> Inácio Ferreira do Souto would become the first General Intendant of the Court's and the Kingdom's General Police.

Minister Carvalho e Melo and Chief Inquisitor D. José de Bragança, who was banished alongside the Neri's qualifiers, who suffered the same fate. The means of Power's interest was thus seen as substantiating an action tending to underline the autonomy of temporal power when Portugal had already been cut off from the ties with the Holy See in 1760 and which would only come to an end in 1769. In this decade, regalist theorisation would be consolidated, which at first contained a marked underlying episcopalist and conciliarist facet, evident in the works by António Pereira de Figueiredo.<sup>37</sup> In 1765, this Oratorian defended a set of theses entitled *De doctrina veteris ecclesiae de suprema regum etiam in clericos potestate*, which would be followed in the following year by *Tentativa teológica*, complemented, in 1768 and 1769, by the *Appendix e ilustração da tentativa teológica* and *Demonstração teológica e histórica*, when the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* was already in progress. Throughout these works, in which mainly theological but also canonical presuppositions are combined, it is clear that from the beginning of the life of the Church obedience to the holders of temporal power was in force, as can be verified with the help of an extensive avocation of ancient and modern authorities and the doctrine of the Councils. "God has distinguished royal and pontifical powers so that each one, in its respective actions and functions, is supreme and independent of the other".<sup>38</sup> The *regalist* position of temporal versus spiritual power will further seek arguments on the bishops' primacy of jurisdiction in their diocese over papal jurisdiction whose primacy is disputed insofar as it is argued that it was Christ the immediate author of the episcopate<sup>39</sup> by ordaining the bishops as his Apostles".

These themes, which will also emerge throughout the *Dedução cronológica e analítica's* argumentation and even after the work's publication, take on the contours of a historical perspective viewed within the timeframe of the mid-16th century up to Pombalism.

Along the impact caused by events that are reported and commented on with repeated invocation of the divine and direct origin of power, of the pure monarchy assumed by the unquestionable absolute regal authority or of the exercise of the potestas of the Prince, it is important to first of all consider the essence of the theorisation that is contested. Thus, if the divine origin of power is indisputable, one can invariably refer to the Pauline mention that there is no power that does not come from God (*Nihil potestas nisi a Deo*, Rm 13, 1), A different issue is to know whether such power is transmitted: directly from God or through mediation. Such mediation can be understood to take place either through the

---

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Zília Osório de Castro, "O regalismo em Portugal – António Pereira de Figueiredo", *Cultura. História e Filosofia*, vol. VI, 1987, pp. 357-411; João Seabra, "A teologia ao serviço da política religiosa de Pombal. Episcopalismo e conceção do primado romano na *Tentativa teológica* do padre António Pereira de Figueiredo", *Lusitania Sacra*, n.º 7, 2.ª série, 1995, pp. 359-402.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. J. S. da Silva Dias, *A política cultural de D. João III*, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 50.

Pope, giving rise to a theocratic foundation, or else by popular means, the latter solution having its roots in Roman law, as evidenced by its great compilers Ulpian and Justinian.<sup>40</sup> It is this doctrine which is generally accepted and against which the Pombaline jusdivinist absolutism will struggle hard, as can be seen, quite explicitly, in the outright refutation of the principles extracted from the *Justa aclamação* by Francisco Velasco de Gouveia, and which the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* transcribes, namely: “That regal power of the Kings is in the peoples, and republics, and from them it will immediately receive it; That even if the peoples transferred the power in the Kings, it remained to them habitually, and they can reassume it when it is necessary for their conservation and that the kingdoms, and peoples can deprive the Kings of intruders, and tyrants; denying them obedience; submitting to whoever has the legitimate right to reign in them” (§ 649).

### 2.2.2.THE ORIGIN OF POWER AND ITS FOUNDATION

The origin of power in Portugal, in the regalist and Pombalist jusdivinist perspective, derives from the right of conquest in a just war against the infidels (§ 592). By succession, this power came to be assumed by Dom Afonso Henriques: “That in this certainty the Kingdom of Portugal, was not separated from the Kingdom of Leon by order of the peoples; nor was the first count elected by them; but rather possessed it by the title of the said donation, which el-Rei his father-in-law made to him on account of the dowry, the same county remaining therefore proper to him, and to his successors. Nor was the said Prince Dom Afonso Henriques elected by the Peoples of Portugal but succeeded his father in it” (§ 593).

The acclamation that took place on the eve of the Battle of Ourique, as recounted in the *Crónica geral de Espanha* (1344) or in the *Crónica do muito alto e esclarecido príncipe D. Afonso Henriques, primeiro rei de Portugal* (1505), by Duarte Galvão (1446-1517), did not involve any kind of election of the army or the people:

“[...] D. Dom Afonso Henriques on the eve of the famous battle of Campo de Ourique was proclaimed king by the army and the people, who were present. But that people and that army did not own him, nor could they give him the State or the government, or the supreme jurisdiction, which the said prince had by that time already incorporated in his royal person, by the titles of dowry, and then of conquest” (§594).

This Pombaline indoctrination on pure monarchy appears, however, confirmed by the interpretation made of the *Cortes* of Lamego, which were supposedly convened by Portugal’s first monarch. In order to contest the Courts of 1668, it is emphasised that:

---

<sup>40</sup> On the problems of the origin and transmission of power and the 17th century theorisations, see Pedro Calafate, *Da origem popular do poder ao direito de resistência. Doutrinas do século XVII em Portugal*, Lisbon, Esfera do Caos, 2012.



“[...] that succession by bloodline law, formalized by the fundamental law of the Courts of Lamego, and by the constant custom always observed from them until the said *Cortes* of the year 1668 had also constituted in this kingdom a law equal to the people’s law. Which is therefore respected in all civil societies; because in it consists in all kingdoms the most solid base of the monarchy, leaving no place for interregnums, or elections. And thus, preventing all cabalas, and all the quarrels, which ordinarily degenerate into civil wars always harmful to all states (§ 601).

In support of the fundamental nature of the alleged provisions of Lamego, it should be added that the French *Lei Salica* and the English *Magna Carta* are mentioned as examples justifying a widespread regalist practice.

However, the reiteration of the right of succession and the right of conquest on which the royal power is based also presupposes the fullness of its affirmation when the Peoples were summoned and heard, giving it the form of succession and “the character of a State law, or of a fundamental law, and unalterable for future times” (§ 663), in the evident reservation of any injunction that would distort the ultimate foundations of the monarchy or unacceptable despotic exercise of power. Thus, having fully defined the ownership of power by right of succession and conquest and the safeguarding of fundamental laws that legitimate it, it is also important to characterise the nature of the monarchy: “a monarchical government is that in which the supreme power resides entirely in the person of one man. He who, although he (man) must be guided by reason, recognizes no other superior (in the temporal) than God Himself. He who deposes the persons, who seem to him most suitable to exercise in the different ministries of government. And he (man) finally makes the laws, and overrules them, when it suits him” (§ 604).

The titularity and the respective exercise of power, defined here, came to be historically substantiated in various ways. Both by the invocation of the veteran and neotestamentarian precepts and by various conciliar dispositions (from the 6th to the 14th century, § 627-632), as well as by a whole doctrinal tradition on the relations of the *sacerdotio* and the *imperio*. The supreme power and authority of kings is illustrated in this sense, exemplified by the possibly exaggerated precepts of unrestricted obedience which the prophet Samuel demands of the people of Israel (§ 607) or by the question posed by Solomon: “Where the king’s word is, there is his dominion; and who shall ask him. What do you do?” (§ 611).

But it is not only the veteran-testamentary avocation that appears in the pages of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*. We are reminded that Christ, according to Saint John’s words, did not come into the world to judge, but to save (§ 613). Similarly, the question of tribute and the Jesus’ maxim to Caesar what is Caesar’s (§ 615), or the affirmation of the Apostle Peter on the necessary subjection of the peoples to the princes on Earth, or the classic Pauline mention that there is no supreme power that does not emanate from God and that whoever resists the supreme prince resists the command of God” (§ 615), are also

brought up. It is in this context that various conciliar dispositions which fill substantial pages of the Pombaline text will also be adduced (§§ 625-632).

### 2.2.3 MONARCHOMACHY AND TYRANNICIDE

In the combative aspect of the pertinacious indictment, with a well-defined target and purposes, there could not lack the denunciation of a doctrine tradition that discusses the full affirmation of the power of princes and which would imply the full association of the Society of Jesus with monarchist principles, connected with the problem of tyrannicide. In this way, any manifestation of the right to limit royal power, of contractual solutions, or of the avocation of the resistance of the peoples, is contested.

William Barclay (1543-1605) in *De regno et regali potestate adversus Buchananum, Brutum, Boucherium et reliquos Monarchomachos libri VI* (Paris, 1600) will include all those authors, mostly Calvinist and Huguenot, who opposed the tyrannical rule of princes and advocated, more or less violently, their overthrow. In the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, works such as *Vindiciae contra tyranos* (1579) published under the pseudonym Stephanus Junius Brutus, commonly attributed to Philippe Du Plessis Mornay (1549-1623), and *De jure regni apud scotos* (1578) by George Buchanan (1506-1582) are listed, master of the Conimbricium *Colégio das Artes* who had to leave Portugal in 1552 or the very well-reasoned text by François Hotman (1524-1590) entitled *Franco - Galia sive tractatus isagogicus regimine Regum Galiae et iure successionis. A Politica methodice digesta, atque exemplis sacris et profanis illustrata* (1603) by the Calvinist and Federalist Johannes Althusius (1557-1563) is another adduced text in arguing that it is in the people that sovereignty resides and it is not lawful for them to alienate it, consequently opposing not only the essentiality of civil law but also the voluntary delegation of the sovereign power of the people to those who govern them, to the absolute power of divine law.

However, the Pombaline libel seeks to root the expressions of modern monarchomachy in a more profound tradition, referring to the attitude of the Pharisees as described by Flavius Josephus in the *Ancient History of the Jews* in favour of Caesar and the Justinian doctrine of the supremacy and subordination of the Emperor to the constituent power of the Peoples (the only occasion for a remission in Part I of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* - in a note to § 618 of Jean Bodin's *De Republica*, 1530-1596). The objection of Ulpian's positions (150-223) or of the Justinian *Corpus iuris civilis*, which will be set out here, contributed in a counter-polar way, as we know, to the foundation of legitimation by popular means, as will be the case of Francisco Suárez in *Defensio fidei*,<sup>41</sup> which the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* could not let pass unnoticed (§§ 633-641). However, what is perhaps most important to retain from the opportunity of mentioning the Monar-

---

<sup>41</sup> Cf. AA.VV., *A Escola Ibérica da Paz nas Universidades de Coimbra e Évora*, op. cit., vol. II, p. 18.

chomachian ideas is their generalised association with the Society of Jesus, which adopted them “with the greatest commitment for the usefulness it found in them” (§ 635). And so, without ceasing to associate method and doctrine, both the demonstrative artifice of an Arabic-peripatetic logic and the Monarchomachian-Jesuitic sectarian adherence, in defiance of the anti-Monarchomachian confutations, whether Catholic or Protestant, are deplored, or Protestant, where authors such as William Barclay, already mentioned, Adam Blackwood (1539-1613), Dietrich Reinking (1590-1664), the jusnaturalist Samuel Pufendorf (1632-1694) and others are listed (§ 637).

#### 2.2.4. ANTICURIALISM AND THE HARMONY OF THE SACERDOTIO AND THE IMPERIO.

The regal independence of power as defined in the framework of pure monarchy, of which we have presented the fundamental traits, implies, of course, a given theorisation of the *sacerdotio et imperio* in which some diminution of the primacy of the pope is hinted at and curialist positions are contested. In this regard, the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* does not forget, in the absolutist argument it develops, to raise the problem of the falsity of Pseudo-Isidore’s Decretals<sup>42</sup> to execrate the presumptive “temporal power of the Pope over the monarchies on Earth” (§ 685). And although the primacy of the spiritual in matters of doctrine is not disputed, subject as such to the censorship and definition of the Vicar of Christ, the precise delimitation of the relationship between the altar and the throne is evident. The set of authors who are invoked to support the harmony of the said relationship range from Pedro de Marca to Paul Sarpi, already mentioned, as well as from Bossuet (1627-1704) to Van Espen (1646-1728), as can be seen in various demonstrations that appear in Part II of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*.

The Pombaline argument is even more explicit concerning the imperative need of concord between the ecclesiastical sphere and that of the temporal power as regards the aspects of repeated denunciation of the interference of the Roman Curia in temporal affairs. Let us take as a mere example, among many that are referred to throughout the Pombaline text, the curialist excesses concerning the unrestricted acceptance of the dispositions of the Council of Trent (§ 75 and §§ 129-132).

#### 2.2.5. THE QUESTION OF AUTHORSHIP

Sebastião José de Carvalho e Melo’s political programme shines through the extensive and prolix argumentation of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, which José de Seabra da Silva “gave birth to”. The Count of Oeiras, future Marquis of Pombal, certainly defined

---

<sup>42</sup> Reference to the *Decretals* forged in the second quarter of the 9th century, also known as Decretals of Isidore (a certain Isidore Mercator) consisting of papal determinations which assumed full pontifical *potestas* in relation to the bishops.

the work's plan and permanently accompanied its writing, besides having participated in it by requesting the collaboration of several personalities and followers of regal ideas, as happened in the production of other works. It can be admitted, in any case, that Seabra da Silva, in addition to being one of the co-authors, had concatenated a final version within the powers that *ex officio*, as procurator of the Crown, competed to him in order to beg the King for measures to act in light of what was denounced in the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* and that are contained in the *Petição de recurso*.

There have been, in fact, numerous authorial references since the full drafting of the Minister Carvalho e Melo,<sup>43</sup> to his permanent superintendence and alteration of the text even if made collectively.<sup>44</sup> But, it also cannot go unnoticed that, in many steps, the first person is used (e.g. §§ 327, 354, 402) and the mention of “paramount importance of the business I am dealing with (§ 74), or the “indispensable obligation of my office” (§ 416).

However, what appears to us as more uncontroversial is the fact that the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* would become an unavoidable reference text soon after its publication, with wide national and international dissemination. It should be noted that at

---

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Auguste Carayon, *Documents inédits concernant la Compagnie de Jésus*, vol. x, Poitiers, Henri Oudin, 1863, p. 13 (“Un des parents du marquis de Pombal, Dom Antonio da Sylveira, a assuré aux Pères de la Compagnie, que le marquis était personnellement auteur de l’ouvrage intitulé *Deducção chronologica*, auquel Joseph Siabra, l’ami intime de Pombal mit son nom comme dans le *Compendio histórico* (sic)”; “Carta de Niccoló. Pagliarini para Giovanni Bottari, de 21 de Julho de 1767”, in Zília Osório de Castro, “Jansenismo versus jesuitismo. Niccoló Pagliarini e o projecto político pombalino”, *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia*, n.º 52, 1996, pp. 228-229 (“Acabou finalmente de ser impressa a primeira parte da obra na qual o senhor Conde trabalha desde dezembro” (...)) “Contudo quero antecipadamente comunicar-lhe o titulo sob sigilo, reservando-me mandar-lhe o original português dentro de um mês” (...) “O título é este *Deducção Cronologica e Analitica*”) (“The first part of the work on which Senhor Conde has been working since December has finally been printed” (...)) “Nevertheless, I would like to inform you in advance of the title, under strict confidentiality, reserving the right to send you the Portuguese original within a month” (...) “The title is this *Deducção Cronologica e Analitica*”; Letter from António Pereira de Figueiredo to Father Nicolau Francisco of the Goa Oratory, 24 April 1771 in *Cartas de Luis António Vernei and António Pereira de Figueiredo aos Padres da Congregação do Oratório de Goa*, ed. by Joaquim da Cunha Rivara, Nova Goa, Imprensa Nacional, 1858, p. 15 (Rma.. Procure em Goa quem lhe empreste a *Dedução Cronologica e Analítica* (da qual eu sei o Sr Marquês seu autor mandou para lá muitos exemplares)” (...) “Esta é a obra prima do Sr. Marquês, a qual eu com tanto gosto como trabalho traduzi de português para latim para que ela pudesse aproveitar todas as nações”), (V. R ma.. Look for someone in Goa who can lend you the *Dedução Cronologica e Analítica* (of which I know that Mr. Marquis, its author, sent many copies there) (...) “ This is the masterpiece of Mr. Marquis, which I gladly and painstakingly translated from Portuguese to Latin so that it could benefit all nations”; J. Lucio de Azevedo, *O Marquês de Pombal e a sua época*, Lisbon, Clássica Editora, 2nd ed.

<sup>44</sup> There is a vast bibliography on the conjecture of implicit authorship by the Count of Oeiras. Cf. P. Manuel Antunes, *O Marquês de Pombal e os Jesuítas*, in AA. VV., *Como interpretar Pombal?*, pp. 139-140, *op. cit.*; Mar Garcia Arenas, “La Compañía de Jesús en la *Deducção cronológica e analítica* pombalina”, *Revista de Historia Moderna/Anales de Universidad de Alicante*, n.º 21, 2003, pp. 9-11; José Eduardo Franco, “Os catecismos antijesuíticos pombalinos. As obras fundadoras do antijesuítismo do Marquês de Pombal”, *Revista Lusófona de Ciências das Religiões*, ano IV, n.º 7/8, 2005, pp. 255-258.

the time of the appearance of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, whose planification was certainly drawn up even before the expulsion of the Society,<sup>45</sup> the argumentative and programmatic relevance of the content seems to override the importance of authorship. António Ribeiro dos Santos, in his regalist Pombaline phase, when he published the *De sacerdotio et imperio*, in 1770, even if he does not fail to consider the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* an *immortale opus*, is also worth mentioning that he makes no mention to José de Seabra da Silva's authorship. This canonist's lesser importance, protected by the Pombaline bourgeoisie and very much within the process of regalist affirmation,<sup>46</sup> which the recurrent coincidence of many of the authors cited and doctrinal positions proves,<sup>47</sup> seems to be in order to relativize the problem of a personal authorship. Still on the subject of authorship, it is always necessary to take into account the fact that the immense amount of scholarship covering history, theology, controversialism, jus canonical dispositions and further knowledge does not seem to us to be dealt with by a single author. As a work directed towards a particular political objective, it also required a superintendence and final revision of the foci of argumentation on what was intended. This task could only have been undertaken by the Count of Oeiras, notwithstanding the fact that the diligent Crown's Procurator may have been assigned the task of coordinating and editing a work that is, above all, an instrument for the exercise of State Power. Unlike the theological and canonical reflections by António Pereira de Figueiredo or, shortly afterwards, the academic theses by António Ribeiro dos Santos, even though both authors have contributed equally to the justification and clarification of the Pombaline regalist and jusdivinist policy. In this sense, beyond its anti-Jesuitism and the publication's strategic immediacy, the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* is a classic work of Portuguese political thought.

José Esteves Pereira

---

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Samuel J. Miller, *Portugal and Rome c. 1748-1830. An aspect of the Catholic Enlightenment*, Rome, Università Gregoriana Editrice, 1979, p. 59. It is also very significant to note the reference in the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* to an appendix to the *Reflexões de um portuguez sobre o Memorial do padre geral da Companhia de Jesus*, anonymous publication of 1759. It includes a final chapter entitled "Prejuízo que causaram os Jesuítas à república civil", which converges with the argumentative presuppositions of the Pombaline libel of 1767 and 1768.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Keneth Maxwell, *Marquês de Pombal*, pp. 102-103, *op. cit.*.

<sup>47</sup> Cfr José Esteves Pereira, *O pensamento político em Portugal no século XVIII-António Ribeiro dos Santos*, Lisbon, Imprensa Nacional - Casa da Moeda, reprint, 2005, pp. 146-147.

### 3. PART TWO OF THE *DEDUÇÃO CRONOLÓGICA E ANALÍTICA*

#### 3.1. On the immediate divine origin of kings' Power

In the study concerning this work's First Part, Professor José Esteves Pereira has already set out the fundamental lines of Pombalism's question on the origin of civil power. However, given that the subject cuts across both parts of the *Dedução cronológica*, let us return to it in order to clarify the exact position of the Society of Jesus' theoreticians, whose theses were under fire from the doctrinaires of absolutism.

In fact, throughout the work the authors of this historical deduction were in chorus with those who in 17th century France and England banned and burned the works in which the Jesuit Francisco Suárez defended the right of active resistance against tyranny and the democratic origin of civil power.

By criticising Suarez, it was intended to show that just as God had given power directly and immediately to Saul and David, so the absolute power of kings emanated directly from God without any mediator on Earth.

The defence of the kings' absolute power and, above all, of their immediate origin in God, traditionally referred to biblical sources, which were privileged topics in the arguments put forward.

In fact, some biblical texts could support this thesis, such as Proverbs (Pr 8) where God says "By me kings reign"; or the Book of Wisdom (Sb 6, 1-3), where we read: "Listen therefore, O kings, and understand; Give ear, you who rule over multitudes [...] For your dominion was given you from the Lord and your sovereignty from the Most High"; or again in Daniel Dn 2, 20-21), when welcoming the revelation of the mystery of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, the Prophet says: "Blessed be the name of God from age to age, for wisdom and power are his; He changes times and seasons, deposes kings and sets up kings".

Thus, what was really at stake for Pombal's theoreticians was to refute the Jesuit theses with Thomistic matrix according to which the power of kings was not directly conferred on them by God but by the people, who conferred or transferred it initially on the basis of a pact, in which mutual obligations were established and where hereditary succession could be determined or not.

Saint Thomas had suggested this interpretation when he considered, in the first book of *De regimine principum*, that all entities endowed with a proper end should constitutively possess the faculties necessary to achieve it, and since the community is a transpersonal entity whose proper end is the common good, it should possess within itself the faculties that enable it to achieve it. Among them was the temporal or secular power which was thus considered constitutive of all human communities, in the terms of natural reason and, therefore, of natural law.

Luis de Molina had clearly taught this in Evora when, in his *De iustitia et iure* (1593), he stated that:

“By the mere fact that men have agreed to constitute the body of the republic, there arises by natural right the power of the whole republic over its members for its government, legislation and administration of justice”.<sup>48</sup>

Shortly afterwards, in 1613, Francisco Suárez taught in Coimbra that

“Democracy could exist without a positive institution, only by natural emanation, for natural reason itself establishes that the supreme political power naturally follows from the perfect human community and, for this reason, belongs to the whole community, except if it is transferred to another [...] The perfect civil community is free by natural right, it is not subject to any man outside itself, but holds within itself, in truth, all the power, which is democratic insofar as it does not change”.<sup>49</sup>

These theses were far from being defended only by the Society of Jesus’ theoreticians, for they were profusely sustained by the Dominicans of the University of Salamanca in the 16th century, namely by Francisco de Vitoria and Domingo de Soto, with the purpose of substantiating the legitimacy of the indigenous sovereignties in America and bringing the Spanish empire back to a basis of legitimacy and justice.

In Portugal, several decades before Molina and Suárez, Professor Martín de Azpilcueta, known as Doctor Navarro, since he was a native from the kingdom of Navarre, in a brilliant *relectio*<sup>50</sup> delivered in 1547 before the Great Assembly of the University of Coimbra had explained that lay power began naturally from the moment men decided to meet in community, having the inevitable consequence that “those things which are given naturally from their beginning, are up to whom they are given”,<sup>51</sup> that is, they are up to the peoples and communities and not to the supreme hierarch of the church nor directly to princes, since they receive power directly from the people. The professor at Coimbra explained that royal power was effectively created immediately by God, but not transmitted immediately to princes or emperors, “because kings are made by election or succession and, thus, through some created thing”,<sup>52</sup> to the extent that, he adds, “no one can deny that regal power existed before kings in the very community of men gathered together”<sup>53</sup> and

---

<sup>48</sup> Luis de Molina, *De iustitia et iure*, Cuenca, Ioannis Masselini, 1593, t. I, liv. I, disp. XXII.

<sup>49</sup> Francisco Suárez, *Principatus politicus*, II, 11 (Coimbra, 1613), in *Corpus Hispanorum de Pace*, Dir. de Luciano Pereña, vol. II, Madrid, CSIC, 1965.

<sup>50</sup> Martín de Azpilcueta, *Relectio c. novit de iudiciis*, in VV. AA., *A Escola Ibérica da Paz nas Universidades de Coimbra e Évora*, translated by *op. cit.*, vol. II.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 97.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 118.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 118.

as for “reigning by God”, a title always invoked by Christian monarchs to legitimize and dignify the majesty of lay power, this should be understood in the precise sense in which “they reign by the power created immediately by Him, but mediately received”.<sup>54</sup>

In this regard, Dr Navarro understood that when a people had no guide or chief, they were their own chief or guide, or that when a people did not have the light of an emperor, they were their own light, because they possessed it within themselves, implying that democracy was the most natural form of government, because it did not need to be positively instituted, although it was not necessarily the most perfect. The refutation of regal absolutism and theocracy finds here its most relevant foundation, which was to be followed, as a logical consequence, by one of the most sensitive questions in Christian and Catholic political thought: the right of active resistance against tyranny, in the name of objective principles of justice.

Therefore, for Jesuits and Dominicans, who raised the thesis to be demolished in this *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, God gave power directly and immediately to the community of men and not to this or that person. Otherwise, God would have established monarchy as the only legitimate form of government. Suarez, for example, will say that:

“there is no reason to show that this particular form of government [monarchy] is necessary, as we can see from the customs of peoples or nations which have elected distinct forms of government, and none of them is contrary to natural reason or immediate divine institution”.<sup>55</sup>

The peoples, then, could choose the form of government they decided upon, for God did not precept any one in particular. Thus, there is no intermediary between God and the people in the granting of power, but there is an intermediary between God and the prince: “Between the king and God, He wanted the people to be the mediator through whom the king receives this kind of power” [*“Deum voluit populum esse medium, per quod rex talem accipit potestatem”*].<sup>56</sup>

Another of the fundamental enemies to be slaughtered in this *Dedução cronológica e analítica* was the *Justa aclamação* (1644), by Francisco Velasco de Gouveia, in which the jurist of the 1600s founded the legitimacy of the action of the Conjurors on 1 December 1640, based on these same doctrines. In eschewing the various theses that he rejects in order to present the one he defends Velasco de Gouveia says at one point:

---

<sup>54</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 119.

<sup>55</sup> Francisco Suárez, *Principatus politicus*, II, 4, 5, *op. cit.*.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibidem*, II, 4,5.



“There is a manifest error concerning the same political regal power, contending that kings do not receive it from peoples and republics, nor is it in them, but immediately from God, wherein alone it consists”,<sup>57</sup>

Therefore, the most correct resolution is the one which states that

“Political and civil power is in peoples and republics, and that kings did not immediately receive it from God, but from them, where primarily it consisted and resided”.<sup>58</sup>

And even if the cases of the political power of Saul and David could be peacefully interpreted as a direct and immediate concession by God, they would remain as exceptions, since in Law it could be maintained that special cases “remain as the rule to the contrary”, thus resolving or attenuating the controversy. Francisco Suárez himself, analysing the biblical texts on Saul and David, understood that in civil matters men could not be guided by miracles or supernatural interventions, but by natural reason. In the 17th century, moreover, there was a broad range of defenders of the democratic origin of civil power.<sup>59</sup>

On the Pombalist side, the thesis that runs through the *Dedução cronológica* is that the sovereignty of princes is immediate to God and that the power to reign was granted directly by God to kings, regardless of the facts that determined and conveyed the historical constitution of their sovereignty, which in the Portuguese case was the legitimate dowry and the conquest of patrimony in a just war.

Here is the thesis in all its clarity:

“The supreme temporal power being one, unique, undivided and the same identical power in all sovereign princes, to them immediately emanating from almighty God, without depending directly or indirectly on any other power in this world for the government of human affairs and of everything in which the public order and good of the temporal state is concerned. [...]”<sup>60</sup>

By stating the non-dependence of the sovereign on the people or the community, the result was that the courts took on a purely consultative and supplicatory dimension, before which the king positioned himself with the firm authority of supreme lord. On the

---

<sup>57</sup> Francisco Velasco de Gouveia, *Justa aclamação do serenissimo rey de Portugal Dom João o IV: Tratado analytico: dividido em tres partes: ordenado, e divulgado em nome do mesmo reyno, em justificação de sua acção: dirigido ao Summo Pontifice da Igreja Catholica, reys, principes, republicas, & senhores soberanos da Christandade*, Lisbon, Lourenço de Anveres, 1644, p. 25.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 26.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Pedro Calafate, *Da origem popular do poder ao direito de resistência. Doutrinas políticas no século XVII em Portugal*, Lisbon, Esfera do Caos, 2012.

<sup>60</sup> *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, 1767, Part Two, p. 74.

king's part, the relationship between him and the courts occurred within the framework of a benign clemency from the vassals' father.

In this respect, it is very significant to see how the authors of this work interpret the various episodes in which the community was called upon to intervene, through the courts, in the granting of temporal power to kings.

The first was the "raising" and "acclaim" of Afonso Henriques on the eve of the battle of Ourique, as well as the subsequent "Royal courts of Lamego", where it was supposedly decided to ratify the act that had raised the Infante to royal dignity.

In the *Crónica de D. Afonso Henriques* (and before him the *Crónica de 1419*), Duarte Galvão reports that, after Christ miraculously appeared to him, the Infante Afonso Henriques started organising his troops for the battle of Ourique. When the Portuguese knights saw the Moors' immense force and the radical disproportion between the two sides in the conflict, they turned to the Infante and asked him to do them a favour: "Sir, what all these people are asking of you is that you consent to being made king, and then there will be more effort to fight".<sup>61</sup> So, the Infante would have received the dignity and the royal power from "all these people", who in that circumstance were acting as the community. That is also, for instance, Francisco Velasco de Gouveia's interpretation in the above-mentioned book, when he says: "To the first king of Portugal, Afonso Henriques, the people gave the title of king in Campo de Ourique".<sup>62</sup>

The position of the *Dedução cronológica's* authors is contrary to this thesis, as it could not be otherwise, sustaining that "D. Afonso Henriques did not have supreme dominion or supreme power by convention or transfer of the peoples", nor were the so-called "courts of Lamego" convened to transfer power or dominion to him, but only to establish a fundamental law of the state, in which monarchy was established as the form of government and the respective modes of succession, a law unchangeable by any of his successors and being the only limit of the power held by the kings of Portugal.

The second event that required interpretation in the light of the regal absolutism criteria were the Courts of Coimbra in 1385. Here, again, the Master of Avis could not have received kingly power in courts, and under the terms of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* it can only be assumed that there was a break in the line of direct succession and therefore the exercise of sovereignty was suspended. Were there to be various disputes and opinions about the most legitimate of the suitors, then the confluence of these two situations "supplied the authority to the vassals for a few moments, not to retain it but to reduce it to evidence to whom it is returned among the suitors, in order to restore it to the one to

---

<sup>61</sup> Duarte Galvão, *Crónica de D. Afonso Henriques*, Ed. de José Mattoso, Lisbon, INCM, 1955, p. 62.

<sup>62</sup> Francisco Velasco de Gouveia, *Justa aclamação do serenissimo rey de Portugal Dom João o IV*, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

whom it legitimately belongs”.<sup>63</sup> It was, therefore, the restitution of a right to its legitimate holder.

The third case was obviously the Restoration and the rise of the Duke of Bragança to regal dignity, which in the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* is not read in the light of the exercise of the peoples’ right to resist tyranny, in this case the king of Spain’s, nor of the rectification by the 1641 Lisbon courts. Here, it too was merely a matter of “returning” the title of king to the rightful holder, demanding that the Restoration theorists’ claims about the popular origin of civil power were wrong.

The work that obviously comes in the line of fire is the aforementioned *Justa aclamação* by Velasco de Gouveia, which significantly opens with the seat taken at the Cortes held in Lisbon, 1641, to ratify the acclamation of the Duke of Bragança. It reaffirms that only the kingdom is responsible for judging and declaring the legitimate succession when there is doubt about it, as well as legitimising disobedience to the king who “by his mode of government has made himself unworthy of reigning, since this power was left to him when the peoples at first transferred theirs to the king to govern them”, the author of the treaty explaining that when the word “kingdom” is used we should mean “people, republic, community”<sup>64</sup>.

In turn, from this Contractualist conception, on the basis of which kings received power from the people by means of a pact with mutual obligations, another thesis was extracted and it is refuted throughout the two parts of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*: that of the “jurisdiction of vassals to attack their sovereigns”,<sup>65</sup> compounded by the consequences of probabilism and casuistry, in Jesuit fashion, in the light of which, as will be said years later in the *Compêndio histórico do Estado da Universidade de Coimbra* (1771) “it is permissible for a subject not to obey a superior if he believes probably either that the said superior has no legitimate jurisdiction, or that he exceeds his power”.<sup>66</sup>

The right of individuals and communities to resist had been theorized by Martín de Azpilcueta in Coimbra,<sup>67</sup> in his aforementioned lesson of 1547, which we have opportunely published in Portuguese translation,<sup>68</sup> and amplified by Suárez in his teaching in

---

<sup>63</sup> *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, Part One, p. 456.

<sup>64</sup> Francisco Velasco de Gouveia, *Justa aclamação do serenissimo rey de Portugal Dom João o IV*, op. cit., p. 19.

<sup>65</sup> *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, Part Two, p. 43.

<sup>66</sup> *Compêndio histórico do estado da Universidade de Coimbra* (1771), “Apêndice”, p. 14.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Pedro Calafate, “O pensamento político de Martim de Azpilcueta”, *Filosofia*, n.º 18, 3, 2017, pp. 203-212.

<sup>68</sup> VV. AA., *A Escola Ibérica da Paz nas Universidades de Coimbra e Évora*, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 13-192.

Coimbra, especially at the beginning of the second decade of the 17th century, in a work written against James I, King of England.<sup>69</sup>

Indeed, for both authors, by conferring or transferring power to kings, the community conferred it in act but retained it in habit.

The concept of habit goes back to Aristotle's *Categories* (Cat. , 15, 15b, 16-25) who uses it as a generic term, in the sense of an internal determination that is difficult to remove, explaining that it can be understood as a disposition by means of which a being is well or badly disposed, whether in relation to itself or in to something else, that is, to an end.

This concept was taken up and enriched by 13th-century scholastics, notably by Saint Thomas Aquinas. In the *Summa Theologica* (1-2 q.49 a.3), following Aristotle's earlier definition, St. Thomas says that "there are some habits which, by the requirements of the subject in which they reside, primarily and principally imply an order to the act, because the habit, primarily and of itself, relates to the nature of being. If, then, the nature of being, in which the habit is found, consists in the tendency to act, it follows that the habit implies primarily an order to action".

From this, our political treatise writers concluded that if the people or the political community retained power *in habitu*, it could be resumed and exercised *in actu* under extreme circumstances of manifest injustice and tyranny.

This was advocated by Francisco Suárez when he wrote that: "The people never transmit their power to the prince without retaining it '*in habitu*', in order that he may make use of it in certain cases by recovering it '*in actu*'".<sup>70</sup>

This was one of the most feared and criticised theses by Pombaline theorists throughout the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*'s two parts.

### 3.2. Relations between the State and the Church

The second major issue addressed in the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, dealt with in greater detail in Part Two, is that of the relationship between the temporal power of kings and the church's spiritual power, to which another issue is added, which is a relevant topic in the argumentation of the work's authors: the discussion on the nature of the pope's authority in the church, especially with regard to its relationship with the authority of the bishops, manifesting hints of pronounced episcopalism.

The question of the relationship between the two powers traversed the entire Middle Ages and became more pronounced in the course of European modernity. At issue was

---

<sup>69</sup> Francisco Suárez, *Defensio fidei catholicae et apostolicae adversus anglicanae sectae Errores* (Coimbra, 1613). We have published this work's most relevant chapter on the doctrine of tyrannicide and the right of active resistance in *ibidem*, pp. 285-301, translated by André Santos Campos.

<sup>70</sup> Francisco Suárez, *Principatus politicus*, III, 3, 4, *op. cit*

the rejection of the doctrines on the plenitude of the Pope's power, holder of the two swords or two powers: spiritual and temporal.

In a second moment, once papal theocracy was rejected, another thesis had to be put down: that the Pope, having no temporal power, had nevertheless indirect power over temporal things in order to attain a spiritual end, taking into account the eminence of his spiritual power, that is, when temporal matters that related directly and principally to the spiritual end of men were at stake. In this regard, the relevance of the church's temporal goods in Catholic states was also highlighted, which were understood to be founded not on divine law but on a conception of the prince and could therefore be revoked by means of confiscation and annulment of privilege.

Let us look first at the question of theocracy. Indeed, most theocrats of the 14th and 15th centuries had in their favour a literal interpretation of Pope Boniface VIII's Extravagant bull, written in 1302, entitled *Unam sanctam*. The terms of this papal text read: "Whoever denies that in Peter's power is the temporal sword, pays no attention to the words of the Lord when he said: 'Sheathe the sword'" and, further on, Boniface VIII stressed that "In the power of the Church are found both the spiritual and the temporal swords".<sup>71</sup>

One of the defenders of this thesis was, among us, the 14th century Bishop of Silves, Alvaro Pais, for whom "the Pope has universal jurisdiction throughout the world, not only in spiritual things, but also in temporal ones [...] since just as there is one Christ, priest and king, lord of all things, so also there is one vicar-general of his on earth and in everything [...]. The pope is the vicar not of a pure man but of God [...]; therefore the earth and its fullness also belong to the pope <because> Christ has granted the rights of the two powers to St. Peter".<sup>72</sup> Framing this fullness of papal power was the thesis that political power came from God through the pope, so that the emperor's power and other secular princes was granted to them directly by the Roman pontiff and not by the people.

For his part, Alvaro Pais leaned heavily on Henry of Susa, an Ostian cardinal, who maintained that, with the coming of Christ, all power had come under the authority of the Church.

However, one of the culminating moments of these theocratic conceptions at the end of the Middle Ages was Egidio Romano's *De ecclesiastica sive de summi pontificis potestate*,<sup>73</sup> written at the beginning of the 14th century, in which he argued that it was the spiritual power that instituted temporal power, which is why only kingdoms that recognise the pope as the institutor are legitimate.

---

<sup>71</sup> <https://www.papalencyclicals.net/bon08/b8unam.htm> (accessed September 10, 2022).

<sup>72</sup> Álvaro Pais, *De Status et Planctu Ecclesiae*, vol. I, INIC, Lisbon, 1983, pp. 347-45, translated by Miguel Pinto de Meneses.

<sup>73</sup> There is an excellent translation of this work into Portuguese: Egídio Romano, *Sobre o poder eclesiástico*, translated by L.A. De Boni, Petropolis, Vozes, 1989.

For Egidio, true justice, the foundation of political power, exists only in that republic whose founder and governor is Christ, but nothing is under the government of Christ if it is not under the supreme pontiff who is Christ's vicar.

Naturally, the thesis that the pope had received both powers from God conflicted directly with the thesis of the immediate divine origin of the prince's power, amply expounded throughout the two parts of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*.

Before this, however, the rejection of these theocratic theses had an important moment in the struggle between the King of France, Philip the Fair, and precisely Pope Boniface VIII, to which theologian Jean Gerson (quite often quoted in the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, insofar as it conveyed conciliatory ideas that came to fruition later in the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1648) issued by Charles VII.) would later contribute.

In it the King of France conveyed the fundamental principles of what was conventionally called Gallicanism, in the French case, or regalism, in the Portuguese case, insofar as it demanded the convening of a general council of the Church every ten years with an authority superior to that of the pope, the election of ecclesiastical positions and the drastic limitation of the appeal to Rome by the Gallican Church. Through various vicissitudes, progress and setbacks, Gallicanism would come to find its most relevant expression in the Four Gallican Articles by the General Assembly of the French Clergy, in 1681, determining that the pope had received from God only spiritual power, which was why kings were not subject to him in temporal matters, either directly or indirectly, establishing moreover the council's perennial supremacy.

For obvious reasons, the role of bishops and their authority, affirmed in the early centuries of the Church's history and now re-established, was bound to serve Pombal's regalistic purposes. He had severed relations with the Holy See in 1760, especially as the requirement of the royal approval for the appointment of bishops clearly strengthened the authority of the State, in inverse proportion to papal jurisdiction.

In the modern age and in the Pombaline view, episcopal theories had been very successfully advocated by the Belgian theologian Bernard von Espen (1648-1728) in his significantly titled work *Jus ecclesiasticum antiquae et primitivae Ecclesiae*, published posthumously in Louvain, 1753.

In it, Von Espen advocated a return of the church to its original sources, insofar as in the early centuries it had been governed by a college of bishops, characterised by equality among its members, with the pope alone holding the primacy of honour.

After Van Espen, episcopatism found a home in one of his most brilliant disciples, the Bishop of Trier, Nicolaus von Hontheim (1701-1790), with his work *De Statu Ecclesiae et legitima potestate Romani Pontificis liber singularis* (1763), translated into Portuguese by order of the Marquis of Pombal and by the hand of Miguel Tiberio Pedegache, under the title *Do estado da Igreja e poder legítimo do Pontífice Romano s* (1770).

Von Hontheim signed his work under the pseudonym Justinus Febronius and stressed the democratic root of church power, which is why the pope must be subordinate to a community that could confer on him the use of its jurisdiction on the same terms as it could revoke it. Thus, Von Hontheim concluded that Christ had not granted the pope with primacy of jurisdiction.

These theses fully fitted Pombaline purposes and that is why the “false Decretals of Isidore Mercator”, which gathered several texts supposedly authored by various popes, were so much criticised in order to consolidate papal authority and, in the Pombaline view, “to subvert all ecclesiastical discipline”.

Nevertheless, and for the sake of historical truth, the Society of Jesus’ theoreticians, like the Dominicans, were not theocrats, insofar as civil power was granted directly by God to the community or people, as we have seen.

However, theocracy having been set aside, both Jesuits and Dominicans defended the thesis that, given the eminence of spiritual ends and when these were directly and principally at stake, the pope could intervene in temporal affairs, asserting his (spiritual) authority. This was the thesis regarding the popes’ indirect power over temporal affairs, according to which the pope, having no temporal power, had power over temporal things for the sake of the spiritual end.

As we have said, a substantial amount of Part Two from the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* is devoted to rebutting these two theses, extending on the question of the nature of the church’s temporal goods and on that of episcopalism.

Secular princes were to fully respect the “spiritualities of the Church”, but on the basis of a clarification of the limits to that spirituality, and from there to a desirable harmony between the two powers. This, in Part Two, was to be seen above all in the specific questions of book censorship and of expurgatory indices, removing from the Church the prerogative of making pronouncements on books foreign to matters of dogma, as well as the possibility of imposing temporal penalties, since these were matters for civil power.

The starting point is expressed thus:

“It is such an excess to attribute to the church an unlimited authority, on the one hand, not only to censure but to proscribe books written on any and every kind of subject, and to impose spiritual and temporal penalties against transgressors, as to deny to the same church the authority to censure such and such books which, according to the circumstances of the time, pervert either religion or morals”.<sup>74</sup>

In fact, being distinct powers and once this distinction had been clarified, it would then be possible to determine the ways of concurrence, that is, of a meeting of the ways, harmonizing without confusing and guaranteeing “Christian union”. Thus, in the case

---

<sup>74</sup> *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, Part Two, p. 2.

of expurgatory indices concerning the prohibition and censorship of books, the church could use the spiritual sword of excommunication, but confiscation, pecuniary, corporal and other penalties of the same nature were within the sphere of the civil state. Likewise, outside of the legitimacy of the spiritual power lay necessarily the censorship of books foreign to the matters of dogma, since they belonged to the state's sphere of action, thus preventing the "usurpation of matters from books".

If the church had received spiritual power directly from the hands of God, the same could be said, as we have seen, of temporal princes, for indeed they received it "immediately from almighty God since the creation of the world". Thus, the rights of princes did not depend upon the approval by the popes; there was no power of the popes, direct or indirect, over the temporality of princes, just as there would be no jurisdiction of vassals to heed or resist their power.

The two parts of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* thus complemented each other in eliminating the factual powers limiting the action of the absolute state, showing that the Priesthood was "fully spiritual" and the Empire was "fully temporal".

With regard to the aforementioned harmony and "Christian union", it should be stressed that the intention to delimit the two powers by safeguarding the authority of the State vis-à-vis that of the Church was not intended to be irreligious, since the Pombaline Enlightenment was a Catholic Enlightenment, contrary to what happened in other Enlightenment movements in the rest of Europe, showing in this respect a strong proximity to the Italian Enlightenment.

It is true that the Church's sword, excommunication, could not be applied against the nature of its own spirituality, nor could it injure temporal or earthly things. But outside this purpose of delimitation, Pombaline theoreticians and their mentor ceaselessly proclaimed that

"There is nothing more in conformity with good reason than that the mysteries of the infinite divine providence do not fit into the limited sphere of human understanding [...] because even then there is nothing in any of these mysteries that implies the right dictates of reason, all are congruent with it, and if it does not perceive them, it is because they remain in inaccessible distance above it".<sup>75</sup>

This submission of reason to the precepts of dogma was one of the leading threads of the Pombaline Enlightenment, expressed in the struggle against the sufficiency of natural religion, namely in the existence of a strong apologetic current in Portugal along the lines of Huet, Bergier and Abbadie (António Ribeiro dos Santos, Manuel do Cenáculo, Teodoro de Almeida).<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 247.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Pedro Calafate, *A ideia de natureza no século XVIII em Portugal*, Lisbon, INCM, 1984



Later, this same purpose would be revealed in a fundamental text from the Pombaline reforms, the *Compêndio histórico do estado da Universidade de Coimbra* (1771), where, regarding ethics, the importance of rational ethics is underlined, insufficient in view of the condition of “fallen human nature”, however. For this reason, the members of the *Junta de Instrução Literária* said that, once the precepts concerning the obligations of men and citizens had been deduced from the normative contents of natural reason, they should be confronted with revealed morality, so that we could know, “by a posteriori demonstration”, if the deductions that had been made from those principles had been legitimate and truly dictated by rational nature, given that, being contrary to revelation, they could not be true dictates of Christian reason.<sup>77</sup>

Finally, with the concept of “Christian union” safeguarded within the framework of Catholic Enlightenment, the question on the nature of the Church’s temporal goods and the privileges which it had historically enjoyed in this area also arose quite acutely.

The struggle for the recognition of the state’s rights over the church’s vast territorial domains (as well as the corresponding tax exemptions), which, according to what D. Luis da Cunha said in his Political Testament, already covered a third of the country, is mentioned here in very emphatic terms, showing that such lands, benefits and rents were not “sanctified”, since they belonged to the “High Domain of the Crowns”, in the first and last instances.<sup>78</sup>

Thus, by nature, the temporalities of the Catholic Church were subject to the supreme power of temporal princes “in whose kingdoms or states they exist”<sup>79</sup>, making the seizure and occupation of said temporalities by sovereign princes legitimate.

These theses had been strenuously defended by António Pereira de Figueiredo, in *De suprema regum* (1765), one of the Marquis’ closest collaborators and the main theoretician of regalism in Portugal. He maintained that kings could impose taxes on the temporalities of the church without consulting the pope, because all the temporal goods she possessed were *sub iure regum* and not under the purview of divine law. He drew a further consequence concerning the exemption which canon law confers on clerics both in matters of temporal goods and civil crimes emanated from regal authority and not from papal authority.

This was another of Pombaline regalism’s fundamental battles, which is dealt with extensively in Part Two of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*.

---

<sup>77</sup> *Compêndio histórico*, fl. 181.

<sup>78</sup> *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, Part Two, p. 107.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibidem*.

## 4. PART TREE OF THE *DEDUÇÃO CRONOLÓGICA E ANALÍTICA*

### 4.1. The *Dedução cronológica e analítica* as a pragmatic and evaluative work

The *Dedução cronológica e analítica* is a pragmatic and evaluative work in history, in order to legitimize the country's reform in the light of a previously chosen model of rationality. In this context, it allows us to indirectly know the precise content of that model, which translates the dynamics of the Portuguese Enlightenment in its relationship with the various European Enlightenment.

This way of accessing the contents and purposes of the Portuguese enlightenment is provided by the choice of facts, by the way they are interpreted and integrated into systems of knowledge, into philosophies of history, into worldviews, into reformist purposes, or, in a few words, into the unitary empire of an idea of philosophy.

As we said in this study's introduction, we are facing a court-history in which, in the light of a regressive methodology, the past is transformed into an extension of the present, submitted to a process of condemnation and absolution, under the terms of a rigid code. Through it we show what we want and above all what we don't want, through it we construct a discontented thought in order to prepare our future contentment, delimiting guilty parties, identifying enemies, showing the determination of those who confront them, the kindness of those who want to rid us of them and the gratitude we owe them.

It is worthwhile supplying the reader with a brief passage from Friar Manuel do Cenáculo in which the president of the *Real Mesa Censória* (Royal Board of Censorship) and a very active member of the *Junta de Instrução Literária* characterised the privilege of his time for finally being able to free the country from contrition and error, speaking very emphatically of the "present excess", that is to say, of the centripetal concentration of historical conditions for the implementation of reform project of man's life in society:

The preservation of praiseworthy ancient times; a more combined improvement of those same ancient goodness; the reformation of those things which called for it; the union of new perfections; the increase in other provisions; more polished and multiplied institutions; all decides for the present excess<sup>80</sup>

It is this excess, thus understood, that runs through this whole *Dedução*, marked by optimism and conviction, allowing the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, after two long parts corresponding to the first two volumes, to also be composed of a third volume, published a year later (1768). This has the form of a documentary appendix, so as to prove and reinforce the evidence of the two main conclusions it intended to reach, increasing its evidential potential, its intervening force and its historical and political legitimacy.

---

<sup>80</sup> Frei Manuel do Cenáculo, *Disposições do superior provincial da Ordem Terceira para a observância regular e literaria da Congregação da Ordem Terceira de S. Francisco destes reinos, feitas em os annos de Mil Setecentos Sessenta e Nove, e Setenta*, Lisbon, at the Regia Officina Typografica, 1776, p. 33.

The first conclusion sought was that of the legitimacy of condemning the Society of Jesus, accused of erecting a State within the State, transforming itself into a factual power incompatible with royal absolutism, not only because of the power it held but above all because of the force of doctrinal contents averse to the Jusdivinist conceptions on the origin of temporal power, insofar as they were built on a democratic and contractual basis, with room for the right of active resistance and tyrannicide. Furthermore, the Jesuits sailed in uncharted waters that resisted the onslaught of geometrism and the criteria of certainty, evidence and demonstration in the various domains of human existence, preferring the more complex paths of probabilism and casuistry, in response to the difficult transparency of the world of men and its paths' infinite complexity, often labyrinthine, transforming sharpness or the art of capturing things in their complex dynamism into one of the superlative terms of the worldview that is now condemned.

Often, in this confrontation, there are not only political and doctrinal aspects, but also echoes of the clash between Enlightenment and Baroque, the latter being more attached to metaphors of opacity and thickness than the former to those of transparency and lights. To the labyrinthine world of the Baroque, the Enlightenment opposed the idea that nature always follows the simplest path, conceiving it as the inner voice of universal reason. Hence, for example, the emphatic language of the Statutes of the University of Coimbra, approved five years later (1772), when they accused the Jesuits of:

making philosophy degenerate into a verbal, equivocal and contentious science, in which they foster the bad taste and scholastic abuse of despising certain knowledge and giving value to great collections of vacillating, uncertain, versatile and useless probabilities.<sup>81</sup>

In this way the idea of cultural decadence, responsible for the distance between Portugal and the rest of Europe, was being nurtured, so it was now a matter, as it was said in the same Pombaline Statutes, of removing everything that from this heritage was translated in "harm to the common good and the advancement of Literature".<sup>82</sup> In this way, "at a time when all the nations in Europe received benign influences [...] the Jesuits in Portugal worked to involve this kingdom and its lordships in the thickest ignorance".<sup>83</sup>

Therefore, the future Pombaline reforms of the University prohibited scholastic philosophy, taught by the Society of Jesus, and opened higher education to the dynamics of scientific conceptions emanating from European academies, not before the Marquis of Pombal had sought to clarify that, in matters of science, the Bible could never constitute

---

<sup>81</sup> *Estatutos da Universidade de Coimbra*, vol. III, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 5.

<sup>83</sup> *Compêndio histórico do estado da Universidade de Coimbra*, Lisbon, at the Regia Officina Typografica, 1771, p. 338.

an obstacle to discussions among men of science, and the “Scriptures’ physical truths” should not be interpreted literally.<sup>84</sup>

This direct intervention by Pombal in a matter that was one of the great controversies in the European 18th century is worth noting, as it shows the Marquis’ explicit desire to concede a prominent place to technical-scientific performativity in the modernisation of Portugal. This will also be one of the many routes taken by the anti-Jesuit libel which, a few years later, with the publication of the *Compêndio histórico do estado da Universidade de Coimbra* (1771) and the *Estatutos da Universidade de Coimbra* (1772), will complement the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, accusing the Society of following the Aristotelian model. This was linked to a qualitative physics and a hierarchical notion of space, which prevented the mathematization of reality or the reduction of matter to extension, so as to make nature intelligible, and in a very Cartesian manner, to the light of algebraic models, despite the primacy of Newton’s experimental mathematics amongst the Portuguese Enlightenment.

The second claim to which we referred above was complementary to this historical condemnation of the Society of Jesus: the spiritualisation of the Church’s action, affirming the primacy and authority of the State in all of the Church’s temporal dimension, delimiting with advantage to the State the sphere of the kings’ temporal power before the Pope’s spiritual power of the Pope, denying the plenitude in the temporal and in the spiritual of papal power, destroying not only the doctrinal foundations of theocracy (which the Jesuits did not defend) and also above all the thesis of the pope’s indirect power over temporal affairs directed at the eminence of the spiritual end, which gave it so much scope for intervention in matters that the theoreticians of Pombaline regalism considered to belong within the state sphere.

In this second case, as we have seen, the *Dedução cronológica*, especially in its Second Part, turned with more attention to the question of book censorship and the expurgatory indices, forbidding the Church a lengthy practice - which they intended to demonstrate also in this documentary appendix - of usurpation in the exercise of these attributions, both as regards prohibitions and the resulting punishments and penalties, leaving it only with the supervision of books that dealt with matters of the dogma and the punitive sword of excommunication, passing on to the sphere of the State the police of doctrines.

Censorship was now a royal matter, as reflected in the creation of the *Real Mesa Censória*,<sup>85</sup> by charter of April 5, 1768, a year after the publication of the first two volumes of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* and in the same year as the publication of this third volume.

---

<sup>84</sup> Cf. Manuel Lopes de Almeida, *Documentos da reforma pombalina*, Coimbra, Por Ordem da Universidade de Coimbra, 1937, p. 118.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. Rui Tavares, *O censor iluminado*, Lisbon, Tinta da China, 2018; Maria Adelaide Salvador Marques, *A Real Mesa Censória e a cultura nacional*, Coimbra, Imprensa Coimbra Editora, 1963.

This also explains why, at the same time, the Pombaline Enlightenment transformed education into a state issue by creating the regal classes under the draft of the 28 June 1759 charter, with decisive extension in the reform of the University of Coimbra in 1772, which we referred to above.

As a long and well-nourished documentary appendix, the volume regarding the *Coleção das Provas* is of undeniable importance, not only for the way in which such documentation is laid down in the forerunner bed of the Enlightenment's worldview and reforming project, but also for its own intrinsic value. It compiles letters, charters, edicts, opinions, provisions, court documents, certificates, papal bulls, wills, royal decrees, organized in such a way as to document and prove, "with evidence and certainty", the assertions and theses expounded in the two previous volumes.

Thus, this documentation has a double value. First, from a court-historical point of view, given the way it is used and integrated into a historically dated system of interpretation. Second, from a knowledge-historical point of view, for its intrinsic documental value for doing historical research.

In this documentation's vast universe, and considering the merely introductory dimension of the text now being presented, we will focus our analysis on three key documents/evidence of this anti-Jesuitical testimony: the *Relação abreviada*, the inquisitorial process of Father António Vieira and the letter of Father Nuno da Cunha, which possesses an eminent political and doctrinal interest.

#### **4.2. Jesuit Reductions in Paraguay and the relevance of the *Relação abreviada***

This relevant document, abridged with the title *Relação abreviada da república que os religiosos jesuítas de Portugal e Espanha estabeleceram nos domínios ultramarinos das duas monarquias*, was published anonymously in 1757, being with high probability its author the Marquis of Pombal himself. It is a text that deserves our special attention since it refers to a fundamental episode in the formation of Brazil and to a remarkable episode on the genesis of the persecution against the Society of Jesus by the Marquis of Pombal: the difficulties raised by the Society of Jesus in the implementation of the Treaty of Madrid, signed between Portugal and Spain in 1750, and to which Brazil owes today a considerable part of its territory both to the south, in Rio Grande, and to the north in Amazonia.

This treaty was the result of complex negotiations between the two crowns to delimit the Brazilian frontier to the south and to the north, leading it to its current configuration, and had on the Lusitanian side a strong and far-sighted intervention by Alexandre de Gusmão.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> See Jaime Cortesão, *Alexandre de Gusmão e o Tratado de Madrid*, Lisbon, Livros Horizonte, 1984.

Along with D. João V's secretary, two outstanding and decisive figures in this Treaty's implementation must be highlighted. To the south, Gomes Freire de Andrade, who commanded the Portuguese troops in the Guaranitic wars, and whose accounts are compiled in this *Relação abreviada*. To the north, the Governor and Captain General of the Grão Pará and Maranhão Captaincies, Francisco Xavier de Mendonça Furtado.

However, in these two regions there was a strong, historically sedimented implantation of the Society of Jesus. In Maranhão and Grão Pará through the administration of the Indians in villages, for which they obtained numerous concessions from the crown over the years, including temporal power over the villages, negotiated by Father António Vieira and claimed by him in his *Sermão da Epifania* (1662). In the far South, in the basins of the rivers Uruguay and Paraná, through the *reduções*, *povos* or *missões* that the Jesuits had been establishing for a century and a half and which Pombal, with some reason, accused of being a State within the State, "a powerful Republic" that enjoyed a strong political-administrative, cultural and economic autonomy.

In fact, throughout a century and a half (1609-1767), the Jesuits set up thirty reductions, which became known as the Thirty Mission Settlements, located in the basins of the Uruguay and Paraná rivers, which they administered in the form of a spontaneous theocracy, where over one hundred thousand Guarani lived, giving them a political, religious, economic and even military organisation.

The initial aim was to force the Guarani to work on the *encomiendas* of the Spanish colonists, who produced large quantities of yerba mate under an intensive labour regime, while resisting the onslaughts of the *bandeirantes* who, on the Portuguese side, attacked the indigenous villages, causing rapine and illegal slavery.

Without in any way denying the legitimacy of the *encomiendas* implemented by the colonial legislation of the Spanish crown in America, they sought not only theoretical foundations, but above all the possible practice of removing the Guarani from their personal service to the *encomenderos*.

The solution was the progressive assembly of the various villages, tribes and peoples into larger communities, defining autonomous spaces, for which they claimed and achieved increasing autonomy, upon payment of pecuniary tribute to the Spanish colonial authorities based in Buenos Aires. They thus defined a separate territoriality, including ethnically speaking, to the extent that the prolonged stay of non-Indians was forbidden. In this regard, the eminent professor Bartomeu Mélia SJ, considering the frequent accusation that they were States within the State, wrote that such Reductions were rather a State where there was no State, to the extent that "era el Estado colonial el que estaba posibilitando sociedades sin Estado".<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> Bartomeu Melià, "Las reducciones jesuíticas de guaraníes en el marco de la Escuela Ibérica de la Paz", in Heriberto Campos y Pablo Bielsa (ed.), *Lo temporal y lo eterno. La presencia de los Jesuítas en el Paraguay*,

This goal of removing the Guarani from the work at the *encomiendas* was well characterised in the assembly of the mate herb workers held in 1630 in Puerto del Salto del Guayrá, a significant milestone in the Jesuit missionaries' struggle against the personal service of the Indians and the denunciation of the *encomenderos'* abuses. This meeting, *junta* or assembly was organised by the Ignatians in order to make the Indians aware of their legal rights in the context of the colony, since the Spanish crown had ordered them to serve the *encomenderos* for two months only and not for years without end, as was common practice. The assembly's conclusions, written in Guarani and later translated into Spanish and Portuguese, are currently at the National Library of Rio de Janeiro, under the suggestive title: "Respuesta que dieron los indios a las reales Providencias en las que se manda no sirvan los indios de las Reducciones más que dos meses como S.M. lo manda y no sean llevados a Mbaracayú en tiempo enfermo".

In said text there is a curious emphasis on statelessness, that is to say, on the fact that the Spanish colonists did not comply with the legislation of their own crown. To this end, the legal rights of the Indians were enunciated, and it was often concluded: "pero los españoles no hacían caso", with dramatic reference to the *hierba mate* fields of Mbaracayú were "all llenos de los huesos de nuestra gente".<sup>88</sup>

In the text's conclusion, signed by numerous Jesuits that were present, such as Antonio Ruiz de Montoya and José Cataldi, one can read the Indians' request that the Jesuits be messengers of their claims to the King of Spain, in almost the same terms as Las Casas had once been in the controversy of Valladolid in 1550-1551: "Es por eso por lo que requeremos que vosotros mismos hagáis escuchar nuestras palabras al Rey".

The Jesuits were necessarily part of the Spanish empire's missionary project, but they opposed as far as possible a political-economic system which in the short term would end with the extinction of the indigenous peoples, turning the greater purpose of evangelisation unviable.

Another relevant milestone in the path of consolidation of the reductions or settlements were the petitions of the Jesuit Antonio Ruiz de Motoya during his stay in Madrid, and available in memorials of 1637-1638, claiming permission from the King of Spain to arm the Indians against their own vassals in distant America, given the constant armed onslaughts of the *encomenderos*, to which the incursions from the Portuguese side were added. This being the initial purpose, the result was the constitution of a true Guarani-Jesuitical army or militia,<sup>89</sup> a permanent military body that reconciled those peoples' war-

---

Asunción-Paraguay, Editorial Arandurã, 2015, p. 80.

<sup>88</sup> *Apud* Bartomeu Melià, "La Reducción según los guaraníes: dichos y escritos", in Regina Gadelha (ed.), *Missões guarani: impacto na sociedade contemporânea*, São Paulo, EDUC, 1999, p. 57.

<sup>89</sup> Mercedes Avellaneda, "El ejército jesuíta-guaraní en la Revolución de los Comuneros", in Herib Campos y Pablo Bielsa (ed.), *Lo temporal y lo eterno. La presencia de los Jesuítas en el Paraguay*, *op. cit.*, pp. 83-101

rior traditions with some Jesuits' military wisdom, both in the field of handling firearms and military architecture and combat tactics that they later put into practice against the Portuguese and Spanish armies, already at the time of Pombal. This explains the *Relação abreviada's* texts in which the commander of the Portuguese army, General Gomes Freire de Andrade, concluded that, in view of the difficulties of the war, it was very likely that instead of teaching Christian doctrine the Jesuits were dedicated to teaching combat strategies and military architecture.

The Jesuit missionaries saw in their mission project the creation of communities that sought, at least theoretically, a difficult balance between possible freedom and a project of evangelisation, given the fact that, at that time, to be christianised was for Europeans an indisputable advantage. This evangelizing project deserved not only Voltaire's criticism in *Candide*, but also frequently from the Indians themselves, as it happened with the penetrating statement of the Indian Potyrava when he incited the cacique Ñesú, moral author of the death of four Ignatian missionaries in the region of the Reductions, not to let himself be "reduced" by the missionaries of Saint Ignatius:

Pues, por qué consientes que nuestro ejemplo sujete a nuestros indios y lo que es peor a nuestros sucesores, a este dissimulado cautiverio de Reducciones de que nos desobligó la naturaleza.<sup>90</sup>

An evangelisation project, possible freedom, utopia achieved in idyllic Paraguay, concealed captivity, such were the horizons in which this singular experience could be exercised or was exercised. It merited Pombal's analysis in the *Relação abreviada* and also in the epic poem *Uruguai* (1769), by the Luso-Brazilian poet and writer Basílio da Gama, which, due to the inherent streaks of Indianism, has been considered one of the milestones of Brazilian identity.

After the 18th century, socialisms and communisms of various kinds were attracted by this reality of a model of socio-political organisation that banned money, limited private property in favour of community property, promoted an egalitarian society, moderate in its desires, in solidarity and with relative progress, also expressed in architecture, urbanism, education, statuary and music, and whose ruins constitute today a World Heritage Site, declared by Unesco, and whose recovery and restoration is still in charge of Mercosur Cultural.

For many authors of the 18th and 19th centuries, the Mission Settlements functioned as a distant image of a world lost by the civilised man of European society, driven by possessive and materialistic individualism. Therefore, these echoes of a Christian society alien to "false modernity" exerted an attraction that is difficult to overstate. However, the

---

<sup>90</sup> José María Blanco, *Historia documentada de la vida y gloriosa muerte de los padres mártires del Caaró e Yjuhí*, Buenos Aires, Ed. Sebastián de Amorrortu, 1929, p. 525.



social life in the Jesuit reductions, as well as their political and economic administration, as Bartomeu Melià explains, resulted more from the circumstantial convenience of practical decisions than from doctrinal options.<sup>91</sup>

Between 1609 and 1767 the missions in Paraguay, referred to by Pombal, recently portrayed by cinema in a well-known work,<sup>92</sup> were built in a context of inculturation, based on the confluence of evangelical ideals and the customs of the Guarani people, for whom selling and trading for money were acts of vengeance and so they saw us, the West, as a people of merciless avengers.

To frame this reality in evangelical principles, following perhaps Saint Paul's example when he wrote that he made himself "a slave to everyone, to win as many as possible" (1 Corinthians 9:19), surely implied a permanent search for solutions that would shelter under Christ's mantle, the immense labyrinth of peoples, even refusing the obligation to preach in the Castilian language and giving clear primacy to indigenous languages, in peoples whose spirituality was essentially concentrated in the word and not in the image, as was the case with European Baroque culture.

In the first place, these reductions began by translating urban solutions and geographic frameworks worthy of note, with evident attention to the conditions of environmental sustainability of the regions in which they were established, by means of a careful cartographic work, all the more so as they actively sought regions far from the colonial *encomiendas*. It would not have been difficult to find this Ignatian concern with the marked indigenous concern for the preservation of nature, which they did not conceive of as an external space, insofar as they considered themselves to be nature's nerve centre. Hence the reason why the Ignatians referred to them as the "jungle theologians", the name by which the Guarani peoples became known.

Furthermore, the urban solutions found reflected an egalitarian society without exclusion, a cosmos organised according to community principles. They embodied a urbanism that reconciled the European and Baroque model of the central square, in which the temple, the Jesuit college-residence (only two per reduction) and the cemetery were built, with a uniform distribution of houses in streets of equal width, filling in the other three sides of a square.

As it would be expected, those people's habits of common living forced the missionaries to teach them how to build small monogamous dwellings, built together by the community and distributed to each "family". There were no relevant distinctions between the houses of the chiefs (located on the lateral limits of the central square) and those of the members of their party.

---

<sup>91</sup> Bartomeu Melià, "Introdução à obra de Joseph Manuel Peramás", in *Platon y los guaraníes*, Asunción, Centro de Estudios Paraguayos Antonio Guasch, 2004, p. 12.

<sup>92</sup> We are referring to the film *The Mission*, directed by Roland Joffé, 1986.

They added a house for visitors from outside the community, whose stay could not exceed three days, as well as a house for the wives of indigenous people away on distant business. In essence, the search for a perfect cosmos, including through the concern for demographic balance, setting the ideal number of inhabitants at 3,500.

No less interesting was the question of land ownership in a society in which agriculture and cattle breeding occupied a central role. A mixed regime of communal and private property prevailed, with clear primacy of the former, resulting in the inexistence of beggars or outcasts, insofar as those who could not work were supported by public goods and those who could, but refused, were expelled from the community.

In addition to small parcels of land for individual work and private use, all the inhabitants worked in communal fields, including the authorities and the mayor, extracting a surplus to pay taxes to the king or for public utility works and to buy the necessary utensils in nearby towns. In these reductions there was no money, no internal commerce and no foreign peddlers.

The concern with education was also one of the relevant aspects of this historical experience. Those considered to be more capable were called to it, on the basis of writing, reading and arithmetic. Relevantly, some of these communities had libraries that were more important than those in some of the colonial cities of the time.

Anyone visiting these reductions's ruins today can easily perceive the presence of a heritage of this cultural dimension expressed above all in music. In fact, taking advantage of the strong musical side of the indigenous cultures, numerous orchestras and workshops for the production of instruments were set up, which the existing museums are trying to preserve with the support of Unesco and Mercosur Cultural.

The administration of public authority was exercised by the two resident Ignatian priests, in theocratic fashion, more by lived pragmatism than by doctrinal affiliation, since the Jesuit tradition was not one of theocracy. The intermediate public offices, established by the Laws of the Indies of the Spanish Empire, were exercised by the Indians, chosen annually by the group of those who had exercised them the previous year, but with the prior consent of the two parish priests, who were also responsible for the administration of justice and, obviously, for the ceremonies of religious worship.

In 1756, the Portuguese and Spanish armies united to crush the rebellion in these Reductions against the application of two articles of the Madrid Treaty (articles 6 and 9), which determined that seven of the Thirty Mission Settlements previously on the Spanish side would remain on the Portuguese side of the new border.

The Jesuits offered great resistance to these articles in the Treaty, inciting the Guarani to armed resistance, under the direct command of the Ignatian missionaries, applying war tactics that so surprised General Gomes Freire de Andrade and led Pombal to accuse

the Ignatians of being military engineers but wearing a habit, during the Guaranitic war (1750-1756).

But beyond the Jesuits, who are here the main object of the accusation in this *Relação abreviada*, it is also important to know what the position of the Guarani Indians really was, not as infantilized or subordinated subjects, but as a group endowed with identity and will. In fact, the experience of the reductions allowed processes of inculturation that somehow preserved ways of life and cultural practices, forms of use and possession of the land, preservation of the native language, in essence, socio-cultural and socio-economic differences in relation to colonial societies that they might feel threatened. Therefore, it is difficult, from the point of view of historical causality, to interpret this armed resistance as a mere instrumentalization of peoples acculturated by the Jesuit missionaries. The reality is surely much more complex, for the Indians who fought under the command of the parish priests cannot be considered mere blank sheets of paper on which there would be nothing more to write at will.

In fact, the Articles of the Madrid Treaty concerned were mainly Articles 6 and 9.

According to Article 6, Spain ceded to Portugal all land occupied “on the northern bank of the Negro River from its mouth and bank” and “the eastern hinterland of the Uruguay River, as well as the bank and eastern hinterland of the Pepiri River”, a tributary of the Uruguay River.

Article 9 stipulated that the lands ceded by the King of Spain “would be handed over with all the factories, Indians and cattle, without taking away more than the movable goods belonging to the missionaries, leaving the Indians free to stay or leave with their movable goods and to sell their stable ones”.

It is true that the Treaty did not determine the destruction of the settlements or reductions that were passed to the Portuguese side, but it would not be difficult to foresee that, in the context of an Absolute State and with the iron hand of the Marquis of Pombal, factual powers such as those would not be tolerated and experiences so different from those that were dominant in colonial society would not be accepted. The freedom to leave those lands that were already their habitat and an integral part of a dynamic tradition, by selling them, was a totally alien possibility to their cultures, insofar as selling anything was in itself absurd.

It would therefore not be difficult to understand the strength of the resistance and the war that Pombal speaks of in the *Relação abreviada*.

Further north, in distant Amazonia, although not for the same reasons, but perhaps out of solidarity with their confreres in the South, the Jesuits resisted collaborating with the Demarcation Commission, withdrawing with the Indians without whom the said Commission’s work could not be carried out, resulting in an effective boycott denounced by

Mendonça Furtado in his letters to the Marquis of Pombal, as can be read in the *Relação abreviada*.

The historical situation in which the Jesuits thus found themselves involved was one of the powerful arguments used by Pombal for the expulsion of the Ignatians from Portugal and its dominions and for the increasing affirmation of the Marquis and King José's regalist policies.

#### **4.3. The symbolic value of Father António Vieira's inquisitorial condemnation**

Other documents of the greatest relevance in this third volume of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, to which we believe special reference should be made, are those related to the life and work of Father António Vieira, insofar as they allow us to understand the strength of the head-on clash between worldviews and political doctrines, in two distinct periods of Portuguese culture: that of the millenarian messianism of the Six Hundreds, marked by the metaphors of the opacity, and the labyrinthine complexity of the world, and that of the rationalism of the Enlightenment, marked by sensism, mathematism and experimentalism, where the metaphors of light and transparency pontificated.

In the 18th century, Galileo, Bacon, Descartes, Gassendi and, above all, Newton and Locke, despite the doctrinal differences that separated them, were considered the main giants in modern Europe from which the Jesuits had separated Portugal.

Among the fundamental topics of this divorce, then considered tragic, was not only scholastic Aristotelianism but also a certain sense of *extremosidade*, marked by the unheard and by expectation, of which the miracle, or the particular intervention of Providence in the ordinary course of nature and history, was one of the most relevant manifestations, as happened in Vieira's case with the fierce and structuring defence of the miracle of Ourique in the historical destiny of Portugal, based also on the interpretation of ancient and modern prophetic texts, a pronounced personal liberty.

In fact, in the case of 16th-century Portugal, and particularly in António Vieira, the loss of independence, together with the intensity of the Baroque imaginary, eventually converged in a very active dynamic of the marvellous Christian, in which patriotic aims crossed paths with a particularly receptive anthropological mesh, offering shelter to millenarianism and prophecy. It also corresponded to one of Isaac Newton's faces, perhaps the most unknown and silenced, himself an assiduous reader of Old Testament prophetic texts, showing us that, after all, in the minds of some of its most distinguished protagonists, the origin of modern science was not always the one that is usually exposed.

On the other hand, in 1746, Luís António Verney, one of the authors who would decisively set the tone for the new epistemological attitude that triumphed during Pombalism, was the first to deny the veracity of the Ourique miracle, long before Alexandre

Herculano in his decisive booklet *Eu e o clero* (1850), considering it a story “to amuse boys” and remarking that these and other stories referred to by António Vieira were kept by “critics” in the same cupboards where “phoenix feathers” used to be kept.<sup>93</sup> Later, in *De re metaphysica*, Verney would also point out that in his time the Sacred Congregation of Rites submitted reports of possible miracles to the “examination of physicists,” “with the result that in the face of such a large number of miracles almost all, and sometimes even all, of them are rejected.”<sup>94</sup>

In the Enlightenment mind of the bearded friar, first lay the knowledge of the laws of physics, in order to be able to separate what was natural from what could be admitted as supernatural with scientific criteria. Verney’s attitude, at the dawn of the Enlightenment in Portugal, as he states in the same *Metaphysica*, was that: “we must carefully judge about unusual things, so that we do not take things that are not as miracles”.<sup>95</sup> In his *Carta sobre a física do Verdadeiro método de estudar*, he reveals a mind clearly influenced by the primacy of natural philosophy, which made him consider that (modern) physics was the most relevant part of philosophy.

The same attitude continued in Verney’s denial of the Lusitanian singularities, expressed in supposed or imagined providential designs that would make us, as Vieira put it, the “light of the world”.

For Enlightenment authors like Verney, as for the theoreticians who later collaborated with Pombal, seeking and cultivating the singularities of their country in the terms in which Vieira and other authors of the 16th century did, supported by designs from beyond, with Lusocentric purposes, was a historical loss proportional to the contempt for the culture in the great nations of Europe, and especially their scientific academies. Hence, for example, the keenness with which António Sérgio would later emphasise the figure of the *estrangeirados*, with Verney at the head, in the framework of his cultural neo-luminism.

Verney typified the radical change in the epistemological attitude, in line with Enlightenment’s rationalism, just as the Portuguese diplomat Luís da Cunha did a year later in 1747 in his *Testamento político*, showing that the analysis of the causes of the Portuguese victory in the Peninsular war that followed the Restoration could not neglect the Reason of State of European powers, as well as the pressure suffered by the Spanish crown with the war in Catalonia. In this regard, and also taking note of the change in the point of

---

<sup>93</sup> José Eduardo Franco e Carlos Fiolhais (dir.), *Obras Pioneiras da Cultura Portuguesa – Primeiro Tratado Pedagógico*, vol. 27, Luís António Verney, *Verdadeiro método de estudar* (coord. Adelino Cardoso), Lisbon, Círculo de Leitores, 2018, p. 180.

<sup>94</sup> Luís António Verney, *De re metaphysica ad usum lusitanorum adolescentium*, liv. IV, cap. XIII, Roma, Typographia Generosi Salomoni, 1753.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibidem*.

view, he concludes with some irony by stating that “God is not always in the mood to perform miracles; nor were they real ones, but rather very natural”,<sup>96</sup> perhaps referring to the accounts of the miracle of Ourique and especially the supposed oath of King Dom Afonso Henriques, which was very important to him. Afonso Henriques, very dear to António Vieira, according to which God had promised a decay of the Portuguese monarchy and its subsequent restoration in times that would coincide with the accession of the Duke of Bragança, João IV, to the throne of Portugal.

The reference we make to these two major authors of the Portuguese Illustration, even preceding the rise of the Marquis of Pombal, will perhaps be enough to point out the incompatibility between Father António Vieira’s prophetic messianism and the model of rationality now prevailing, although the messianic aspect has not been suppressed, since, messianism being the belief in the redemption of humanity, it is difficult to deny that this mission was now attributed to a very vague concept of reason, through its pronounced mythical contagion.

This was perhaps one of the reasons why in this volume of the *Coleção das Provas* António Vieira is particularly targeted, including part of his inquisitorial process, namely the condemnatory sentence passed by the judges of the Holy Office.

In fact, to the same extent that it opposed Enlightenment rationalism, Vieira’s prophetic messianism clashed with Catholic theology of a scholastic bent, in its canonical version, which is why the *Dedução* would not fail to take advantage of its condemnation. The real demolition of the figure of António Vieira was, therefore, one of the active strands of the anti-Jesuitical sign of Pombalism.

In order to give the reader a more precise idea of what was at stake, it is necessary to refer to Vieira’s project as he originally conceived it, showing how it was incompatible with both later Pombalism and the inquisition of his time.

In fact, throughout the thirty volumes of his work,<sup>97</sup> we see how early on Vieira was imbued with a missionary spirit that gave him the opportunity to think of a grandiose project and, starting from modern Europe, fragmented in the struggle of state egoisms, consecrated in Westphalia (1648), he idealized a universal empire that was not the result of the search for worldly greatness or glory, but the affirmation of the substantial unity of men - all men: Indians, Blacks, Jews, Chinese and Japanese... and the spiritual and temporal expression of a communion in Christ, the head of the human race, in its diversity and greatness.

---

<sup>96</sup> D. Luís da Cunha, *Testamento político ou Carta de conselhos ao Senhor D. José sendo Príncipe* [1747] (ed. Abílio Diniz Silva), Lisbon, BNP, 2013, p. 96.

<sup>97</sup> Cf. José Eduardo Franco e Pedro Calafate (dir.), *Obra completa Padre António Vieira*, Lisbon, Círculo de Leitores, 2013-2016, 30 vols.

Therefore, as he said of the Portuguese, he “exceeded” and “let himself go”, he overcame the canons of geometric reason and “raised himself above himself”, to live the dream and the madness that characterised, in his view, the heroes and the saints.

The connecting thread in his thought resides, in my opinion, in the Pauline thesis (Rm 5:20) that man has gained more through the sacrifice and blood of Christ than he has lost through Adam’s sin, and that this thesis is also marked by Christ’s affirmation: “I have come that they may have life, and have it to the full” (Jn 10:10).

But as this abundance of life, which he interpreted in the sense of the affirmation of universal peace, founded on justice under the sign of Christianity, had not yet taken place, he projected it in eschatological terms towards the future, manifested in such exhortations of joy, that the blessed in heaven would be “overwhelmed with wonder and amazement, seeing a perfect portrait of heaven on earth”<sup>98</sup>.

We must bear in mind that, at the time of Vieira, exactly the opposite was true.

In the 17th century, Thomas Hobbes had destroyed the idea of humanity as the regulating principle of the international community, and in the previous century Machiavelli had excluded the idea of international order in his considerations on the nature of the prince’s power. Hence, nations were progressively conceived as organisms separated by nature, guided exclusively by the instinct of self-preservation. Hence also a continent always at war, projected more and more beyond the borders of Europe in the struggle for hegemonies.

Therefore, Vieira’s project went against the grain of history. He knew that the world of his time was effectively Machiavellian and Hobbesian. He warned Dom João IV that in the peace negotiations in which the king involved him the European powers would only respect the treaties they signed with Portugal as long as it was convenient for them, and that to expect otherwise would be to deny experience, to want to amend the world and to hope for the impossible. But even so, he wanted to amend the world, deny experience and hope for something that did not seem impossible: a regulating principle of international order capable of guaranteeing universal peace.

What stood out in this project, against the predictability of the Pombalist model of enlightened rationality, was admiration, grandeur, amazement, in a word: the *extremosidade*, so cultivated by the thinkers of 16th century Baroque, both in Portugal and in Spain, writing, in their defence before the judges of the Inquisition, that “as our eyes are so small, the world and its conversion seem to us a very great thing, and when we hear ‘all the peoples, all the peoples’ our timid incredulity is astounded”<sup>99</sup>.

---

<sup>98</sup> José Eduardo Franco e Pedro Calafate (dir.), *Obra completa Padre António Vieira, op. cit.*, t. III, vol. I, *História do Futuro* (coord. Pedro Calafate), 2014, p. 563.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibidem*, t. III, vol. II, *Defesa perante o Tribunal do Santo Ofício* (coord. Paulo Borges), p. 407.

Also in *A Chave dos profetas*, his most dense and complex work, he will not tire of underlining that the peace spoken of by the prophets “will be on earth and not [only] in heaven”, taking care to specify that he does not speak of the earth “in a metaphorical sense, but of the true and proper earth”, and, so that there would be no doubt, he repeats and insists several times that “the breadth of the peace that is promised is so great that it extends to the entire earth: entire, I repeat, not by synecdoche or in any other figurative sense, as in other passages of the Scriptures, but full and genuine, that is, to the whole earth”.<sup>100</sup>

In this sense, Father António Vieira is part of the Baroque millenarian currents. The millennium to which Vieira referred, inspired by chapter 20 of Saint John’s Apocalypse, translated the consummation of Christ’s Kingdom on Earth. That is why he soon stressed, against the Inquisitors, that this kingdom of peace and happiness would not only be valid from the perspective of each man’s inner life. The inner peace of each one with himself was not sufficient for such a plan, since it was noted that the promulgation of the Law of Christ had not yet extinguished wars and vendettas, as well as hatreds, envies and detractions that have reached a more intense dimension among the moderns than among the ancients.

The peace of which Vieira spoke therefore also referred to peace in neighbour to neighbour relations, of kingdom to kingdom and of all kingdoms to the longed-for universal empire, which was not an empire of domination but a criterion of regulation endowed with authority and jurisdiction to guarantee its effectiveness, or as he put it, to guarantee brotherhood among men.

So the Kingdom of Christ consummated on Earth had not only a spiritual dimension, translated into a new state of greater perfection of the Church of Christ, which was a spiritual republic, but also a temporal aspect, relating to the life of men in society, expressed in an empire that he dreamed of, extending to the rest of the world, which he idealised as having a Portuguese king at its head and the city of Lisbon as its capital, in the same terms as Campanella projected it for Spain and Rusticano for France.

The Portuguese head of that empire was based not only on the miracle of Ourique, where God announced to the still Infante D. Henrique that he wanted to build a Christian Empire through him and his descendants, but also on a peculiar interpretation of prophetic texts, especially those of Daniel and Isaiah, not without warning us that “everything in the divine Scriptures is divine, everything is rare, everything is marvellous”,<sup>101</sup> going against inquisitorially protected canonical models in his time and models of rationality prevailing in the century of the Enlightenment.

---

<sup>100</sup> Cf. Pedro Calafate, “Introdução”, in José Eduardo Franco e Pedro Calafate (dir.), *Obras completas Padre António Vieira*, op. cit., t. III, vol. V, *A chave dos profetas*, p. 60.

<sup>101</sup> José Eduardo Franco e Pedro Calafate (dir.), *Obras completas Padre António Vieira*, op. cit., t. III, vol. I, *História do Futuro* (coord. Pedro Calafate), 2014, p. 508.



It was therefore the exegesis of prophetic texts, both ancient and modern, that made his life a troubled path in an immense sea of things that he himself qualified, much to the taste of the 17th century Baroque, as “prodigious, great and full of mysteries”,<sup>102</sup>, idealising a great empire that was the political condition for peace among men, based on the cardinal virtue of justice, in such a way as to also insistently stress Portugal’s hopes and its special mission in the world.

Here began his clash with the Inquisition with which he was confronted during the sixties of the 17th century, during which he was arrested and condemned to “active and passive deprivation of voice”.

The most relevant aspects in this confrontation, as can be concluded from the reading of the sentence pronounced against Vieira in this volume of the *Coleção das Provas* resided in the first place in his claim to be able to interpret the biblical prophecies about the universal empire and the end of times - with those of the prophet Daniel foremost in mind - in a way different from the ancient interpreters, based on an interpretative freedom that added novelty to what had already been said and that made him enter the ranks of the moderns, since he always insisted on underlining the dynamism of experience, and also of the profane sciences, developed in the course of historical time, as a condition for a correct interpretation of the prophetic narratives.

Secondly, as we have already written, Father Vieira refused to accept the rigid circumscription of prophecy to the canonical prophets, opening prophetic inspiration profusely, while at the same time weakening the Church’s authority in the exclusive establishment of its criteria of veracity and legitimation, for Vieira defended the possibility of proving the veracity of prophecy also on the basis of “natural speech”, verifying and proving the success of the things prophesied, since for him, as “The wind blows where it wishes” (Jn 3:8), the gift of prophecy did not require a vocation to holiness. For that reason, if what the humble 16th century Portuguese shoemaker known as Bandarra predicted in his *Trovas* were to come true in time, then he would be a true prophet. This was followed by his refusal to accept, as we said above, that the millennium was only inherent in the individual souls of believers or that, consequently, the millennium itself had already begun and ended with the coming of Christ and was thus identified with the Church’s present state.

Vieira did not deny it at all but stressed against the inquisitors the hope in stages of time and history that would introduce marked changes and novelties, in the terms of the awe and amazement referred to above. That is to say, against the inquisitors Vieira refused to disbelieve in a long and extended future of justice and peace among men, characterised by happiness on Earth, understood on the plane of pronounced moral stoicism, thus depriving man of future history. The prophet Daniel had already referred to this future history

---

<sup>102</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 439.

in his interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, prophesying a last empire free from the imperfections of the previous ones.

In any case, the empire mentioned by Daniel in the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream should not be understood, according to the inquisitors, as the Fifth Empire mentioned by Vieira, because the last of the empires, in the traditional sense of the term, was the Roman Empire, the fourth empire, and the fifth empire would be that of the Antichrist, already near the end of the world and of very short duration, when the Roman empire would end.

Thus, for the Inquisitors, the universal evangelisation and the quasi-extirpation of sinners would not be spread over the thousand years about which Vieira spoke, since, for the Holy Office, the evangelisation of all men would only be completed towards the end of the world, not by the Portuguese and Spanish preachers, as Vieira wished, but by the prophets Elias and Henoch, after the death of the Antichrist, and its duration would also be brief and short.

For this same reason the existence of a long period of time in which the Devil would remain imprisoned without the possibility of tempting men so much, a condition of justice and peace, and in which the Grace of Christ would intensify, was denied by the inquisitors and affirmed by the Jesuit, for whom it was not credible that the immense difficulty felt by the Portuguese (and by himself) in the evangelisation of the people should end in a short period of peace and communion in Christ. For him, the immense scale of the effort required proportional validity over time.

On the other hand, Vieira did not accept the thesis, imposed by the inquisitors of the Holy Office, that Christ as man only reigned spiritually in the world and not temporally, and neither did he accept the thesis that, as man, he did not receive temporal power from the Father and, consequently, that he did not and will not reign temporally in the world.

The judges of the Holy Office also understood that the hope for a future kingdom of Christ, with direct temporal power, favoured Judaizing theses, insofar as it coincided with Jewish hopes for a liberating messiah, with adjacent temporal felicities, leading the inquisitors to skilfully manoeuvre the charge of Judaism, favoured by the contacts he had had with the Jews of Amsterdam in his diplomatic missions.

In the background, the inquisitors also maintained that the resurrection of John IV the King of Portugal, deceased in 1656, announced by Vieira in a letter written in Amazonia in 1569, at the end of the city of Belem do Pará, would be an unacceptable multiplication of miracles, and that the election of Portugal as the temporal head of the universal empire, or Fifth Empire, of which Father António Vieira spoke, had no support in biblical texts and should therefore be rejected.

These were the topics that led to Vieira's confrontation with the Inquisition, especially in the sixties of that century, and which led to his condemnation in the document so

pleasantly reproduced here, in order to highlight the perversity of Jesuit Antonio Vieira, not only as an enemy of the Church but also of public good and sanity.

#### **4.4. On Father Nuno da Cunha's "Paper": the right of resistance and the Pope's indirect power over temporal affairs.**

We now come to another document/evidence which seems to us very relevant from the point of view of the political doctrines in confrontation throughout the whole of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*. It is the "*Papel que o jesuíta Nuno da Cunha apresentou nas Cortes à unta do Estado da Nobreza sobre o ponto de Privar do Título de Rei ao senhor Rey Dom Afonso VI deposto do reyno*" (Paper that the Jesuit Nuno da Cunha presented at the Cortes to the State Council of the Nobility on the point of depriving the deposed King Dom Afonso VI of the title of King) (Evidence number L).

As the title indicates, this doctrinal stance taken by the Jesuit Nuno da Cunha was part of the context of vicissitudes accompanying the "deposition" of King Afonso VI, who was considered unfit for the exercise of the royal office and was replaced by Pedro, who remained regent until the death of the deposed king, when he assumed the throne under the name of Pedro II.

This document is very interesting, since what was at stake was one of the fundamental topics of Pombal's dispute with the Society of Jesus: whether a kingdom in Courts could deprive a king of his kingdom for being considered unfit and incapable of governing for the common good, depriving him not only of the administration and government but also of the title of king, in order to be able to hand it over to his immediate successor.

Complementarily, this "Paper" also addresses a question that was practically "sacred" for Pombalism: whether in Christian kingdoms the Pope held not necessarily temporal power over Christian states, but power over the temporal things that are under the administration and supreme power of Christian princes.

Let us look at each of these topics.

First the question we have already dealt with in the study concerning Part Two of the *Dedução*: the problem of the right of resistance and the limits to the sovereignty of the Prince.

In fact, it was an outright Jesuit doctrine that both the power of the pope and the power of the king could and should be qualified as *supreme*, each in its *own order*, which is different from qualifying them as *absolute*. In Jesuit discourse, the distinction between *supreme in its order and absolute* was strategic and fraught with consequences, hence the heavy fire it drew from Pombaline doctrinaires, particularly in this work.

The tradition of political philosophy cultivated by many Jesuit masters, with Francisco Suárez at its head, was that the sovereignty of states was considered relative, as it was limited by natural law and the law of nations, that is, by an objective order of values, tacitly or explicitly expressed in the contract granting power to the prince by the community of men.

On the other hand, Francisco Suárez also stressed that “that power which is called supreme in its order or matter is not subject to any other”.<sup>103</sup> To say that the state power is “supreme in its order or matter” means, in Suárez, to see it in relation to the spiritual power of the Pope. That is to say: in those matters which directly and mainly concerned the temporal end, the power of the Christian state was supreme before the pope. But the Christian sovereign recognized an authority on Earth to which he submitted in matters of the spiritual realm, the Jesuit adding that the Pope, having no temporal power, had nevertheless power over temporal things, when a spiritual end was directly and principally concerned. This indirect power, it must be emphasized, was not temporal power, because it derived from the eminence of man’s spiritual end and was therefore constitutive of the Pope’s spiritual power. As regards the communities and states of unbaptized peoples or those who occupied territories which never belonged to Christians, St. Paul’ applied: “For what have I to do with judging outsiders?” (1 Cor 5:12) as if to emphasize that the Church had no power among the gentiles and among other peoples and men who were not baptized.

Starting then from a jusnaturalist basis which led them to say that the power of pagan princes was of no lesser or different nature from that of Christian princes, since both had the same nature and the same end, or that the natural power that men had to dictate civil laws was common to Christians and to pagans and infidels, the scholastic tradition supported by St. Thomas Aquinas understood that despite this jusnaturalist basis inherent in natural reason common to all men, it was fundamental to the thesis that grace, not contrary to nature, perfects it. From this arose the thesis that the power of Christian princes was more perfect than that of pagan princes, because the former knew the spiritual direction of the grace of Christ.

Thus, given the spiritual plan of grace’s eminence, Catholic princes recognized the spiritual direction of the Church, when a spiritual end was directly and principally at stake, for example, peace among the sheep which were in Christ’s sheepfold, or the evangelisation of the peoples of the world, reserving trade in those regions to such Catholic princes as the Pope wished, inasmuch as it was a trade aimed at providing temporal means for the spiritual end of salvation. This explained, for example, the various papal bulls in this regard, reserving trade in the West and East Indies to the Spanish and Portuguese respectively.

On a practical level, it is not difficult to see that the thesis lent itself to abusive interpretations given the ambiguity of the border between the two domains, and this was one of the main reasons why Pombal intended to bar this thesis, denying it across the board, safeguarding the sphere of action and power of the state.

---

<sup>103</sup> Francisco Suárez, *Defensio fidei III, Principatus politicus* (Coimbra, 1613), in *Corpus Hispanorum de Pace*, vol. II, p. 65, *op. cit.*.

It is these theses that can be read between the lines in the Paper by the Jesuit Nuno da Cunha on the “deposition” of Afonso VI.

Firstly, the defence of the conditionality of real power on the terms of the contract of concession or transfer of power, assuming the initial sovereignty of the people: My opinion is, following the common doctors and the doctrine of the master of theology St. Thomas, that once the first donation and contract are made in which the kingdoms subjected themselves to the kings and promised them obedience in the form of the first conditions, with the charge of defending them in peace and justice, the kingdoms cannot, by the habitual power which they retained in themselves, when at first they chose the prince to govern them, reassume in themselves more than what they then reserved in some kingdoms, or, in certain cases, what the doctors consider to be precisely necessary for their conservation and natural defence, as reason and natural right asks and it is justice.<sup>104</sup>

Father Nuno da Cunha believes that this was what happened to Afonso Henriques at the supposed Cortes of Lamego, in which he tells us that the community “declared and confirmed” D. Afonso Henriques, a thesis that Pombalism did not accept, attributing to these Cortes only the Fundamental Law of the Kingdom, which enshrined the monarchic form of government and the principle of hereditary succession.

But in the text that we quoted above, there is a relevant statement that may go unnoticed by today’s reader. Nuno da Cunha speaks of the “habitual power” that the community retained when it granted power to the prince. It was exactly this “habitual power” that Pombal did not accept, on the part of the community, because it limited the sovereignty of the Absolute State.

The concept of habitus, which integrates the notion of “habitual power”, goes back to Aristotle’s *Categories* (*Cat.* 15, 15b, 16-25), who uses it as a generic concept, in the sense of internal determination that is difficult to remove, explaining that it can be understood as “a disposition by means of which a being is well or badly disposed, whether in relation to itself or in order to something else”, that is, in order to an end.

This concept was taken up and enriched by the scholastics of the 13th century, notably by St. Thomas Aquinas. For St Thomas (*Sum. Theol.* 1-2 q 49 a1), the habitus, within the framework of the metaphysical potency-act structure, supposes a potency capable of receiving it “as its possible act”, that is, it is more than the potency, assuming itself as a disposition that already comes equipped with the faculties or conditions necessary for its passage into act, for which reason it participates at the same time in the nature of the act and the potency. In the *Summa Theologica* (1-2 q.49 a.3), following Aristotle’s previous definition, Thomas says that “there are some habits which, by reason of the requirements of the subject in which they reside, imply primarily and principally an order to the act, because the habit, primarily and of itself, relates to the nature of being. If, then, the nature

---

<sup>104</sup> *Coleção das provas que foram citadas na Parte Primeira e Segunda da Dedução Cronológica e Analítica*, p. 110.

of being, in which the habit is found, consists in the tendency to act, it follows that the habit implies principally an order to action” (1-2 q.49 a.3).

It should be further clarified that in this context the habitus can be understood as an “operation principle”, being in potency with respect to the operation, for which reason, says St. Thomas, the habitus can be considered as a “first act” and the operation as a “second act” (*Sum. Theol.* 1-2 q. 49, a.3). The habit, then, was “that by which one acts when it is necessary”.

It is in this sense of a “first act”, relative to a “second act” which is the operation itself, that our theorists of the right of resistance use the concept of habit.

By retaining power “*in habitu*” (*act one*) the people or the political community can re-assume it to exercise it “*in actu*” (*act two*) in extreme circumstances of manifest injustice and tyranny, which Suárez sets out in detail in *De iuramento fidelitatis*.

This explains a fundamental statement by Francisco Suárez in his Coimbra lessons on *As leis* (1612), when he says: “The people never surrender their power to the prince without keeping it ‘*in habitu*’, so that he can make use of it in certain cases, recovering it ‘*in actu*’”.<sup>105</sup>

This is exactly what Nuno da Cunha means when he speaks of a habitual power that the community or kingdom has retained for itself and that it therefore keeps, and may not use it “at whim” but only in extreme situations in which the natural right of the community to its conservation and defence is endangered.

This speaking of a king who occupied power by legitimate title and not exactly of a usurper who ruled against the common good of the community, for in such cases, as Suárez had taught at Coimbra, the usurper “may be put to death by any private person who is a member of the Republic victimized by such tyranny, if there is no other way to safeguard the community”.<sup>106</sup> And whoever would do so, in these circumstances, would act by “the authority of God, who by means of the natural law has given every man the right to defend himself and his country from the violence inflicted by such a tyrant usurper”.<sup>107</sup>

Therefore, in the initial act of concession or transfer of power, there are always conditions that are explicitly or tacitly reserved and that will have to be respected. One of the most relevant, which the community or people cannot renounce under penalty of invalidity of the contract of concession or transfer of civil power is the one that covers all that is necessary “for the same purpose of natural defence”, as Father Nuno da Cunha says, although in other matters it cannot “exempt itself or limit the obedience it owes to kings”.

---

<sup>105</sup> Francisco Suárez, *Defensio fidei III, Principatus politicus*, in *Corpus Hispanorum de Pace*, vol. II, p. 34, *op. cit.*

<sup>106</sup> *Idem*, *De iuramento fidelitatis*, in *Corpus Hispanorum de Pace*, vol. XIX, 1978, p. 77, *op. cit.*

<sup>107</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 82.

This doctrinal principle implied the denial of the jusdivinist theses that would later underpin the Marquis of Pombal's political thought. As in fact Nuno da Cunha says in the document or "Evidence number L", "one should not admit the doctrine of some political heretics of this time, of which some said that kings have all the power given by God, and totally independent of the kingdom".<sup>108</sup>

Therefore, in the event of the king's unfitness to fulfil the purposes for which the power was granted, he may be "removed from government" or even "deprived of the title of king", as a consequence of regal sovereignty not being totally independent of the kingdom, republic or community.

One of the sides in this issue which also motivated the Marquis' doctrinal opposition is that which, in the scholastic tradition of a Thomistic and peninsular matrix, made this act dependent on the approval of the Pope. Thus, another battlefield was opened.

Father Nuno da Cunha considered that "in the merely temporal and that has no connection with the supernatural end and spiritual good of souls" kings do not recognize superior and have no obligation to appeal to the Pope in these matters. That is why it was said in the scholastic tradition that the power of kings was supreme "in their sphere".

This explanation was once again postulated by Francisco Suárez, whom Nuno da Cunha knew well, not only because he quotes him but because he closely followed his lessons.

Suárez expounded his thoughts on this subject in the book written at the supreme pontiff's request against the king of England, *Defensio fidei catholicae et apostolicae*, especially in book IV, when he deals with the issue of the oath of fidelity (*De iuramento fidelitatis*).

The starting point is what we have already explained above: grace does not contradict nature but perfects it, therefore the power of Christian princes was considered more perfect than the power of pagan princes, because in the first case there was to be considered the spiritual direction of Christ's grace through his church.

Hence, on the subject of the deposition of kings, Suarez considered that "although the community or kingdom of men - considered only from the point of view of its nature, as it existed among the gentiles and exists at present among the pagans - has the power we have mentioned of defending itself against the tyrant king and of dismissing him in case of need, nevertheless the Christian kingdoms have in this aspect a certain dependence and subordination to the supreme pontiff [...]. It has this power because of the moral dangers and the loss of souls that usually accompany these popular uprisings"<sup>109</sup> It was above all an indirect power of the Pope over temporal affairs exercised in the name of a higher spiritual end.

Now this is exactly what Father Nuno da Cunha says when he states that "when the temporal has some connection with the spiritual or dependence on it, the Catholic Doc-

---

<sup>108</sup> *Coleção das provas que foram citadas na Parte Primeira e Segunda da Dedução Cronológica e Analítica*, p. 111.

<sup>109</sup> Francisco Suárez, *De iuramento fidelitatis*, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

tors agree that the Pope can over the temporal whatever is necessary for the supernatural end, and good of souls”.<sup>110</sup> Thus the pope could invoke the thesis that “the spiritual good depending much on the peace and quietness of the kingdoms, and the good administration of them, was a matter of his jurisdiction, even if the temporal also entered into it”.<sup>111</sup>

This did not mean that the pope was lord of both powers, as the theocrats argued, but rather that he had indirect power over temporal affairs, as long as these interfered directly with spiritual ends.

In turn, scholastic and Suarezian doctrine understood that the pope also possessed a direct power over temporal matters among Christians, as was the case with the punishment of crimes that were related to spiritual matters, such as the heresy of princes, in which case he could dethrone them, or that dealt with temporal matters that embodied sins.

The culmination of this doctrine is in the thesis expounded by Nuno da Cunha in this Evidence that even in the case of the making of laws on temporal matters, which are the office of kings, “if the said laws touch anything on the spiritual good [...] they are revoked by the popes and their revocation is infallibly kept among Catholics”.<sup>112</sup>

This document is therefore an icon of the *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, as it is situated at the antipodes of the doctrinal position of Pombalism. It should be noted in this respect that among the documents in this volume of the *Coleção das Provas* are also the decrees of King John IV concerning the severance of relations with the Holy See, imposing the thought of “denaturalisation” on his subjects who did not leave the dependencies of the Holy See within a fixed period.

Pedro Calafate

---

<sup>110</sup> *Coleção das provas que foram citadas na Parte Primeira e Segunda da Dedução Cronológica e Analítica*, p. 112.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 113.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibidem*.



# COMPÊNDIO HISTÓRICO DO ESTADO DA UNIVERSIDADE DE COIMBRA<sup>1</sup>

(HISTORICAL COMPENDIUM  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF COIMBRA'S STATE)

**Leonel Ribeiro dos Santos**

## 1. THE WORK IN ITS TEXT AND CONTEXT. INTERPRETATION PROBLEMS

The *Compêndio histórico do estado da Universidade de Coimbra*<sup>2</sup>, if taken in its title's abbreviated form, could be considered as merely one of the central pieces produced with the Pombaline reform of the University of Coimbra in mind, as a memoir or account that describes or take stock of the situation in which that educational institution found itself at the time and which points the Reformer in the direction of the necessary and urgent interventions or corrections to be made. In fact, however, by the remaining part of its long, baroque and periphrastic title – *no tempo da invasão dos denominados Jesuítas e dos estragos feitos nas ciências, e nos professores e directores que a regiam, pelas maquinações e publicações dos novos Estatutos por eles fabricados* (at the time of the invasion of the so-called Jesuits and the damages done to the sciences and professors, and directors who governed it by the machinations, and publications of the new statutes fabricated by them) -, it is immediately apparent that it intends to fulfil other much broader and more complex functions than the most obvious one of serving as a report prior to the undoubtedly necessary reform of the courses lectured at that university institution.

Many and varied judgements have been made about the character and aims of the work, which, while pointing to different aspects, are not mutually exclusive. Some see it more in relation to its inspirer and commissioner's ideological and political programme, and perhaps even its real and true arch-author - the Marquis of Pombal; while others see it more in its instrumental function as a preparatory document for the Pombaline reform of

---

<sup>1</sup> Citations made from this work and from the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* follow the criteria for updating the edition defined within the project POMBALIA - Obra completa pombalina

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Compêndio histórico do estado da Universidade de Coimbra no tempo da invasão dos denominados Jesuítas e dos estragos feitos nas sciencias e nos professores, e directores que a regiam pelas maquinações e publicações dos novos estatutos por elles fabricados*, Lisbon, at the Regia Officina Typografica, 1771 (hereinafter designated by its shortened title *Compêndio histórico*).

university studies and should therefore be read in natural relation to the new University Statutes that follow it; others, at last, see it more from the perspective of the explicit and insistent accusatory thesis that it develops and of those targeted and held responsible, prosecuted, condemned and exprobated under any pretext throughout each of its five hundred pages - the Jesuits, the Society of Jesus itself as a whole. According to some, an unavoidable document for understanding Pombalism, as a “text on power representation” and on the affirmation and justification of power, in which the Pombaline idea of political power itself is developed as the establishment of an iron conditionality of knowledge within the framework of regalism in principle and in practice; therefore, not exactly as an anti-Jesuit libel, or even as a sufficiently elaborated survey of the possible damage to the university that is vehemently enunciated.<sup>3</sup> Others, however, prefer to read it as a merciless accusatory libel against the Portuguese Jesuits and the Society of Jesus as a whole, and as one of Pombalism’s the most important “anti-Jesuit catechisms”, joined by the *De-  
dução cronológica* and other texts of the same kind. They contribute to the Pombaline creation, constitution and legitimisation of the “Jesuit myth”, i.e. the theory of the great Jesuit “machination” and world conspiracy, thus explaining a posteriori the just and imperative reasons for their physical, intellectual and moral extermination.<sup>4</sup> From this perspective, what seems to constitute a relatively minor issue or concern in the work is what one would expect to be its main purpose: to draw up an objective report of the situation and the historical evolution of teaching at the university with a view to its reform.

In fact, under the guise of the University of Coimbra’s two-centuries history, from the middle of the 16th century to the middle of the 18th century, it allegedly shows how it gradually declined from its much vaunted flourishing that took place in the middle of the 16th century to its state of complete ruin at the time. Under the pretext of serving as a document with a view to the reform or “new foundation” of that institution by the enlightened reforming minister, the work is presented as a voluminous and monotonous accusatory libel, obsessively setting out an extremely broad, thorough and even redundant deduction of the incrimination *corpus delicti*, thus seeking to justify and legitimize *a posteriori* - through the accumulation of supposed evidence, of very badly recounted facts

---

<sup>3</sup> See: José Esteves Pereira, , “Prefácio”, in Marquês de Pombal/ Junta de Providência Literária, *Compêndio histórico da Universidade de Coimbra* [...], coord. by José Eduardo Franco and Sara Marques Pereira, Oporto, Campo das Letras, 2008, pp. 11-13.

<sup>4</sup> See: José Eduardo Franco, *Le mythe jésuite au Portugal, au Brésil, en Orient et en Europe (XVI-XX Siècles)*, São Paulo, Arké Editora, 2008. This work condenses reflected information, gathered from primary sources, presents syntheses on the most varied aspects of the issue approached, based on and contrasted through a vast bibliography, showing how the dark “myth” of anti-Jesuitism is born, built, consolidated, inculcated, disseminated and reproduced, in multiple derivatives and under various forms. See also: Christine Vogel, *Guerra aos Jesuítas. A propaganda antijesuítica do Marquês de Pombal em Portugal e na Europa*, by J. E. Franco, Lisboa, Círculo de Leitores, 2017.

and of the listing of very ambiguous incidents and documents, the condemnation, denaturalisation, expulsion and extinction of the Jesuits and the Society of Jesus, previously executed by royal decree more than a decade before (September 3, 1759). The Society was considered to have been the only and universal responsible for the situation exposed in the work and not only for the “damages” in the university and in the sciences and arts, but also for all the evils of the kingdom and its domains, thus consummating not only the disapproval and expulsion or denaturalisation of such alleged perpetrators of crimes against Science, the kingdom and the Humanity, but fulfilling the still necessary supplementary act of effective and complete execution or effective intellectual, moral and even religious extermination of that institution and of its members, even of their own memory. Thus, in this *Compêndio histórico*, the monumental and even monstrous incriminatory and condemnatory process is consummated, one that had been initiated with the summary accusatory libel *Erros ímpios e sediciosos* (1759) and continued and amply instructed with the *Dedução cronológica* (1767-1768), whose declared, or rather shameless purpose - legitimating *a posteriori* the subversion of the most elementary forensic procedural logic - is to present the “evidence [...] to be formed after their [the Jesuits’] expulsion the *corpus delicti* of such infamous and detestable faults”.<sup>5</sup>

In short: first, the sentence was carried out; then, the accusation was constructed and deduced to justify that execution! In fact, the *Compêndio histórico* reiterates, corroborates and reinforces much of what had been published four years earlier in that other also representative work on the same incriminating and condemnatory process, whose structure, style and tone the present one follows and reproduces. And not only using its economic design and summarizing its factual content, and whose explicit and public authorship is due to José de Seabra da Silva, of the Court of Appeal, the Crown’s Procurator and Advisor to the King, who is also co-author of this *Compêndio histórico*.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, Part One, § 9.

<sup>6</sup> On the true authorship of the *Dedução cronológica*, considered to be the “Bible of Pombaline and Portuguese anti-Jesuitism”, see José Eduardo Franco, “Os catecismos antijesuíticos pombalinos. As obras fundadoras do antijesuítismo do Marquês de Pombal”, *op. cit.*, p. 257. Franco adduces various testimonies, including that of Seabra da Silva himself, according to whom the latter would have been a mere collaborator and instrument of Sebastião de Carvalho e Melo and would have given his name in order to authorise the work, thus not implicating the minister, who, thus concealed, would in fact be its true author. In the same line, see also: José Eduardo Franco and Carlos Fiolhais, “Historiografia antijesuítica em Portugal: Antes da restauração da Companhia de Jesus”, in José Eduardo Franco and Ricardo Ventura (Coord.), *A sombra dos demónios. Para uma história da cultura em negativo*, Lisbon: Edições Esgotadas, 2019, pp.93-106. There are historians, among whom João Lúcio de Azevedo stands out, seconded by Manuel Antunes, who point to the Marquis as being the work’s real author: “There is no doubt, however, that the author was Carvalho. The style is his, and whole pages, additions, notes and corrections of his hand, starting with the title, in the existing original, all give proof that the *Deduction* was not only conceived by the minister, but also entirely written. He would certainly have had collaborators [...] José de Seabra himself, the monk Cenáculo, the theologian António Pereira, Verney, [...] the famous Platel when

In fact, as has been recognized and pointed out by those who have studied this troubled period and obscure process, in order to understand the material and formal substance of the *Compêndio histórico* one must read and keep in mind that *Dedução cronológica*, a vast three-volume work (the third one consisting of “*Provas*”!), which also constitutes an infamous libel and a distorted history of the Society of Jesus’ first two centuries. In it, all that was considered decadent and negative is attributed to the Ignatians, even the facts that happened in institutions that had little or nothing to do with them. This was precisely the case with the University of Coimbra, where there appeared to be no trace of the Jesuits during the whole of the two centuries referred to in the *Dedução* and the *Compêndio histórico*. Nor did they hold office either as rectors, or visitors, or even as professors of the university faculties themselves (in Theology, Law, Medicine, Mathematics), apart from a few very singular and very brief exceptions, which we shall speak of further on. In the light of a justice that follows the basic principle of common sense, one would ask the accusers: But how could the Jesuits be the cause of so much “damages” and “hindrances”, the cause of so many “atrocities” and “*terriblenesses*”, and so constantly, in an institution where really and effectively they were never present and for which they had neither materially nor formally throughout that long period any direct responsibility?

The question, however, would not bother the accusers, who, in the ample deduction of the overwhelming material of the accusation and in the prompt pronouncement of their condemnatory sentence, make use of the presumption of interest principle given to defendants in the crimes of which they are accused and for which they are condemned. And to sustain such a presumption everything served them as a good argument, whatever negative there could be about national or foreign Jesuits, according to another principle that also governs their strange argumentation, that of “*crimine ab uno disce omnes*” (“From

---

he was in Lisbon [...] to all of these, without daring to conjecture, one may attribute some contingent in the thundering libel”. Manuel Antunes, “O Marquês de Pombal e os jesuítas”, in: *AA.VV, Como interpretar Pombal? No bicentenário da sua morte*, Lisbon/Oporto, Edições Brotéria/Livraria A.I., 1983, pp.139-140. Others consider the minister, if not as its true author, at least as its “mentor-author” or “implicit author” (José Eduardo Franco, “Os catecismos antijesuíticos pombalinos. As obras fundadoras do antijesuítismo do Marquês de Pombal”, *op. cit.*, p. 248). The same could be said about the authorship of the *Compêndio histórico*. J. Marcadé, gives an account of debates and disagreements between some of the co-authors of the *Compêndio* and the minister, on some points, namely on the complete rejection of scholastic philosophy, in which the position of Br. But the final text offers no hint of any more moderate outlook, rather overcoming the fundamentalist anti-peripatetic unanimism. The same author, bringing together scattered testimonies, gives a succinct account of the “unpleasant atmosphere” in which the sessions of the *Junta de Providência Literária*, in which the preparation of the *Compêndio* was carried out, took place, of the tensions between its members and even of the “plot” or “cabal” of some of them (Seabra da Silva, Cardinal da Cunha and Francisco de Lemos) against another whose positions were more moderate (Friar Manuel do Cenáculo), as well as of the assiduous, intervening and decisive presence of the minister in chairing sessions. See: J. Marcadé, *Frei Manuel do Cenáculo Vilas Boas, Évêque de Beja, Archevêque d’Evora (1770-1814)*, Paris, F. C. Gulbenkian, 1978, pp. 80 and ff.

one sample, judge or know all the rest”). To which another principle of this twisted justice is added: if there is no visible evidence that these defendants committed the crimes they are accused of, it is because they committed them by clandestine machination, or by a very secret and insidious conspiracy, using intermediaries they control. It proves that they are the real authors of such acts because, according to the accusers, only they would be capable of carrying out such “*terriblenesses*”, and these are such that only those perverse and pernicious beings could be the authors.<sup>7</sup>

Both works - the *Dedução* and the *Compêndio histórico* - are thus part of the systematic campaign of ideological persecution and destruction of the Society of Jesus and its members and of the concerted anti-Jesuit catechetical campaign, promoted and carried out by the minister of king D. José I. They are both fundamental pieces in the creation of the “Jesuit myth”, giving this “myth” the systematic and holistic framework which translates into a discourse based on mountains of supposed facts and incidents, of doubtful quotations, allegations and proof documents, from which summary judgments of total and irremediable guilt are extracted - all of this listed in successive loads and served by an insistent rhetoric of supposedly incontestable evidence and so subtly plotted. It would survive the fall of the marquis and “Pombalism” itself and would continue for the next two centuries, in the liberal and republican, masonic and anti-clerical generations, feeding the anti-Jesuitism in the political and intellectual elites of the country’s ideology and imaginary, surviving even throughout the 20th century in incidental and more discreet manifestations.<sup>8</sup>

This amazing mixture and mix-up of plans and this intricate confluence of purposes (not all obviously confessed, but masked), all served an orchestration (the work has four preludes, two parts and a *finale*, which is the Appendix) of tedious, overwrought and dull rhetoric always returning to the same theme, which have complicated and made the work difficult to read and interpret, as well as the judgment that is ultimately made about it.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> “And all the aforesaid machinators of the said statutes being such notorious and decisive instruments of Jesuit terribleness, that they only did what they were ordered to do, as is thus manifested. It is clear that such a studied and planned work could not but be Jesuitical, and as pernicious as its authors”. (*Compêndio histórico*, fl. 53).

<sup>8</sup> See: José Eduardo Franco, *Le mythe jésuite au Portugal*, *op. cit.*, pp. 519-665.

<sup>9</sup> Referring to this work and to the content of the denunciation and accusation made in it of the “machinations”, “damage”, “hindrances”, “atrocities” and “terriblenesses”, allegedly practised on purpose by the Jesuits, which they could only do because they were “perverse atheists”, writes António Alberto Banha de Andrade: “But this flabby rhetoric clearly puts us on our guard and brings to mind the fable of the fox who dressed in sheep’s clothing, leaving his tail out... Astonishing the lack of criterion in a publication that claims to be historical and that criticises methods and science of others”. *Contributos para a história da mentalidade pedagógica portuguesa*, Lisbon, INCM, 1982,. In the same line is the judgment by Marcadé, who classifies the *Compêndio* as a monumental “pamphlet devoid of all objectivity” (J. Marcadé, *Frei Manuel do Cenáculo*, *op. cit.*, p. 82).

The history of its reception shows how difficult it is to escape the dichotomy of being at times with the accusers and judges, at times with the accused and condemned, of taking the side of those who condemn to intellectual and moral extinction or of those who are summarily sentenced to extermination under generic, twisted and even false allegations of universal and incommensurable guilt. Something, however, is obvious: this work cannot be read without placing it in the broader context of the political and ideological (religious and theological, pedagogical and philosophical) struggles of the era that gave birth to it, a context of which it is at once the expression, the sounding board and the decisive instrumental agent. The distortion of facts and documents, which are ostentatiously and extensively transcribed, is so obvious, such is the gross simplification of their interpretation and the all too easy and frivolous generalisation of conclusions, always drawn without hesitating, with the sole purpose of proving the same thesis, that it is only with difficulty that one goes on reading the immense and monotonous farce that is being woven into the work, at the same time as one becomes aware of how painful and time-consuming (and, in the end, useless) it would be to submit all the factual matters of guilt that are listed in support of the inculcated thesis for legal appraisal and evaluation.

To such a degree is the shameless lack of rigour and objectivity of what is reported in that work and of what is deduced from it, that even a historian of the university, who shared explicit and firm sympathies for Pombalism and for what it meant and believed to continue to mean, namely, also for what refers to the anti-Jesuitical cause and for the Jesuits' accountability for the "Portuguese University's decadence" due, also according to him, to the "absorption" that those regulars had imposed on it - a cause, which, by the way, the same historian will continue and sustain in a positivist, republican and anticlerical version -, yet, even so he could not help but recognizing and writing that this work - the *Compêndio histórico* - is "deprived of all the light of historical criterion", and that all those who, writing about the university, lean on that exposition suffer from "the same blindness" that its editors, writing it under the effect of "blind hatred" and being "deprived of the criterion of literary history", only produced with it an "opaque report".<sup>10</sup> And this is not the only critical remark made by Teófilo Braga regarding the work's lack of objectivity. Elsewhere in volume II of his *História da Universidade de Coimbra*, we read this judgment: "When, after the first half of the 18th century, the Marquis of Pombal tried to reform the University of Coimbra, he created [...] the *Junta de Providência Literária*, to make it examine the causes of its decadence. We can see that a historical balance of the university's pedagogical progress was indispensable: although without a clear historical criterion, the members of the *Junta* proceeded to this enquiry, and [...] presented their account to the public authorities under

---

<sup>10</sup> See: Teófilo Braga, *História da Universidade de Coimbra nas suas relações com a instrução pública portuguesa*, II: 1555 a 1700, Lisbon, Academia Real das Sciencias, 1895, pp. 230; 409-411. On the contribution of Teófilo to the positivist recreation of the theory of the "Jesuit plot", see José Eduardo Franco, *op. cit.*, pp. 585-588.

the title of *Compêndio histórico do estado da Universidade de Coimbra no tempo da invasão dos denominados Jesuítas*. [...] The exclusivism of the attribution of the university's decadence to the Jesuits prejudiced the historical examination. Other universities where the Jesuits were never admitted, like that of Salamanca, suffered from the same decadence; the Jesuits could defraud the university of its income, but the doctrinal depression had a more general origin, to which the Society itself obeyed. [...] The error of the *Compêndio histórico* consists in attributing this general cause of scientific decadence to a particular factor, the Jesuits; having confirmed this obsession, which obeyed the *Dedução cronológica*, numerous facts in the *Compêndio histórico* are true and well observed, even if the documentation is paltry".<sup>11</sup>

The last sentence of the quoted passage expresses some ambiguity from its author's position: how are the "numerous true and well-observed facts" but "the documentation paltry"? Unless it is meant that the facts or incidents adduced, even when they are true and well observed, are taken out of their contexts and their interpretation is twisted and tortured to adjust them to the predetermined conclusion that one wishes to inculcate. Despite the ambiguity in which it is expressed, Teófilo's position is nevertheless significant, particularly because it points in the direction of a more objective, broader and more productive and enlightening approach to the question of the state of the University of Coimbra in the modern period and how it came to be. In general, he rejects the thesis supported and insistently inculcated in the *Compêndio histórico* concerning the of Jesuits' unique and universal accountability for all the university's ills. In particular, on the question of the University Statutes, which, according to that work's authors, had been successively elaborated by direct or indirect action of the Jesuit "machination". The historian notes that identical statutory reforms took place at the time in other European universities, which were by no means under the dominion of the Jesuits, as was the case with Salamanca. Such changes, he claims, were rather the result of a general instability dependent on the "doctrinal and political currents of the troubled 16th century, of which the Jesuits were also a factor", but not the only nor the main cause,<sup>12</sup> because "before the direct influence of the Jesuits, the university was already decaying".<sup>13</sup> Teófilo, who thus dispels the recurrently invoked myth in the *Compêndio histórico* of a golden age of the university, immediately prior to the arrival of the Jesuits and which would have been interrupted by them, also notes that it was the universities of the time which, generally speaking, by their very institutional nature "were antipathetic to any change of doctrine" and "as soon as they naturally found themselves, in the second half of the 16th century, as instruments of retrogradation in the service of the Monarchies, and then of Catholic

---

<sup>11</sup> Teófilo Braga, *História da Universidade de Coimbra*, *op. cit.*, pp. 653-654

<sup>12</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 230.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 102.

reaction, under the absorption of the Jesuits” these “just sterilised them“. And, insisting on the key of the “absorption” of the University by the Jesuits, the same historian always concedes to the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* that “the king [D. João III] gave himself in to the Jesuits [...] who proceeded to absorb the University of Coimbra like most of the universities of Europe; they were not its decadence’s primary cause, but, given their spirit of retrogression, they took advantage of these strongholds of pedagogical conservatism to react against the manifestations of the modern spirit, thus activating irremediable decadence and sterility”.<sup>14</sup>

The renowned historian’s ambiguous position certainly denounces his underlying philopombalism and anti-Jesuitism, which, however, did not turn him totally blind to the point of not recognising the *Compêndio histórico*’s clamorous lack of historical objectivity. In other pages of the same work, however, Teófilo rehearses a kind of comparative historiography of what happened at the same time in similar European institutions, and ends up unequivocally exempting the Jesuits and the statutes they supposedly “set up” (according to the insistent accusation in the *Compêndio histórico*) of any responsibility for the university’s decadence, showing that this decadence had more distant causes and was, in fact, the common fate of other European universities, which had no Jesuit influence whatsoever. The historian writes: “Whoever compares the provisions of the old statutes with the legislation which governed the university sixty or seventy years before, will be convinced that the doctrines, the teaching methods and the school system established in the said statutes were already mostly in force in the university before the entry of the Jesuits in Portugal and before they meddled in the affairs of the kingdom. From the Universities of Paris and Salamanca it received our strong influence. [...] It generally conformed to those Universities’ systems, accompanying their reforms, and almost went through the same alternatives. The last statutes of the ancient universities of Paris and Salamanca are from the beginning of the 17th century, coeval, and with little difference from our university’s old statutes. The disputes concerning the literary part are in all three similar and in many respects identical. It will not be said, however, that the Jesuits influenced the Parisian and Salmantine statutes. It is well known that in those two Universities there was always little affection for the Society of Jesus”.<sup>15</sup>

Thus, the main matter of explicit accusation against the Jesuits listed by the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* fell to the ground. Unexpectedly, unlikely, the Jesuits found in the positivist, republican, anticlerical and anti-Jesuit historian their first, and certainly the most unsuspected, defence lawyer in the cause of one of the crimes they were insistently

---

<sup>14</sup> *Ibidem*, pp.106-107. However, this view is attenuated by what will be said later on about the significance of the *Conimbricenses*’ Aristotelianism (see pp. 409 and ff.) and the blocking of proposals for the renewal of the courses by the monarch himself (king John V).

<sup>15</sup> *Ibidem* p. 42.



accused of in that work, on which all the others depended. And this was written and published by that university historian more than a century after the writing and publication of the *Compêndio histórico*. With all the more reason, now that two and a half centuries have passed since its first publication, perhaps it is possible to look with even greater objectivity at the content, the scope and the meaning of that work and to extract a more comprehensive and fairer judgement regarding the cause it discusses and the protagonists involved in that cause, whether as accused and incriminated or as accusers and judges.

In recent decades - in Portugal, especially since the end of the First Republic - both nationally and internationally, there has been an increase in studies of a more general or more particular scope on this troubled period and process, which, generally practising a historiography free of ideological or partisan prejudices, have shed light on many aspects, whether those relating to the economic, political and cultural situation of the time;<sup>16</sup> those concerning the history of the Society of Jesus in Portugal and its domains;<sup>17</sup> those trying to understand the person, the ideology and the political action, the reforming work and the legacy of the Marquis of Pombal,<sup>18</sup> in general, and the Pombaline university policy,<sup>19</sup> in particular; whether in relation to the comparative history of the Portuguese university and European universities in the modern era;<sup>20</sup> or, finally, regarding the So-

---

<sup>16</sup> João Lúcio de Azevedo, *O Marquês de Pombal e a sua época*, op. cit.; José Sebastião da Silva Dias, "Portugal e a cultura europeia (séc. XVI a XVII)", *Biblos*, n.º XXVIII, 1953; Ana Cristina Araújo, *A cultura das luzes em Portugal, Temas e problemas*, Lisbon, Livros Horizonte, 2003.

<sup>17</sup> Francisco Rodrigues, *História da Companhia de Jesus na assistência de Portugal*, Oporto, Apostolado da Imprensa, 1950; Serafim Leite, *História da Companhia de Jesus no Brasil*, Rio de Janeiro, Instituto Nacional do Livro, 1949; Horácio Peixoto de Araújo, *Os Jesuítas no Império da China, O primeiro século (1582-1680)*, Macau, Instituto Português do Oriente, 2000.

<sup>18</sup> See: AA.VV., *Como interpretar Pombal? No bicentenário da sua morte*, Lisbon/Oporto, Edições Brotéria/Livraria A. I., 1983; António Leite, "A ideologia pombalina. Despotismo esclarecido e regalismo", *Brotéria - Cristianismo e cultura*, vol. 114, mai./jun., 1982, pp. 27-54; António Ferrão, *O Marquês de Pombal e a expulsão dos Jesuítas*, Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade, 1932.

<sup>19</sup> There is an immense literature on the topic, older or more recent and of broader or more sectorial scope. In addition to vols. II and III of the already cited *História da Universidade*, by Teófilo Braga, see: António Ferrão, *A reforma pombalina da Universidade de Coimbra*, Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade, 1926; ; José Eduardo Franco, "A reforma pombalina da Universidade Portuguesa no quadro da reforma anti-jesuítica da educação", in Marquês de Pombal/Junta de Providência Literária, *Compêndio histórico da Universidade de Coimbra [...]*, op. cit., pp. 17-58; Ana Cristina Araújo (coord.), *O Marquês de Pombal e a Universidade*, Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, 2000; *Idem*, *A universidade pombalina*, Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, 2017.

<sup>20</sup> See: Luís A. de Oliveira Ramos, "A universidade portuguesa e as universidades europeias", 1.: *A Universidade de Coimbra*, in *História da Universidade em Portugal*, vol. I, t. II (1537-1771), Coimbra, Lisbon: Universidade de Coimbra-F. C. Gulbenkian, 1997, pp.361-394; Fernando Taveira da Fonseca, "História da Universidade de Coimbra. Estado da questão", in: *Miscelânea Alfonso IX*, Salamanca, Universidad de Salamanca, 2006, pp. 109-137; cf. *idem*, capítulos "Os corpos académicos", "A Teologia", "A Medicina", in *História da Universidade em Portugal*, vol. I, t. II, op. cit., respectively, pp. 501-600, 781-816 e 835-873.

ciety of Jesus itself. Objectively speaking, it constitutes a major subject in this *Compêndio histórico*, considered for its pedagogical action and its intellectual and moral legacy, which are, however, not properly and objectively exposed, discussed, criticized and evaluated, but rather exprobed. This after being forcibly reduced to a few crude clichés and labels, if not simply slanderous, which reveals either the bad faith that leads to silencing and omitting aspects of the issue that would give it another face, or the real and crass ignorance of modern philosophical and theological history on the part of those who apply them. However, despite the much that has been done at a historiographical level in recent decades, there is still ample room for new studies, whether of a broader or narrower scope, which can shed light on many aspects that were involved in this long period of two centuries regarding the cause which is the subject of this *Compêndio histórico*. And there is even a need for such studies - which help to place the facts in the wider political, religious, social and cultural landscape and in the long and differentiated time in which they happened. Also to appreciate them from different points of view, to identify the multiple players effectively involved and their respective participation in the process, so that we may better see, in the narrative of the *Compêndio histórico*, both the summary simplifications and the frivolous generalisations, the omissions, the distortions and also, of course, what truth there may still be in it.<sup>21</sup>

The broader and more contrasted vision of the intellectual - philosophical, theological, scientific -, institutional, and political history of the modern era that we now possess allows us a much more complete perspective, since it is more complex and nuanced, which in no way consents to the Manichean reductionist reading and the narrow conclusion or thesis offered by the authors of the *Compêndio histórico*. But the final sentence concerning this troubled historical process and the verdict that it pronounces is still suspended, always open to new allegations. Perhaps this is one of the possible meanings of Hegel's enigmatic aphorism, taken, however, from Friedrich Schiller's poem "Resignation", according to which "universal history is the final Judgement",<sup>22</sup> an aphorism pronounced at the end of Modernity that would finally meet with that, so dear to some Proto-modern

---

<sup>21</sup> Without a doubt, there is always room for the justification or even laudatory discourse on the work and its authors, assuming that it is a matter, in this and other works by Pombalism, on using the adequate and fair means in the service of a cause (or even a war of death) between two antagonistic ideological regimes: the Enlightenment against the obscurantists, progress against decadence, the true sciences against ignorance, the Enlightenment against darkness. This is also the simplistic and reductive scheme that presides over the *Compêndio histórico* and legitimises it. See, in this line, the essay by José Antunes, "Notas sobre o sentido ideológico da reforma pombalina. Alguns documentos da Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra", in *O Marquês de Pombal e o seu tempo – Revista de História das Ideias*, vol. IV, t. II, 1982-1983, pp. 148-197, sobretudo as pp. 193-197, especially pp. 193-197.

<sup>22</sup> On the context and meaning of the Hegelian aphorism, see: Michael Rosen, "Die Weltgeschichte ist das Weltgericht", *Internationales Jahrbuch des deutschen Idealismus*, ed. F. Rush, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2014, pp. 256-272.

thinkers (Gerolamo Cardano, Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes and even the Jesuit Father Antonio Vieira), in which the intimate relationship sensed between Truth and Time is expressed: that “Truth is the daughter of Time” (*veritas temporis filia*). Hegel’s aphorism is usually understood as if each epoch constituted an absolute *dictat* on the past and eliminated it by violent overturning. The other, in turn, is understood as if each epoch had its own particular truth, resulting in different epochal truths which are incommensurable, but which can also be so in the sense - and this was what Vieira gave it - that time matures the awareness that humans have over truth, giving them a broader, more contextualized and more contrasted vision. It even allows them to come to recognize pertinence in what before seemed to be deprived of it or even the lack of meaning in what before was considered to be full and absolute meaning, and thus the more recent would be at an advantage over the older in terms of the knowledge of truth.<sup>23</sup> In any case, despite the prophesied or declared “ends of History”, it seems that Time is still running, so that no particular time is entitled to the dictatorial pronouncement of its final verdict.

As has already been mentioned and is generally acknowledged by those who have been concerned with this work’s problematic, whether with regard to the documentary material of proof listed, or to its theses and arguments, the *Compêndio histórico* extensively uses, replicates and recycles national anti-Jesuitical documentation taken mainly from the *Dedução cronológica* and from other shorter anti-Jesuit catechisms, such as the *Relação abreviada* and the *Erro ímpios e sediciosos*. But beyond that, it also feeds on the European anti-Jesuitical, especially French and Italian, literature of the time. It is not only the “Appendix”, whose material is taken and adapted from a work that had been published in France, and at the end of which reference is made to another Italian work, which, translated into Portuguese, had just been published at the *Imprensa Régia* (Royal Press). In fact, the general accusations presented in the *Compêndio histórico* against the Jesuits are very similar to those that had been exposed in a four-volume work published in France by Christophe Coudrette and Louis Adrien Le Page in the year 1761: the *Histoire générale de la naissance & des progrès de la Compagnie de Jésus, et Analyse de ses Constitutions et Privilèges: où il est prouvé, 1. que les Jésuites ne sont pas reçus de droit, spécialement en France, & que quand ils le seroient, ils ne sont pas tolérables. 2. que par la nature même de leur Institut, ils ne sont pas recevables dans un État policé*. This work, as Christine Vogel has recently shown, exposes and systematizes the “Jesuit conspiracy discourse” in the French context, whereby the Jesuits had early on had a long history of rejection by the clergy and the Parliament of Paris, and had been involved in many controversies, especially in confrontation with the Jansenists of Port-Royal. The authors of this *Histoire générale* also make use of Portuguese documents

---

<sup>23</sup> See: Leonel Ribeiro dos Santos, “Da verdade e do tempo: António Vieira e a “Controvérsia dos antigos e dos modernos”, in José Eduardo Franco (Coord.), *Entre a selva e a corte. New Views on Vieira*, Lisbon, Esfera do Caos, 2009, pp. 79-89.

at central points in their argument, namely the anonymous booklet *Erros ímpios e sediciosos* (1759), certainly written under Pombal's tutelage, and understood that work as a testimony of explicit approval of the Portuguese king's actions, stating in the Introduction that "it is a matter of an apology of the behaviour that the king of Portugal has had in the last two years in his states, and of the example he sets for the other powers of Europe".<sup>24</sup> It is impossible that this work's volumes have not been present to those who produced and wrote both the *Dedução Cronológica* and the *Compêndio histórico*, although the style of the latter far exceeds that of the former in its aggressive tone and markedly accusatory and condemnatory content. Thus, with such literature a true anti-Jesuitical International was growing and it joined the chorus of European countries that supported Pombal's policy of Jesuit expulsion and extermination of the Society of Jesus.

## 2. THE WORK'S STATED AIM, STRUCTURE AND THESES

In a letter from the king dated 23 December 1770, the commissioning of the work, undoubtedly prepared and written by his minister, already gives the lead that will preside over its preparation, content and tone, accusing "the so-called Jesuits" of "after having ruined Minor Studies with the occupation of the *Real Colégio das Artes* [...] they have also successively destroyed the other Major Studies, with the evil purpose, now manifest to all, of plunging my kingdoms and its vassals into the darkness of ignorance".<sup>25</sup>

For the execution of the order the monarch created the *Junta de Providência Literária* by the same letter, which would work under Cardinal da Cunha's supervision, as well as the Marquis of Pombal of the Council of State. It was composed by seven counsellors (the Bishop of Beja Frei Manuel do Cenáculo, José Ricalde Pereira de Castro, José de Seabra da Silva, Francisco António Marques Geraldês Pereira, Francisco de Lemos de Faria, Manuel Pereira da Silva and João Pereira Ramos de Azeredo), with the task of "examining the causes of its [the university] decadence and the present state of its ruin; [...] examining their causes with all exactness, pondering the remedies they consider most appropriate for them to cease and pointing out the scientific courses and the methods I should establish for the foundation of the good and depurated studies of arts and sciences, which are unfortunately destroyed after more than a century".<sup>26</sup> Eight months later, on 28th August 1771, the *Junta* considered it finished and sent the commissioned work to the king - the voluminous *Compêndio histórico*, which the king approved 5 days later, on 2nd September. Such a prompt redaction of the work can certainly be explained by the minister's urgent

---

<sup>24</sup> *Histoire*, v. 1, p. VIII, apud Christine Vogel, *Guerra aos Jesuítas. A propaganda antijesuítica do Marquês de Pombal em Portugal e na Europa*, op. cit., p. 322.

<sup>25</sup> *Compêndio histórico*, p. II.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. I-III.

will to reform, who is known to have been present at many of the *Junta's* sessions, but also by the fact that it took advantage of the subject matter, the structure and economy, the redactional style and sometimes even abundantly of the very text from the aforementioned *Dedução cronológica*. The letter that accompanies the work's submission to the king replicates the terms of the royal commission, presenting the work as an account of the "decadence and ruin into which the arts and sciences were precipitated at the University of Coimbra through the machinations of the so-called Jesuits", giving "a clear and specific idea of the damage that the same so-called Jesuits had done: firstly to the University of Coimbra and consequently to the classrooms in all these kingdoms". And, in Part I's summary, the insistence on the topic of "damages" is amplified, as if to say that in it "we have chronologically and demonstratively collected, with the evident certainty that the facts constitute by their nature, the sinister and deceptive means with which the aforementioned regulars snatched all its government from the hands of the rectors and directors of that unhappy university, the damages that they did there, ever since they invaded it,...; the other damages they accumulated against its teachers and professors and against all the other ecclesiastical and secular ministers in Portugal [...]; the other deplorable damages they still accumulated by destroying all the laws, rules and methods that had governed the Universities of Lisbon and of Coimbra, until they introduced in the latter the malicious and sinister statutes they fabricated, with which, having just banished from these kingdoms and their domains the arts and sciences, they buried the Portuguese monarchy in the darkness of ignorance".<sup>27</sup>

Statements such as the one just transcribed constitute a kind of refrain, which, be it in wider or in shorter form, is repeated countless times throughout the work. And, as if this were not enough, it continues by stating the thesis of the systematic "machination" carried out by the regulars of the Society of Jesus over two hundred years is insisted upon in the "inhuman, impious and unheard-of stratagems that were devised and practised by the above-mentioned regulars to prevail against the general and public scandal, all those damages done to the university's body, to its teachers and professors, to its statutes, to its classes and classes of all these kingdoms, without there being in them any longer the consistency of forces that was necessary to resist them".<sup>28</sup> A superhuman power is thus attributed to the Jesuits, which, from its systematic and irresistible fashion, can only have a diabolical nature. The summary of the work's second part proceeds in the same vein and in the same tone, insisting on showing the "damages that the same regulars did to each of the four major sciences - Theology, Jurisprudence, Medicine, Mathematics - and the hindrances which they opposed to them so that they could no longer rise from the

---

<sup>27</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. X-XII.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibidem*, p. XII.

ignorance in which they had buried them”.<sup>29</sup> At the same time it expresses the conviction that all this will be cured with the complete extinction of the statutes, which governed the university since 1598 and whose authorship is insistently attributed to the insidious and perverse machination by the Jesuits, and with the granting of new statutes, with which a sort of refoundation of the university was intended.

The direct or indirect responsibility thesis - by “machination” and alleged surreptitious influence - of the Jesuits in the authorship (of the seven versions!) of the university’s statutes is instilled from the title on and throughout the work’s first part, said and resaid in many ways. For instance: “Since these were the old statutes of the university of Coimbra, and such were the means and ways by which, over the space of two centuries, they were removed and annihilated on the one hand, and, on the other, other maliciously devised ones were introduced in their place, with the clear and decisive aim of destroying the arts and sciences”<sup>30</sup>; “...the said Jesuit statutes did to the University of Coimbra what the confusion of different tongues did in Babylon, they made as many obstinate Sects, as many were the opinions of those doctors that they established with oath for their only principles and rules, and they consequently and necessarily made that the university and all this kingdom were by the effects of those *magisteria* and those studies burning in a perpetual war of contradictions and sophisms, which was the object with which the said malignant regulars introduced in the same university the said statutes with so many intrigues”.<sup>31</sup>; “the University of Coimbra, after it was governed by those Sixth and Seventh statutes, no longer became a university of Letters, but a pernicious workshop, whose machines were sinisterly at work, producing the evil work of an artificial ignorance that would obstruct all the natural lights of the happy Portuguese devices”.<sup>32</sup> In short: the said statutes are not subject to reform, “but should be entirely outlawed and abolished, leaving no trace, as is practiced with the plague, which, by any small cause that is ever infected by it, is communicated to the common, uncareful people”.<sup>33</sup>

But what truth lies in this thesis so emphatically and insistently repeated? What effective intervention did the Jesuits have in the university’s decadence and ruin? If, as is repeatedly stated throughout the first part of the work, the statutes were these evils’ instrument in their successive reformulations, what effective intervention did the Jesuits have in the conception, drafting, approval and execution of those statutes?

Throughout the work, attempts are made to inculcate the idea that the Jesuits were the statutes’ real authors (if not directly, then surreptitiously by someone of their supposed

---

<sup>29</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibidem*, fl. 60.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibidem*, fl. 93.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibidem*, fl. 94.

relations or manipulated by them and to serve their interests) since they were the real and only beneficiaries of said statutes. But what was there in such statutes that so much benefited the Jesuits? The guarantee for scientific and pedagogical autonomy by the *Colégio das Artes* handed over to them by king John III? The privilege of direct access for their students from the *Colégio das Artes* to the university's Major Studies? Or that those who attended the *Colégio das Artes* could apply to Law or Canon Law at the university? Or that the university's Registrar should also come from the *Colégio das Artes*? Or that the payment to the university's Registrar and Bursar be dependent on a certificate from the Jesuit Fathers, as a way of putting pressure on them to do what interested them? That members of the Society could not sit on juries in the *Colégio das Artes*, nor take the masters' places in public acts of the university? All this, even if assumed to be well reported, was of such a magnitude as to affect the good government, the content and the methods of teaching in the disciplines of the university - Theology, Law, Medicine and Mathematics - for two centuries? Did the reform or the establishment of new University Statutes, which was certainly necessary, need so much rhetoric for the effective renewal of the studies at the institution? Was it therefore necessary to force the point that the statutes' dark and perverse "schemers" that had governed the institution for the previous two centuries had indeed been the Jesuits?

Certainly not. The insistent and cloying rhetoric undoubtedly serves other purposes: those of condemnation and extinction, no longer of the persons and the institution to which they belonged, for these were already consummated, but that of their memory, aiming to issue a demonisation certificate, of deliberate evil and perversity on the memory of the persons and of the Society of Jesus itself and on its pedagogical work, disqualifying them not only doctrinally and scientifically, but also morally, repeatedly insinuating that to them is due not only the damage, decadence and ruin in the arts and sciences of the university, but also the general decadence and ruin of the kingdom and all the crimes that took place in it. And all this is adduced as being "demonstrated by experience and by decisive facts", which allegedly prove that everything is due to those "pestiferous poisons, stubbornly and inhumanly poured into the fountain of sciences", over two centuries, by the so-called Jesuits, "which have infected the hearts and heads of all the defendants of usurpations, seditions, insults and atrocities, which so amazingly have been seen in Portugal since the aforementioned statutes began to work".<sup>34</sup>

There is not a page of the *Compêndio histórico* that is not pervaded by the thesis of the Jesuits' wickedness and perversity and their pernicious machination of the University Statutes. But why this insistence on the statutes and the Jesuit responsibility? This is due to the fact that one wants to instil the idea that, with the elimination of the Jesuits and the old statutes that are forcibly associated with them, with the new statutes that the same authors of the

---

<sup>34</sup> *Ibidem*, p. XVIII.

*Compêndio histórico* were preparing, all the ills in the university and the kingdom would be solved once and for all? One could assert that never before have such obscure and vulgar statutes of a university been so elevated to such transcendence and to such importance and responsibility, be it for what they brought in terms of damages or benefits.

Such are the accusatory thesis repeatedly pronounced, the style, and the tone which are obsessively practised throughout the work. Throughout its five hundred pages a rhetoric of insistence is served up *ad nauseam*, whose intention is certainly not so much to convince the readers as to suggest them a single, simple idea and lead them to annoy and execrate those of whom such insidious “machinations” and countless “damages” are reported, produced by them in the university over two centuries, with intentional and systematic persistence.<sup>35</sup> But even if the “invading” Jesuits were the statutes’ real authors, which they in fact were not, on whom did the execution of these statutes depend, whether at the administrative, scientific or pedagogical level? On whom depended the initiative for altering them, if not on the monarch? It is worth asking: was it the Jesuits who, throughout the two centuries covered by the extensive volume of the *Compêndio histórico*, performed the functions of rectors of the university, or visitors to it? Were they the ones who, throughout this entire period, occupied the chairs and professorships of the faculties or of Major Studies, which, properly speaking, constituted the university - Theology, Laws and Canons, Medicine, Mathematics? The numbers unambiguously prove that they did not. With very singular and brief exceptions,<sup>36</sup> all the professorships and chairs at the

---

<sup>35</sup> Several recent authors have confirmed the conclusion that Teófilo Braga had already reached and that we mentioned above. Fernando Taveira da Fonseca writes: “The frequently and uncritically propagated idea that the Jesuits dominated the University of Coimbra - without explaining how they did it - seems to have no factual support. The history of the relationship between the *Colégio das Artes* - and the Jesuits who governed it - and the University (which was always the institutional seat of the Faculty of Arts) has chapters that are still open. What seems beyond doubt is that, in the 18th century, the scientific-pedagogical model for the University of Coimbra, drawn up at the end of the 16th century, had become hopelessly inadequate and obsolete, but remained in force by virtue of the norm that had instituted it. Its modification or abolition - as had its creation - was expressly reserved to the royal power, and previous monarchs had sanctioned and ratified what it was now intended to abolish. Fernando Taveira da Fonseca, “Os Jesuítas na Universidade? Notas para uma releitura do *Compêndio histórico do estado da Universidade de Coimbra* (1771)”, in: *Rumos e Escrita da História. Estudos em Homenagem a A.A. Marques de Almeida*, Lisbon: Colibri, 2006, pp. 243-252 (cit. p. 252). See also: Joaquim Ferreira Gomes, “Os vários Estatutos por que se regeu a Universidade Portuguesa ao longo da sua história”, in: *Idem, Novos Estudos de História e de Pedagogia*, Coimbra, Almedina, 1986, pp. 8-65.

<sup>36</sup> Along the same lines as Teófilo Braga and Taveira da Fonseca, José Eduardo Franco sums up the situation thus: “The 1598 statutes are given as the symbol of the Jesuit intervention that would have codified the ruin of the University of Coimbra, but even the responsibility of the Society of Jesus in the drafting of this legislation is not satisfactorily proven. However, the mythification of the Jesuit intervention in the Coimbra university is all the greater as it is known that few professors of the Society taught at that university. Only the theologian F. Suárez and the confrere who replaced him, Cristóvão Gil, had been effective teachers in the major faculties of Coimbra, and Joannes Köning and Miguel Amaral in the



University of Coimbra during the period under review were regularly occupied by seculars or members of other religious congregations and orders (Franciscans, Third Franciscans, Dominicans, Cistercians, Augustinians, Carmelites and others), who generally followed their school preferences and the respective tutelary masters. So how can one speak of the Jesuits “invading” the university? They were certainly in charge of the *Colégio das Artes*, which, however, they did not seize, since it was entrusted to them by king John III in 1555, and, moreover, the College was not part of the university, neither formally nor effectively. It is true that, from the beginning and at all times, the relationship between those in charge of the College and the university was tense: for reasons related with “income” and “degrees”. Administratively, by decision of the regent Catherine, the College belonged to the Society of Jesus, which harmed the university, which thus saw its own income diminished; but, on the other hand, the Jesuits depended on the university to obtain the academic degrees, since the university did not even accept the royal letter by king John III of 9 September 1556, by which he ordered it to admit certain teachers from the College to the Master’s degree, nor did it accept the 1557 charter by the same monarch which granted the Master’s degree to Jesuit teachers at the College, even if that institution refused to recognise such “royal degrees”. Whatever the case, the College was not formally part of the university, being rather a School of “Minor Studies” or of subjects preparatory to the Major Schools or university faculties properly speaking. At the College, the “Arts” were taught: Classical Languages (Latin, Greek and Hebrew), Grammar, Poetics, Rhetoric, Mathematics, and Philosophy (this, in its various disciplines - Logic, Metaphysics, Ethics, Psychology, Physics), following, in the form of commentary, the Aristotelian corpus, it is true, but not according to the “Arabic-peripatetic” mode, or even according to the vaguely said “medieval scholastic” manner, as is repeatedly accused in the *Compêndio histórico*, but that of a restored Aristotle, read in his original texts, interpreted according to the presuppositions of Renaissance humanism and the various Renaissance restorations of Aristotelianism, and certainly also taking into account the philosophical, theological and scientific debates of the time.<sup>37</sup> It is indeed a fact that the Jesuits fought

---

teaching of mathematics. Nor, still less, did the Jesuits ever hold administrative positions at that University”. José Eduardo Franco, “A reforma pombalina da Universidade Portuguesa”, *op. cit.*, p. 44, nota 76.

<sup>37</sup> This teaching of Philosophy in the first phase of the *Colégio das Artes* was editorially recorded in the so-called *Curso (Aristotélico) Conimbricense (Comentários a Aristóteles do Colégio Jesuíta Conimbricense, Curso Jesuíta Conimbricense, Comentários do Colégio Conimbricense da Companhia de Jesus)*, a collective project undertaken by four Portuguese Jesuits: Manuel de Góis, Sebastião do Couto, Baltasar Álvares and Cosme de Magalhães - a “national philosophical initiative with global repercussion” and with many innovative features for its time, having had a worldwide expansion and remarkable diffusion and survival. See: Mário Santiago de Carvalho, *O curso aristotélico jesuíta conimbricense*, Coimbra/Lisbon, But, speaking only of those who were teachers in Coimbra, in addition to the authors of the *Curso Conimbricense*, Pedro da Fonseca deserves special mention, with his *Instituições dialécticas* and his *Comentário à metafísica de Aristóteles*; We should also bear in mind that monument of original thought which is Francisco Suárez’s

for the pedagogical and scientific autonomy of this College that had been handed over to them by the king, they fought for the exemption of its pedagogical supervision by the visitor of the university, since he was not formally part of the university, and they also struggled for access privileges to their students to proper university courses. But was that also not the case with many other Colleges of other religious orders, or of military orders, or the secular colleges, which, with the definitive establishment of the university in Coimbra, founded and set up in that city, also enjoying similar privileges, exemptions or benefits? And yes, these colleges, or at least some of them (such as the two secular colleges of Saint Peter and Saint Paul), not only provided students for the Major Studies or faculties of the university, but were also usually nurseries where the teachers for the Faculty of Laws and Canons, and even the rectors of the university were prepared and trained.<sup>38</sup>

With the Jesuits being held exclusively and absolutely responsible for the ills of the university, all the other actors involved in that institution over two centuries were exonerated, as if they had nothing to do with its state or were themselves only considered victims of someone else's fault. There is undoubtedly much research to be done on the effective rectors and professors of the University of Coimbra from other religious or secular orders, their teaching and respective scientific production or didactic manuals, if any, and compare it in volume, content and form with the Jesuits' corresponding production in the teaching of their disciplines. From what we already know, these manuals or courses were generally inspired by Aristotelian-Scholasticism, with nuances that were

---

*Disputas metafísicas* (1597), a work which represents both the culmination of ancient and medieval metaphysics and the inauguration of modern metaphysics (or Ontology) (we shall discuss its immediate influence on theological thought not only of Catholic, Calvinist, Arminian and Lutheran theology later on). However, the *Curso Conimbricense* and the works of the authors of that first generation of teachers from the *Colégio das Artes* do not exhaust the productivity of the Coimbra Jesuits in pedagogical and didactic matters over the two hundred years of history considered in the *Compêndio histórico*. At least since the first half of the 18th century, in parallel with what happened in other religious Congregations with responsibilities in pre-university or university teaching, such as the Oratorians, there were also efforts among the Jesuits (sometimes frustrated by causes that were alien to them) to renew their curricula of studies in Philosophy and Sciences with subjects taken from the new philosophical doctrines. See: António Alberto Banha de Andrade, *para a história da mentalidade pedagógica portuguesa*, *op. cit.*, pp. 169-190 e 335-405.

<sup>38</sup> See: Fernando Taveira da Fonseca, "História da Universidade de Coimbra", *op. cit.*, pp. 109-137. According to the author, until the Pombaline reformation, it was the religious colleges (with the exception of the *Colégio das Artes*) and those of the military orders that were the almost exclusive suppliers of the teaching staff of the Faculty of Theology. But it is the secular colleges of Saint Peter and Saint Paul, with their elitist culture and rivals in the struggle to guarantee their students access to future positions of influence and power, that are the most important to pay attention to: they "are at the centre of games of influence, in the appointment of Rectors, forming part of Councils and holding almost exclusive teaching positions in the Faculties of Law and Canon Laws" (p.134). Cf. *Idem*, "A Universidade de Coimbra antes da reforma de 1772. Uma visão crítica", in *Aulas y Saberes. VI Congreso Internacional de Historia de las Universidades Hispánicas*, vol. II, Valencia, Universitat de Valencia, 2003, pp. 493-509.

sometimes more in the direction of Thomism and sometimes of Scotism, and the Jesuits and their courses were not the only ones of their kind, as it also happened in other European catholic countries.<sup>39</sup>

In short, the historical representation framework that presides over the *Compêndio histórico* is the following: until the Jesuits' entry, the teaching situation at the Portuguese University was flourishing in all sciences and arts, namely due to the policy by king John III of sending Portuguese students to train at leading European universities like Paris and Louvain and to the monarch's hiring of foreign professors for some subjects. But with the "invasion" of the Jesuits, the humanistic renewal of the university that was in progress was interrupted, and as a result of the successive changes in the University Statutes that these "invaders" surreptitiously devised to make them serve the pursuit of their plans and perverse interests, all the "damages and hindrances" came about in both the contents and the methods of teaching the Sciences and the Arts, followed by the progressive decay of the university over two centuries, culminating in the present situation of total ruin. The Society of Jesus is thus the sole and universal cause of the university's decadence and ruin, but the effect of the damage it produced in this domain reached all other aspects of the kingdom's life. This hyperbolized pernicious action by the Society of Jesus is not due to natural deficiencies, attributable to existential circumstances or to historical-political conjunctures, or to its members' human frailty, but rather it obeys a hidden and perverse plan, a plan systematically pursued and executed, generation after generation, which aimed to institute general ignorance and thus impose that institution's despotic domination, destroying the most fundamental civil laws, sound customs and good religion. It is as if the Jesuits were possessed by a superhuman, perverse, even diabolical force, of such a kind that simple human means could not (and had not for two centuries) resist or contain them. Thus, their physical extermination was justified (already consummated, by

---

<sup>39</sup> In a note to his book about the *Curso aristotélico jesuíta conimbricense*, Mário Santiago de Carvalho mentions that there are, still unpublished, similar courses from other Coimbra colleges, and there will certainly be many more. Bento da Ascensão's *Física* (1675) and Br. António da Luz's *Lógica* (1646), the latter entitled: *Logica Aristotelica ... in Collegio Conimbricensi Scripta*. Teófilo Braga, on his part, in *História da Universidade de Coimbra*, *op. cit.*, p. 420, note 1, drew attention to the immense amount of manuscript material - "some hundreds of years old" - from courses at the *Colégio das Artes* and other Colleges, which still lie dormant at the Coimbra University Library. A wider exhumation, inventorying and study of these courses, which recorded the teaching practised or served as support for that teaching, would probably lead to the conclusion reached by a German historian of philosophy, who studied the manuals and counterpart courses used for the teaching of philosophy throughout the 17th century in the Catholic colleges and universities of Europe, whatever the order or congregation of origin of their authors: the Aristotelian matrix is dominant in all of them and the impression one gets is that "he who reads one, reads them all", so much do they resemble each other in content, structure and form, although the Jesuits' output outnumbers that of all the others, which undoubtedly has its not insignificant significance. See: Paul Richard Blum, "Der Standardkursus der katholischen Schulphilosophie im 17. Jahrhundert", in: Eckhard Kessler *et al.* (ed.), *Aristotelismus und Renaissance*, Wiesbaden, O. Harrassowitz, 1988, pp. 127-148.

denaturalisation, expulsion and expatriation) and now also their intellectual and moral extermination, by this condemnation, with no right of defence or contestation.

The preliminary introduction to the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* opened its first paragraph with this strange comparison, which hangs also over the whole *Compêndio histórico*: “Though it may cause astonishment to the Readers, or seem to them hyperbole, that I warn them, in advance, that the extraordinary metamorphosis from the most prosperous happiness to the greatest desolation, which the entrance of the Jesuits made in Portugal, and all its dominions, has no similar but that of the ravages of the invasion, with which the moors oppressed and desolated Spain; and though at first sight this proposition be made rough in its appearance: it is undoubtedly established on many evidences, which not only suffice, but exceed in constituting a notorious and physical certainty”.<sup>40</sup> The epithets to the “invaders” are successive and repeated *ad nauseam*: the “infested society”, the “tyrannical Empire of the so-called Society of Jesus, which remained from then on for two more consecutive centuries such a terrible scourge of this Crown’s supreme power, of the letters, the arms, commerce, and agriculture of these kingdoms, and all their domains”.<sup>41</sup>

And the author anticipates the reader’s possible strangeness before the “daring” crimes that will be narrated, warning him that what may seem unreal to him is in fact real: “All these seeming moral impossibilities were nonetheless existing, physical truths, which are established on Evidence so authentically, so legally, and so positively, that not even the same, whom they convince, and criminalize, can ever find in all the dilated vastness of their tergiversations, and of their scholastic sophistries, subterfuges, that will suffice for them to conceal them from the eyes of learned, prudent, Christian, and impartial persons, who judge things by what they are in themselves, and not by what the malicious seek, that they may appear to them to deceive them”.<sup>42</sup> In one work as in the other, the reader feels entangled in the web of incidents, of facts, of documents successively adduced as proofs, whose insistently asserted evidence is not attained, but which are effectively rendered “irrefutable” and “convincing” by their massive addition.

On the scientific and pedagogical level, the sum of “damages and hindrances” caused by the Society of Jesus to the University of Coimbra would have resulted, according to the *Compêndio histórico*, into the interruption, for no less than two centuries, of the alleged flourishing renovation that took place there by the middle of the 16th century. The Jesuit “invaders” had instead restored the “rancid” medieval Arabic-Aristotelian scholasticism, with its contents and its methods, and, with this, had polluted all the Sciences and Arts and impeded their advance and real usefulness. The Reform of the University and the granting of its statutes, which the *Compêndio histórico* prepares and announces, represents

---

<sup>40</sup> *Dedução cronológica e analítica*, Part One, § 1

<sup>41</sup> *Ibidem*, § 2.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibidem*, § 3

a new foundation that will inaugurate an era of flourishing of the university, sciences and arts, and soon of the whole kingdom, replacing the darkness of Jesuit ignorance by the lights of reason.

If we wanted to condense the whole argument of the *Compêndio histórico* in a very brief summary, we would say that the work tells a story: the story of a crime, of an immense, nefarious and persistent crime. This crime has its victim, its authors, the means, the weapon, the instruments and manners used by them, the plan they execute and the ends they pursue. The direct victim was the University of Coimbra (and, indirectly, the whole kingdom, which was deprived of the lights of science and submerged in the darkness of ignorance), the target of an “invasion”, an assault, a kidnapping, which led to its complete destruction and ruin. The only and true authors of that robbery were the “so-called Jesuits”, actually, some “false apostles”, “atheists” and morally “perverse”, intellectually, morally, religiously disqualified. The strategy of the crime was the insidious systematic “machination” of the University Statutes in their favour, aiming at the total control of that institution for their benefit. The modes for executing the crime or the “sinister and cunning means” that such “invaders” used were “shameless despotism”, “tyrannical prepotency”, continuous “conspiracy” and all sorts of “stratagems” carried out “maliciously”, “cunningly”, “surreptitiously”, “maliciously”, “deceitfully”. The weapon of the crime was a “poison”, which is called “Arabic-peripateticism” or Aristotle’s “rancid philosophy” or the “Arabic-Aristotelian scholasticism”, a poison that, inoculated by those in the faculties of the University of Coimbra, corroded all the Arts and Sciences and even destroyed the kingdom’s political health. The motive for committing the crime or the end aimed at was the execution of a plan, deliberately devised and systematically pursued by those Jesuits, to produce, through the destruction of the Arts and Sciences, universal ignorance, on which they established their tyrannical and complete economic and political domination of the world.

### **3. THE COMPÊNDIO HISTÓRICO AND THE KNOWLEDGES: DISCIPLINES AND METHODS. FROM ANCIENT TO MODERN: FROM “EMPTY AND STERILE FORMALISM” AND “SCHOLASTIC ARABIC-PERIPATETICISM” TO VAGUE “ECLECTICISM”, NEBULOUS “GEOMETRICAL SPIR- IT” AND FRUSTRATED “EXPERIMENTALISM”**

The second part of the *Compêndio histórico* is dedicated to making a critical assessment of the state of the sciences at the university - that is to say, of the “damages and hindrances” caused to them by the Jesuits and the statutes they allegedly fabricated - and to presenting the monarch with proposals for curricular alteration, substitution or creation of new scientific disciplines and change of the respective teaching methods, which should

be included in the new University Statutes, whose confection was entrusted to the same Junta de Providência Literária. But the Jesuit obsession (the thesis that the Jesuits and the Society of Jesus were totally and solely responsible for the state of decadence and ruin of the University of Coimbra) continues to be present on every page of this section of the work, and is even exaggerated in the long “Appendix” that ends it, presented and justified as a kind of evidence of guilt in the form of a supplement to the second chapter of this second part, which aims to demonstrate the complete corruption of the teaching and practice of Natural Law by the perverse Aristotelian moral taught, professed and practiced by the Jesuits.

Without any doubt, the reform of university studies had long been necessary. The new economic, political and social tasks and the new ideas of the European Enlightenment, which some Portuguese intellectuals were echoing in the country, were creating awareness of the need to change teaching content and methods, making room for new knowledge and new perspectives in the various scientific fields, presented by modern thinkers, from Bacon and Descartes to Newton and Locke. For this, it was necessary to change not only the disciplines and their contents and methods of teaching them, but it was also imperative to change the very paradigm inspiring university studies and the respective social, economic, political and even religious function. Now the paradigm that needed to be replaced by a new one was identified as being of Aristotelian matrix - “Arabic-Aristotelian-Scholastic” - and as being exclusively led by the Jesuits.

In drawing up their account on the state of teaching at the University of Coimbra, the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* made use of the incisive criticism of Jesuit teaching by the Oratorian Luís António Verney, simplifying and reducing it to stereotypes, the most general of which is the idea of a connatural and congenital correlation between the old statutes of the university, pedagogical Jesuitism and Arabic-Scholastic Aristotelianism. The author of the *Verdadeiro método de estudar* (1746) and several Philosophy treatises - on Logic, Metaphysics and Physics<sup>43</sup> - had been a student at the University of Évora, which was completely run by the Jesuits, but was not considered by the authors of the *Compêndio histórico*, because at the time it was written it was already extinct. His blunt criticism towards the disciplinary contents of the various sciences and the methods of Jesuit teaching, expressed in the various Letters that make up that work, were thus aimed at a practice that he knew from his own passive experience and that contrasted with his European experience, which had allowed him access to the knowledge of other more recent alternatives, whether empiricism (Bacon, Locke), or Cartesian and Wolffian rationalism, or modern atomism (Gassendi), or new logics, methods and “arts of thinking”

---

<sup>43</sup> Namely: *De re logica* (Roma, 1751), *Apparatus ad philosophiam et theologiam ad usum lusitanorum adolescentium* (Rome, 1751), *De re metaphysica* (Roma, 1753) e *De re physica* (Rome, 1769).

(of Pedro Ramo and the authors of Port-Royal, Antoine Arnauld and Pierre Nicole) and other “modern eclectics”.

These new logics or “arts of thinking” were presented as new paradigms of thought, which determined the relevance and choice of the objects of reflexion or knowledge, as well as the thought they inspired, whatever the field of knowledge. This is how, in the *Dedicatória* to king D. José of his treatise on Logic, setting the ancients against the moderns (following a strategy that had its origins in the late Renaissance and its highlight in the penultimate decade of the 17th century - Charles Perrault’s famous *Querelle des anciens et des modernes*)<sup>44</sup> and taking the side of the moderns against the ancients, Barbadinho asks: “Which from the Ancients has transmitted to us something in the most severe sciences, except for certain crude and confused principles? Certainly, if we compare with those of the ancients the elucubrations of the moderns, as well as the usefulness of the subjects, the aptitude in teaching, and many other things with which the doctrines transmitted by the ancients have been added to and developed by the moderns, we understand with clarity in how much obscurity and ignorance these have lived”. And, as if making a clean slate of the whole history of this discipline and dismissing as useless the Logic of Aristotle, he is led to state: “Whoever compares Aristotle’s logic, I shall not say with those of the important authors of the present century, but with Gassendi’s, with that of the author of *The Art of thinking*, with that of Hamel, with that of Sylvain Régis and with those of others who have established the fundamental principles of this discipline, will not immediately understand how much disagreement there is between the aforementioned author and each of these? [...] And why do I compare Aristotle with some of the modern eclectics? Everyone cries out aloud that I be allowed to state with intrepidity: A single booklet by Heinecke or Wolff on Logic - considering the order, the clarity and the usefulness of the subjects - seems to surpass by far all the libraries of Aristotle, Theophrastus and Crisippus. [...] Thus, this art of skilfully thinking and of investigating the truth in all the sciences seems to have originated and to have been cultivated only in the present century. Indeed, it is contemptible - and I do not know whether it is also pernicious - a logic which is restricted to such narrow limits that it has a place only in disputes, and cannot pass beyond the boundaries of schools nor be applied to life’s practicality”.<sup>45</sup>

Such a disqualification of Aristotle’s logic implies the disqualification of all knowledge and science that was based on this instrument or set of rules and procedures for the ori-

---

<sup>44</sup> See the essay Leonel Ribeiro dos Santos, “Dos antigos aos modernos. Consciência histórica e consciência de época nos pensadores dos séculos xv a xvii”, in *O espírito da letra. Ensaios de hermenêutica da modernidade*, Lisbon, INCM, 2007, pp. 93-128.

<sup>45</sup> Luís António Verney, *Lógica [De Re Logica, 1748]*, ed. and trans. by Amândio Coxito, fixation of the Latin text by Sebastião Tavares de Pinho and Filipa de Medeiros, Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, 2010, p. 31. Evidently, the disqualification of Aristotle as a logician will correspond to the disqualification of the metaphysical and physical Aristotle, the author of *De re metaphysica* e *De re physica*.

entation and construction of thought. The new desired paradigm is not the Aristotelian system, or any other system, but a philosophy free of any systematic corset: an “eclectic” philosophy, capable of combining the certain and useful truths of the various philosophical tendencies, especially modern ones: namely, “the free, eclectic study, which by making judicious use of the best, and most in conformity with the truth of what has been thought and written, has raised the sciences to the perfection in which they now stand”.<sup>46</sup>

In his Salutation to the Young People of Portugal, to whom his work is addressed, Verney insists on the difference between his proposal and the “peripatetic method”. The latter is described as a sum of “trifles and sophistries”. His, on the other hand, expounds the matter according to a continuous and uninterrupted discourse, without any syllogisms, and asserts that there is no other method of discourse that is easy and secure, so as to be able to judge with certainty and infer by argument, not only in theology but also in all disciplines and in all matters of life.<sup>47</sup>

Such ideas must have sounded pleasant to the Marquis’ and the authors of the *Compêndio histórico*’s ears. They provided arguments for the systematic anti-Aristotelianism that prevails throughout the work and suggested a connatural, complete and univocal equivalence between Aristotelianism and Jesuitism and their respective modes of teaching and teaching contents. And it is this equivalence that presides over the *Compêndio histórico*.

Verney’s frequently quoted works were undoubtedly one of the sources of inspiration for the second part of the *Compêndio histórico*. From them one could grasp an essentially negative characterisation both of Jesuit teaching and of Aristotelian and scholastic philosophy. This was seen, in the first place, as the result of the spurious reception that Aristotle’s philosophy had had among the Arabs (who “made the books of the Greek philosopher very obscure and depraved”) and that would pass from them to the scholastics, who cultivated it with “excessive application to dialectics and contentious metaphysics”, reducing logic to “subtleties and confusions”, to an “art of sophistry”.<sup>48</sup> In support of his critique, Verney draws on the criticisms of a Renaissance man who will also be widely quoted by the authors of the *Compêndio histórico*, Juan Luis Vives, author of a work published in 1531, in which he analyses the “causes of the corruption of the arts and sciences” (*De causis corruptarum artium*), as the first part of his general proposal for reforming the subjects to be taught (*De tradendis disciplinis*). Vives, however, criticised not the Jesuits, since they did not yet exist, but the “pseudo-dialecticians” or false Aristotelians, the pro-

---

<sup>46</sup> *Compêndio histórico*, fl. 250.

<sup>47</sup> Verney, *Lógica*, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-45. Frequently cited in the *Compêndio histórico* is one of its works, which we mentioned before, entitled *Apparatus ad philosophiam et theologiam ad usum lusitanorum adolescentium* (Rome, 1751, an “instrument or *organon* for philosophy and theology”, proposed as an alternative to the “Dialectical Institutions” or the Aristotelian Logics. His work *De re metaphysica* is also cited.

<sup>48</sup> Verney, *Lógica*, *op. cit.*, p. 85.



fessors of the University of Paris, whom the Valencian had known as a student in the first two decades of the 16th century, who hid behind the name and authority of Aristotle, but were ignorant of Aristotle's authentic philosophy, from which he, on the other hand, since he knew it, nourished many of his own ideas. Thus, taking Vives' "pseudo-dialecticians" for all the "scholastics" who adopted "a method identical with that of the Arabs," Verney writes: "We must certainly not be grateful to the scholastics; on the contrary, they must be censured for many reasons. In fact, besides all the errors with which Aristotle and the Arabs were polluted, they too are contaminated by virtue of the addition of some depravities, namely: 1. They prevent the legitimate freedom of philosophising, devoting themselves to applauding the opinions and words of the Peripatetics and to being in continual agreement with them; 2. They do not teach how to know clearly, nor do they concern themselves with the method for judging with certainty, that is, with the criterion of truth; 3. They teach no precepts on the art of criticism; 4. They argue vehemently about subjects that cannot be understood at all and are of no use whatsoever, such as proemials, signs, predicables, categories, modal syllogisms, the art of finding the middle term; 5. They take pleasure in making use of words to which no meaning corresponds... and they argue perpetually among themselves about the signification of words; 6. Their logic is not intended to investigate the truth, but only to dispute, quarrelling about evident and indisputable matters".<sup>49</sup>

"Inquiry", "contamination", "depravity": here is a vocabulary that is also recurrent in the pages of the *Compêndio histórico*. In the same way, the criticism of formalism, from which the sterility and uselessness of Aristotelian logic derives and of the scholastics who follow it - it serves for disputes, not for investigating the truth -, and always the association of the scholastics to the Arabs, whence the idea, which the *Compêndio histórico* replicates, of an amalgamated "Arabic-Peripatetic scholasticism". Such a reasoning is of no use for the human sciences, for theology or for life. And Verney evokes the main Renaissance critics and correctors of Aristotle and his Dialectics or Logic: Lorenzo Valla, Rodolphus Agricola, Juan Luis Vives, Marius Nizolius, Pedro Ramo. All of them share the association of Logic with Rhetoric and the absorption by the latter of whatever substantive and useful could still be salvaged from Aristotelian and scholastic Logic.<sup>50</sup> Such a recovery of Rhetoric, particularly for legal studies where it comes to replace Philosophy, will also be one of

---

<sup>49</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 85) refers to Vives (*De causis*) and to Gassendi (*Exercitationes adversus Aristotelem*, liv. III, p. 70) and even to the Dominican Melchior Cano (*De locis theologicis*, lib. IX, cap, 7), who was also a critic of the sterile formalism of many scholastics of his time.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibidem*, pp.85-87. On this paradigm shift (from Logic and Metaphysics to Rhetoric) in Renaissance thought, see: Leonel Ribeiro dos Santos, *Linguagem, retórica e filosofia no Renascimento, Linguagem, Retórica e Filosofia no Renascimento*, in particular Ch. I: "Viragem para a Retórica e conflito entre Filosofia e Retórica no pensamento renascentista", pp.9-75; and Ch. II: "A Teologia Retórica dos Humanistas (The Rhetorical Theology by the Humanists)", Lisbon, Colibri, 2004, pp. 9-75 e pp. 77-115.

the notes of the *Compêndio histórico*, which, citing some of them, itself associates to those critics and renovators of the flourishing 16th century, before the alleged “invasion” of the Jesuits. In fact, in the proposals for curricula change of the studies of Theology, Laws and Canons and Medicine, there is an intention to return to what is represented to have been that golden age of such sciences, an age which was abruptly interrupted by the two centuries of alleged Jesuit domination of the university, which resulted in an endless series of “damages” caused to those university sciences and “hindrances” to their cultivation and development.

Let us then see what “damages” and “hindrances” have occurred in each of these sciences, and how they can regenerate or clear them. In the first place, in Theology; then in Law, and finally in Medicine.

In Theology, the most general “damage” alleged was that the statutes “machinated” by the Jesuits had restored Scholastic-Peripatetic Theology to the university, interrupting the Renaissance renewal of Theology and reinstating the theological authorities with their summaries or sentences as the doctrine to be taught, and with the respective sects or Chairs (of Peter Lombard, of Thomas Aquinas, of John Duns Scotus, of Durand of Saint-Pourçain, of Gabriel Biel), with their divisions between nominalists and realists, having in common, however, “the contempt by the authorities of the scripture, of the fathers and of the councils, and uniting more and more Philosophy with Theology”: “No one thought differently from what the Masters and heads of the said Schools had thought. All theological study consisted in knowing the questions they had dealt with, in increasing subtleties and excogitating new questions, new reasons and new arguments dictated from the Arabic-Aristotelian Philosophy”.<sup>51</sup>

What then happened to theology with the scholasticism of the 13th (or 11th!) century? This is how the *Compêndio histórico* explains it: “The greater application which from this century onwards has been made to the books of Aristotle, and of Averroes, poured out from the Arabian, has caused the Schools to be inundated with a new flood of subtleties. The theologians became more and more philosophers”; “From this arose contempt for the study of Scripture; to make Aristotle the Oracle, and Organ of theological decisions, they pretended to inquire into the highest mysteries by subtle reasonings and discourses”.<sup>52</sup>

Theology and its teaching would thus have been completely hostage to the “Arabic-Aristotelian Philosophy”, which had been introduced in the 11th (or 13th?) century and lasted until the renewal movements of the 15th and 16th centuries, led by theologians such as Melchor Cano, Afonso de Castro, Luís de Carvalhal, among others. This is how the state of affairs is described: “The Theology that was studied in all these different ages (the Scholastic-Peripatetic, disputatious and warlike Theology), putting aside the useful

---

<sup>51</sup> *Compêndio Histórico*, fls. 129 e 131.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibidem*, fls. 129 e 128.

and necessary doctrines for a good knowledge of dogma and morals and despising the study of the scripture, of the councils, of the fathers, of history, of criticism and further aids and ornaments, appreciated only the subtleties, axioms, reasons, arguments, method, style, and terms of Peripatetic Philosophy, being occupied for the most part with the discussion of abstract and useless questions, divided itself into opinions, and reducing everything to uncertainty. This was the Theology that reigned in the time of the Masters, whom the statutes command to be read in the chairs, and that which continued under their teaching”.<sup>53</sup>

In short, according to the authors of the *Compêndio histórico*, with their University Statutes, the Jesuits were only concerned to perpetuate and fix in the Schools the study of scholastic-peripatetic theology, taking the works of the theologians as texts and not as mere compendia or summaries, they prescribed as the method for the study of theology the same one they used in their philosophical commentaries. But, above all, they would have imposed the necessity of the study of the Peripatetic philosophy in order to be able to attend the Theology Course, ordering the proofs of the conclusions to be based first on reason and then on the authority of Scripture, ceasing to inculcate the necessity of knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew languages for the reading of the same Scripture. With the validity of the Jesuit statutes, “the scholastic-Peripatetic theology [...] soon invaded all the Schools, all the chairs and all the cloisters. The Peripatetic Philosophy again erected its principality; its terms; its distinctions; and its principles, and axioms, were again applied. The study of Dogmatics, of polemics, and of sound morals was despised. All Theology was left consisting of a tedious, and impertinent congeries of dry, and arid questions, of pure name, of possibility, of Dialectic, of Metaphysics, which were of no use to explain the doctrine of the Church, to defend it from its adversaries, and to form the customs, and foster and nourish in the hearts of the faithful true piety”.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> *Ibidem*, fls. 133 e 134.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibidem*, fls. 99 e 100.

<sup>1</sup>In this regard, Teófilo Braga also testifies: “The criticism in the *Compêndio Histórico* is plausible and clear as far as the particularities are concerned; it only errs in attributing the decadence of Theology to the University of Coimbra, when the situation was the same in all the Catholic universities of Europe. ”, *História da Universidade de Coimbra*, *op. cit.*, p. 684 More recently, in his essay on “A Teologia [na Universidade de Coimbra]”(in *História da Universidade em Portugal*, vol. I, t. II, *op. cit.*, pp. 781-816), Fernando Taveira da Fonseca takes stock of the situation in these terms: “The image that it has been possible to sketch from the theological knowledge professed at the University of Coimbra lacks many necessary features. There are, therefore, fewer conclusions than questions: one of these to which, I believe, it is not yet possible, in the current state of research, to give an impartial and complete answer is that of the real meaning of the evolution of theological knowledge and teaching in the University up to the Pombaline reform. And the difficulty [...] originates in the fact that, more than any other science, the university boundaries are diluted and the professed teaching lives from a multiplicity of contributions, largely forged abroad. It is also worth asking whether the constraints imposed by orthodoxy [...] constituted an invincible factor of

The *Compêndio histórico* proposes, therefore, the abandonment of such theology and a return to the impulse of 16th century renewal, which was allegedly frustrated by the harmful role of the Jesuits in the drafting of the University Statutes. Moreover, it even intends to return to pre-scholastic theology, or to one not yet infected by scholasticism, as would have been that cultivated by the fathers of the Church. Thus, the sources of doctrine and teaching of this new Theology will no longer be the sentences or the Summaries by the theologians or theologian-philosophers, but Scripture (whose study must be aided by Philology and knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew languages, by History and Geography, by Criticism and Hermeneutics), followed by the councils and their dogmas, and the writings of the fathers of the Church and all completed with the history of the Church. But the teaching method is also changed: instead of proposing an analytic-disputational method, which only favours the infinite dispersion of matters and the final uncertainty as to what is really to be taken as truth, a synthetic and compendious method is proposed, which expounds doctrines well founded and clear in those authorities, which can be really intelligible and useful for the orientation of life.

The work's authors do not realize that what they are proposing is to replace the arguments or clarifications of reason (or philosophy) by the authority of texts also written by humans, or to replace the rejected authority of a pagan philosopher, who speaks only in the name of human reason, by the arguments of Christian theologians, who support their theses by applying to them the seal of authority of a supposed divine revelation. This is not exactly *sola scriptura*, because it is accompanied by the *auctoritas* of the texts of the Councils and of the holy fathers and of tradition. But the one who judges and who decides on the pertinence of these authorities is still and always another authority, which is right because it is Authority. The similarity of the new curriculum of theological studies proposed in the *Compêndio histórico* with that adopted at the time in the Jansenist theological formation circles does not pass unnoticed. And, in fact, epistolary or sympathetic relations are known between members of the authorial and editorial team of the work (deputies of the *Real Mesa Censória*, collaborators and men from the Marquis' circle, the Marquis himself) and French and Dutch Jansenist circles, namely through the Jansenist theologian Gabriele Dupac de Bellegarde and the Oratorian Fr. António Pereira de Figueiredo. In 1763, that Jansenist theologian had sent to the Oratorian and to the kingdom's Secretariat of State (where Sebastião José de Carvalho e and D. Luís da Cunha were), a "Memoir" of orientation and recommendations addressed to the Portuguese monarch so that he would have them present in the reform of the theological studies in Portugal (*Mémoire au sujet des études ecclésiastiques du Royaume de Portugal*), which intended to make one forget the teaching of the already expelled Jesuits in the theological and moral domain. The propos-

---

stagnation and outdating; or whether the unanimous acceptance of the *Unigenitus* Bull in 1717, in line with the University of Paris, can be understood as uncritical and corporate submission". (p.816)

als of the *Compêndio histórico* give effective and full reception to the recommendations of that “Memoir”, which exposed a clear Jansenist and openly anti-Jesuitical position.<sup>55</sup>

This is a point that would need more detailed study, although existing studies on the subject allow the identification and recognition of one of the main possible sources that inspired the general spirit that presides over the *Compêndio histórico*: theological and political-legal Jansenism. More than the Calvinists and the Lutherans, the Jansenists were the most fierce and persistent adversaries and slanderers of the Jesuits, of their morals and in general of their teaching, as can also be seen by the piece attached to the *Compêndio histórico* - the “Appendix”, by the theologian Father António Pereira de Figueiredo, of whom will be discussed below.<sup>56</sup>

If we move on from Theology to Jurisprudence - laws and canons - the situation is no different, as far as the accusation on the Jesuits’ responsibilities is concerned - “harmful authors of the statutes” - over the ruinous and deadlocked situation to which legal studies have come: “This pernicious deadlock in Jurisprudence was not the work of chance, nor of ignorance; but it was all set up on purpose”.<sup>57</sup> In this regard, we should also note the

---

<sup>55</sup> See: Cândido dos Santos, “Os jansenistas franceses e os estudos eclesiásticos na época de Pombal”, *Máthesis*, n.º 13, 2004, pp. 67-104; *Idem*, “António Pereira de Figueiredo, Pombal e a *Aufklärung*. Ensaio sobre o *regalismo* e o *jansenismo* em Portugal na 2.ª metade do século XVIII”, in *O Marquês de Pombal e o seu tempo*, vol. IV, t. 1, *op. cit.*, pp. 167-203, José Antunes, in his essay on the ideology of the Pombaline reform (see note 20 above), also points out this inspirational matrix and even shows very specifically how foreign Jansenist authors (of theological, political and juridical Jansenism) were generously represented in the works referred to in the *Compêndio histórico* and in those recommended for the reformed university teaching. See cited article, pp.165-168. On the decisive influence of Jansenism in the creation of anti-Jesuitism and the staging of anti-Jesuitic public opinion at the European level, see Christine Vogel, *Guerra aos Jesuítas. A propaganda antijesuítica do Marquês de Pombal em Portugal e na Europa*, *op. cit.*, pp. 48-68.

<sup>56</sup> Besides the essay and work mentioned in the previous note, see Cândido dos Santos, *O Jansenismo em Portugal*, Oporto: FLUP, 2007; Zília Osório de Castro, “O *regalismo* em Portugal. António Pereira de Figueiredo”, *Revista Cultura História e Filosofia*, Lisbon, 1987, vol. VI, pp.357-411; *Idem*, “Jansenismo versus Jesuitismo. Nicollò Pagliarini e o projecto político pombalino”, *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia*, t. 52 (1996), pp.223-232; *Idem*, “Antecedentes do *regalismo* pombalino”, *Estudos de Homenagem a João Francisco Marques*, Oporto: FLUP, 2001, pp.323-331; Francisco António Lourenço Vaz, “Jansenismo e *Regalismo* no Pensamento e na Obra de D. Frei Manuel do Cenáculo”, History Department of the University of Évora. Centre for the Study of History and Philosophy of Science (monograph s.d.). On the relationship between Friar Manuel do Cenáculo and Jansenism and Gallicanism, see also the more moderate position of Marcadé, according to whom, despite his proximity to the Jansenist theses, he was not however a Jansenist “in the strict sense of the term”: J. Marcadé, *Frei Manuel do Cenáculo Vilas Boas*, *op. cit.*, pp. 205-210. The relationship between the Marquis of Pombal and Jansenism is usually seen through his relationship with the Dutch physician Gerard van Swieten. António Soares Barbosa, one of the new lenses of Philosophy (Logic, Metaphysics and Ethics) at the already reformed University of Coimbra, to which the minister took office on October 9<sup>th</sup>, 1772, was known for his Jansenism and as a disseminator of writings by Jansenist authors. The philosophic Jansenism is also revealed in the authors invoked and in the respective works referred to, quoted, recommended or prescribed for the new courses.

<sup>57</sup> *Compêndio Histórico*, fl. 241.

explicit reference to Verney's criticisms (*Verdadeiro método de estudar*, letters 13 and 15, respectively on civil jurisprudence and canon jurisprudence) to Jesuit teaching on these subjects and also to the proposals that he presents for their correction.<sup>58</sup> This section's text is even more bloated, in convoluted and redundant paragraphs, and with many of its pages full of very long notes consisting many of them of transcriptions in Latin taken mainly from works by Germanic authors.

Despite the insistent and redundant rhetoric of holding the Jesuits also responsible for the ruin of legal studies, such responsibility, if any, could only be indirect, insofar as attendance at the Arts Course, and namely the Philosophy subjects, was necessary for accessing the Law and Canon Law courses. For this reason, the *Compêndio histórico* will take some time to criticise the Jesuit Arts Course and to propose corrections to it, both in content and form. Starting with the classical languages, Latin and Greek, whose necessity is emphasised, passing on to Rhetoric, whose importance is especially recommended for the functions of jurisprudence, and to Logic, but not to the "terrible logic of the Peripatium" but to the "modern logic" of such disparate authors as Pedro Ramo, Bacon, Descartes, Gassendi, Nicole and other modern ones, that one cannot see how a synthesis or an "eclectic" primer can be made of them; then on to Metaphysics, but not the "vulgar Metaphysics of the School", but Metaphysics as it had been "reformed" since the previous century, namely, in its specifications of Ontology, Cosmology, Pneumatology and Natural Theology, with care, however, that it be cultivated not for its own sake, but "to be famular to other sciences".<sup>59</sup> And finally, Moral, "the noblest part of Philosophy and the queen of philosophical disciplines",<sup>60</sup> which constitutes the foundation of Jurisprudence and also dictates its ends. For this reason, Moral is the object of a longer appreciation and, as if this were not enough, the work's final Appendix serves as a detailed supplement to it.

Thus, a systematic critique is made of the Morals of the scholastic theologians and Jesuits, whose main error is to have abandoned the moral texts of the holy fathers of the Church and to have adopted as their guide the "ungodly," "pagan," "atheistic," and "perverse" Morals by Aristotle. They "have taken as the basis of their system the aforesaid Ethics of Aristotle. And they were thus demonstratively manifesting that the points of their views were not to direct, and to teach true and sound philosophy; but only and only to distract the people towards the precipice of ignorance, to corrupt religion, and to depraved customs by the study and lesson of the Ethics of the same Aristotle".<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup>See: Mário Júlio de Almeida Costa, "Debate Jurídico e Solução Pombalina", in VV. AA., *Como interpretar Pombal?*, op. cit., pp. 81-107; *Idem*, "O direito (cânones e leis)", in *História da Universidade em Portugal*, op. cit., pp. 823-834.

<sup>59</sup> *Compêndio Histórico*, fl. 167.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibidem*, fl. 169.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibidem*, fl. 183.

The “impiety” and “perversity” of this Ethics are revealed in the general peculiarities of its author’s philosophy or in the “execrable impurities” that arise from his theology, cosmology, physics, and psychology: his God is a god very limited in power; his world is eternal, and not created by God; likewise, matter is eternal; and the human soul is not regarded by him as immortal.<sup>62</sup> Moreover, there also follows from his peculiar and perverse ethical principles, first, the denial that there is full certainty in regard to moral principles, from which follows the irremediable moral probabilism; then, the deduction of what is virtuous, just, and honest from established civil laws; their idea that happiness and the supreme good are confined to civil life; the notion of virtue as a balance between excess and defect, a criterion that does not allow one to truly distinguish what is a truly virtuous and a truly vicious action. But the Jesuit Aristotelian-scholastics added still other defects to the Aristotelian system: they did not inquire into the genuine guiding principles of moral actions; they did not derive moral obligations from the rational nature and faculties of the human soul; they did not give clear and exact definitions of virtues and vices; in short: they confused the precepts of Aristotelian ethics with those of evangelical morality, the principles of reason with those of faith. And finally, with the harmful introduction of dialectics into Morals, they created a contentious and litigious morality, multiplying the “cases of conscience” and the “metaphysical cases”, all resulting in a complete scepticism or moral Pyrrhicism.

After an apprenticeship in the Arts, thus purged of scholastic Aristotelianism and suitably corrected, legal studies of Laws and Canons may be pursued, beginning with the restored Natural Law, for which the modern Hugo Grotius, Samuel Pufendorf, Christian Thomasiaus and Christian Wolff, followed by the Law of the Gentiles, Civil Law, Homeland Law, and all this together with the History of Law, General History, Ecclesiastical and Literary History, knowledge of living languages and the Doctrine of Method, and articulating theory with practice. In this way, the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* believe it will free future Portuguese jurists from those times when, allegedly, the Jesuits “despised the *Aurora Cujaciana*, which was already dawning in the minds of jurists, and went to seek the dark, dark nights of Accursius and Bartolus, in order to eternalise us in

---

<sup>62</sup> These topics had been recurrent in the controversies between defenders of Plato and defenders of Aristotle through the Renaissance (Jorge Gemisto Plethon, *De differentiis Platonis et Aristoteles*, 1439, to which George of Trebizonda replied [*Comparatio Platonis et Aristotelis*, 1458], to which John Bessarion would reply [*In calumniatorem Platonis*, 1459]). But they were already invoked in the Augustinian scholastic sectors of the thirteenth century, who were reacting to the assimilation of Aristotelianism by Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas: Aristotle’s ethics is a mere technique of maximizing intellectual and bodily pleasures; Aristotelian cosmology is incompatible with the doctrine of free creation by God, for Aristotle’s God is not a creator transcendent to the World, but only a first cause of it, which is eternal like matter; Aristotle’s whole philosophy tends towards materialism, naturalism and atheism. Cf. James Hankins, *Plato in the Italian Renaissance*, Leiden/New York/ København/ Köln: Brill, 1991, pp. 205-207.

the darkness of ignorance”.<sup>63</sup> Accursius (1182-1263) and Bartolus de Saxoferrato (1313-1357) represented the medieval Italian school of jurisprudence, of the commentators or glossers of the letter of the law and the interpreters of legal codes with a view to discovering the *ratio legis*; while the Frenchman Jacobus Cujacius (1522-1590) represents the Renaissance school of jurisprudence, whose spirit is intended to be restored in Portuguese legal teaching with the new University Statutes.

Moving on to the other science or faculty considered in the *Compêndio histórico - Medicina* -, one invariably replies to the general thesis of accusation that its ruin over two hundred years was caused by the Jesuits and their pernicious statutes. Also in this section of the work are the observations of Verney (*Verdadeiro método*, letter 12), Ribeiro Sanches (*Método para aprender a estudar medicina (Method for learning the study of medicine)*, Paris, 1761) and the physician Jacob de Castro Sarmiento, both in their criticisms of the state of medical science in Portugal and its causes, and with regard to the reform measures to be taken. But the main fault of the proposed account is always the same: pointing to one and the same cause in all cases: the Jesuits and their statutes. It is also worth quoting in this regard the historian Teófilo Braga, who wrote: “The medical studies declined in Portugal for complex causes; we will cite in the first place the successive persecutions against the new Christians, resulting in a great emigration of men of science who went to ennoble the foreign Universities. On the other hand, the *Physicatura* selling letters to idiot doctors, and a false idea of the indignity of the medical profession, which resulted in a shortage of students, who preferred the lucrative degrees in law, canons and theology”.<sup>64</sup>

The aforementioned judgement by Teófilo Braga opens up a wider space for analysis and for a more fruitful methodological attitude that has guided some more recent studies on the subject.<sup>65</sup> In fact, this scientific area is especially dependent on modern experimental Physics and Chemistry, in which Aristotelian science, as such, could be of little help and could rather constitute a hindrance.<sup>66</sup> More than in the other sciences already considered, Medicine must be founded on Physics or science of nature in the broad sense (general and experimental Physics, Chemistry, Natural History), on Geometry or Mathematics, on observation and experimentation, on clinical and surgical practice, and that the tutelage of Aristotle be replaced by that of Paracelsus, Bacon, Descartes, Locke, Newton, Boheraave and others (some of whom certainly would not want to have all the others for

---

<sup>63</sup> *Compêndio Histórico*, fl. 303.

<sup>64</sup> Teófilo Braga, *História da Universidade de Coimbra*, *op. cit.*, pp. 770-771.

<sup>65</sup> See: Miller Guerra, “A reforma pombalina dos estudos médicos”, in VV. AA., *Como interpretar Pombal?*, *op. cit.*, pp. 277-295; Fernando Taveira da Fonseca, “A medicina [na Universidade de Coimbra]”, in *História da Universidade em Portugal*, *op. cit.*, pp. 835-874.

<sup>66</sup> Although Aristotle’s other naturalistic studies (*On the parts of animals*; *On generation and corruption*) are not unimportant.



company!). The study of classical languages (Latin and Greek), philosophical and mathematical studies, natural studies, studies of Anatomy and Physiology, clinical and surgical practice are recommended for the training of new doctors, for which obviously the adequate technical establishments and equipment are required and suggested, which the new reform will only very partially provide, defrauding the hope of the promised scientific salvation through the adoption and generalised increase of experimentalism.<sup>67</sup>

#### 4. THE “APPENDIX”, OR THE DEFINITIVE ATTESTATION OF THE JESUITS’ MORAL AND RELIGIOUS DISCREDIT

To reinforce their thesis with more proof documents and as a supplement to what was exposed in chapter 2 of Part II, the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* decided to add to the work a long “Appendix”,<sup>68</sup> written by Father António Pereira de Figueiredo, which was an autonomous piece that had several editions and was essentially taken from a French opusculum that compiled perverse sentences or doctrines attributed to the Jesuits or some of their moralists and theologians.<sup>69</sup> This Appendix shows how much the accusations against the Jesuits already depended on a wider movement of European scope, in this case with a French matrix and above all with Jansenist inspiration. In this Appendix the disqualification and the moral and even religious discredit of the regulars of the Society and of the Society as a whole is consummated in the most extreme form. The French booklet that served as its basis gathers its material from the many anti-Jansenist controversies produced above all in Jansenist circles in Port-Royal, examples of which are the *Lettres provinciales* and the *Écrits des curés de Paris*, writings attributed to Blaise Pascal, Antoine Arnauld and Pierre Nicole, though mostly written by Pascal, with their collaboration. These writings were mainly aimed at attacking the morals considered lax,

---

<sup>67</sup> Miller Guerra goes so far as to say that “the *Compêndio histórico*, in the part relating to Medicine, is more in line with the science of the time than the statutes. Anatomy, Surgery and Clinical Medicine are highlighted there, as well as the need for new establishments for the teaching and advancement of science: the Anatomical Theatre, the Pharmaceutical Dispensary, the Hospital Apothecary, the Botanical Garden, and the Teaching Hospital” (“A reforma pombalina dos estudos médicos”, in *op. cit.*, pp. 288-289).

<sup>68</sup> *Appendix ao capítulo segundo da Segunda Parte para servir de suplemento ao sexto dos estragos e impedimentos que a Sociedade Jesuítica fez e acumulou para corromper e impossibilitar o estado da Jurisprudência canónica e civil com a introdução e propagação da moral de Aristóteles*. Some recent studies, already referred to above, have pointed out Pereira de Figueiredo’s relations with Jansenist circles and others have suggested, if not the explicit adherence to Jansenist ideas, at least the sympathy of members of the *Junta de Providência Literária* for Jansenist ideas and authors, including Friar Manuel do Cenáculo himself and the Marquis of Pombal.

<sup>69</sup> *Extrait des assertions dangereuses et pernicieuses en tout genre que les doi-disant Jesuites on, dans tous les temps & perseverament, soutenues, enseignées & publiées dans leurs livres avec l’approbation de leurs Supérieurs généraux, vérifiées et collationnées par les commissaires du Parlement en exécution de l’arrêt de la Cour du 31 août 1761 et arrêt du 3 septembre suivant, sur les livres, thèses, cahiers composés, dictés et publiés par les soi-disant Jésuits*, Paris, Chez P. G. Simon, 1762.

perverse and evil in the Jesuits and the casuistic moralists who were inspired by them. With their specious probabilistic reasoning, the Jesuits not only perverted customs, but perverted the very rule of customs, and instead of trying to accommodate the life of men to the precepts of Christ, they tried to accommodate the precepts and rules of Christ to the interests, passions and pleasures of men. Such permissive false moralists promoted the annihilation of the law of God and in its place put mere human natural reason as the light and rule of moral discernment and of all actions. It was a debate between devout rigorists - followers of what they understood to be the law of Christ and the most genuine Christianity - and their Jesuit adversaries, considered to be worldly laxists, who in their elucubrations on concrete situations for which they wanted to find the measure of the fault's gravity and the respective penance, showed that the law cannot be applied absolutely and abstractly, but according to circumstances, which were infinite in number. Names of moral theologians of the Society are mentioned and quoted, and reference is made to their respective works. It is this same theme that is also discussed in the 18 long *Lettres Provinciales*, also written by Pascal (between 1656-1657). The tone is the same, but in the epistolary genre.<sup>70</sup>

Controversies between Jansenists and Jesuits began early, at least since Cornelius Jansenius' *Augustinus* (1640) was published posthumously. But the bishop of Ypres' ideas were already known, and the work was immediately criticised by Leonardo Lessius, a Flemish Jesuit professor in Louvain who had attended the courses of Francisco Suárez and Roberto Belarmino at the Collegio Romano. The quarrels went on for more than a century, with provocations, calumnies from both sides, reciprocal accusations of heresy and even papal condemnations in between.<sup>71</sup> It can even be said that the Jesuits had their fiercest enemies among the Jansenists and that the latter had them among the Jesuits. The rela-

---

<sup>70</sup> Christine Vogel (*Guerra aos Jesuítas. A propaganda antijesuítica do Marquês de Pombal em Portugal e na Europa, op. cit.*, pp. 48-68.) puts due emphasis on the powerful influence of this truly pan-European (French, Belgian, Dutch, Italian, Austrian, German...) Jansenist strand of anti-Jesuitism, also pan-European. She writes: "The Jansenists managed to make their disputes with the Jesuits "proper salon" and to interest a wide public in this polemic of a theological-moral nature, at the latest with the *Lettres provinciales*, which achieved an unusual success. This 16th century text was the cornerstone of a Jesuit literature that had its own canon, and in which expressions such as "probabilism", "laxity", "mental reservation" and "Chinese rites" became key words in common use. The Jesuit debate of the years 1758 to 1773 seems unthinkable without taking into account this canon and these keywords. The debate only becomes comprehensible starting from tradition and against the background of the history of Jansenism during the eighteenth century" (p. 53).

<sup>71</sup> The persistent accusations of the Jansenist sector and the Bayanist faction from the University of Louvain were eventually received by Pope Innocent XI, who, by the Decree of the Holy Office on March 2, 1679, condemned 65 casuistic propositions taken from the writings of theologians and moralists (among whom were Jesuits such as Escobar, Vásquez, Molina, Lessius and Suárez), considering them to be "*errores doctrinae moralis laxioris*", which, at the very least, were to be considered "*tamquam scandalosae et in praxi perniciosae*". A century later, it was the response to the retraction to which the Louvain theologian

tions and sympathies from the Marquis of Pombal and intellectuals and collaborators of his circle towards the French and Dutch Jansenists are well known. And there is no doubt that there hangs over the whole *Compêndio histórico* the air of a last reckoning and of a posthumous Jansenist revenge against the now extinct Jesuitism, an impression which the addition of the “Appendix” confirms.

Chapter 2 of Part II of the *Compêndio histórico* dealt with the “damages and hindrances” which the Jesuit Society did and accumulated to corrupt and make the Study of Canonical and Civil Jurisprudence impossible as a result of the introduction and propagation of Aristotle’s *Morals* by the fabricators and compilers of the 1598 statutes. They are accused of having taken Aristotle’s *Ethics* as the basis of their system, instead of adopting the moral writings of the holy fathers Gregory the Great and Ambrose: “and they thus manifested that the points of their views were not to direct and teach true and sound Philosophy, but rather and only to distract the people towards the precipice of ignorance, corrupted Religion and depraved customs by the lesson and study of the *Ethics* of the same Aristotle”.<sup>72</sup>

Having incorporated it by means of adapting it, the long Appendix into the *Compêndio histórico*, as being one more document of proof of the general accusation developed throughout the work, the authors put on the robes of morality and religiosity judges in the disqualifying judgement of Aristotelian and Jesuit morality, of which they give this summary: “The said philosopher [Aristotle] did not teach man the perpetual rules of his actions, who was the source of all moral failures, who gave no rules for the probity of a good man, but for if a hypocritical atheist and courtier of pretended virtues, who was entirely lacking in all natural religion, who imagined of God unworthily, who was notorious atheist, teaching that the soul died with the body, who with his false and abominable scepticism relaxed the springs of all virtues, opened the doors of all vices, that this was the demonstrative judgment that learned and pious men made and make of the same Aristotle, and that, finally, due to the fact that the system of the same Aristotle was the only one that conformed to the deceptive plan of the same Jesuit Society, that is why it adopted it with preference to all other systems of *Morals* and why it followed and defended it until now with all its strength so tenaciously and obstinately”.<sup>73</sup>

It then unravels a long procession of twenty-two “atrocities” in morality (with implications for religion, law and politics, and not just in theory, but above all in practice) that result from this system which, according to the accusers, is said to have been an intentional take on “Aristotelian-Jesuitical atheism”.

---

Michel Baius (1513-1589) had been obliged in 1579 by Pope Gregory XIII, the Jesuit Francis of Toledo (1532-1596) having been charged with receiving the retraction in the Pope’s name.

<sup>72</sup> *Compêndio Histórico*, “Apêndice”, § 1.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibidem*, § 2.

The first “atrocities” pointed out is the absolute and authoritarian monarchism of the Society of Jesus itself, which makes of this corporation a united body in total obedience to its general. Hence the unanimism that characterises such a Society, which at the same time does everything to create dissensions and discord, and to stir up insurrections and sedition in all the States, breaking the respective civil, moral and religious unity to pursue its perverse ends.

The second atrocity is the cultivation of probabilism, “practising Aristotle’s Moral, carnal and atheistic, for its own sake and to destroy the human race”.<sup>74</sup> Probabilism is presented as a kind of moral Pyrrhonism that presides over the “carnal and atheistic morality of Aristotle” and which in turn stems from the adoption of the “ungodly and blasphemous principles of Aristotelian Physics and Metaphysics and the subtle, abstract, dark and confused and worldly way in which he treats Morals”.<sup>75</sup> And in this regard no less than 57 Jesuit doctors are cited, defenders and practitioners of this “atrocity”, in their overwhelming majority foreigners, among whom also appears the name of Francisco Suárez, who, as the only Jesuit who was a professor at the University of Coimbra, was not, however, teaching Morals or Laws, but Theology. Theses or passages from the works by those authors are taken from their contexts of exposition, and examples or considerations are gathered from the casuistic morality expounded in those writings, which are understood to be proof of a probabilistic morality professed by the respective authors, morality that could be translated into this maxim: when one cannot reach absolute certainty about what should be done, one may in good conscience follow the most probable opinion or doctrine, which has some good or sufficient reason to support it, or the authority of some doctor. The Jesuits’ critics, whom the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* endorse by including the subject in their work, considered the prospect of moral probabilism, which they wrongly supposed to be an exclusive attribute of the moral doctrine of the Jesuits, as throwing on the moral ground a poison of insecurity, of laxity, of permissiveness, or even of opportunism and expediency in the interpretation of moral duties or obligations.<sup>76</sup> It must be warned, however, that the inverse vice that such critics may incur is that of universalising and imposing as a duty for all that which is only considered as such by some, without there being unequivocal rational evidence that it should be so for all, and above

---

<sup>74</sup> *Ibidem*, § 16.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibidem*, § 17.

<sup>76</sup> See the famous case on the trial of the Oratorian Father Valentim de Bulhões, accused of teaching probabilism, but much more than the “probabilism” of Molina or of the English Jesuit Terill (“reflex probabilism”), he would profess, according to the terms of the accusation, a “diabolically reflex probabilism”! See: Banha de Andrade, “Pombal e os Oratorianos”, in *Contributos para a história da mentalidade pedagógica portuguesa, op. cit.*, pp. 419-433 (especialmente pp.425-426), Idem, “Processo pombalino contra os Oratorianos”, in *ibidem*, pp.435-490. The conclusion was drawn that “the systems of the Neris’ Congregates are the same as those of the wicked Jesuits” (p. 463).

all without attention to the infinitely variable objective and subjective circumstances in which the concrete and singular actions of human beings actually occur. In the antipodes of probabilism and sensible doubt or hesitation lurk radical puritanism, fundamentalism, unconditional rigorism, and even moral terrorism.

The third “atrocities” is the Jesuit doctrine of “philosophical sin”, also called “invincible ignorance” or “erroneous consciousness”. Which can be translated into this general maxim: he who ignores natural law, if he transgresses it, does not commit sin, because, for there to be sin, the knowledge of the law and the explicit will to violate it are necessary. Therefore, pagans are not in sin because they do not know the true God, and even if the true religion is preached to them, if they do not understand it to be true, they do not sin if they do not accept it.

Qualified forms of irreligion and superstition, which were considered to be consented to or practised by the Jesuits, are the 11th and 12th “atrocities”, referring to the so-called “Chinese and Malabarian rites”, an issue born at the end of the 16th century with the beginning of the missionarying of China by the Jesuits of the Portuguese Patronage, and which would drag on for the next two centuries, with progress and setbacks, coming to have final sanction from the authority of the Church, already in the 20th century, posthumously giving unequivocal reason to Jesuit practice.<sup>77</sup> The Jesuits, considering the importance of the civil cult of Confucius and their ancestors to the Chinese, allowed them, even if Christianised, to continue to practise these ancestral customs of their culture. Years later, however, as soon as Franciscan and Dominican missionaries also arrived in China, they considered this to be a grossly reprehensible and inadmissible superstition, and they went on to wage a persistent and exhausting war against the Jesuits. The question reached Europe and added to the already vast list of accusations, suspicions and slanders against the Society of Jesus, becoming not only a religious and theological-moral question, but also a political one, involving other countries with an interest in the mission to China, as was the case of France under Louis XIV and of Spain. The authors of the *Compêndio histórico* and of this “Appendix” like to display their broadmindedness and philosophical knowledge, and once in a while they also invoke as authorities in support of their allegations against the Jesuits the German philosopher Leibniz and his disciple Christian Wolff, seeming not to realize how much these philosophers appreciated the Aristotelianism, even from the scholastics and the Jesuits. But they were not able to extend their reading on these philosophers that they seem to hold so dear to the point of seeing how much one and the other appreciated and used in their respective systems not only the philosophy (and also the moral philosophy) of Aristotle. And even how much they appreciated and used aspects of the metaphysical and ethical-legal thought of the great Jesuit philosopher Francisco Suárez, who, for the authors of the *Compêndio histórico*, only appears on the list

---

<sup>77</sup> Horácio Peixoto de Araújo, *Os Jesuítas no império da China*, *op. cit.*, pp. 203-284.

of exprobated Jesuit doctors. Since, with his nefarious doctrine of popular sovereignty, he would have inspired and encouraged the vassals to kill their kings. Now, precisely those two Germanic and Lutheran philosophers were also among the few voices that, in their time, were able to understand and recognize the pertinence of the position assumed by the Jesuit missionaries in their missionary practice in China, because of the respect they showed for the very advanced culture existing in that ancient Empire, proceeding in ways that were certainly daring and innovative, but honest and sensible, of acculturation towards the message of Christianity, distinguishing the essential from the accessory and seeking and valuing above all the recognisable homologies between the different religions, even if this meant accepting some practices which were, so to speak, natural to the civil culture of those peoples, which, to those who only superficially appreciated them, might seem superstitious. Among these rituals was the veneration or civil cult of Confucius, the ancestral philosopher who formulated the principles of Morals for the Chinese.<sup>78</sup> The Jesuits also have that in their curriculum of benefits (or “damages”, according to the *Compêndio histórico’s* authors!): they brought Aristotle and his philosophy to the knowledge of the Chinese and precisely through their Aristotelian course in Coimbra, and they also brought Chinese theological and philosophical thought to European philosophers.

In the long “Appendix” further countless “atrocities” also parade, attributed to the “filthy Jesuit writers”, “lascivious henchmen of Aristotle’s Morals”,<sup>79</sup> such as: the legitimisation of the practice of simony, blasphemy, sacrilege, magic, judicial astrology and palmistry, irreligion, idolatry, impudence and obscenity, the falsification of documents, perjury, the prevarication of judges, the legitimation of theft and of self-compensation by the one to whom is owed what is not paid, and even the legitimation of homicide and parricide, tyrannicide and regicide, an accusation which is insistent in many pages, aiming at directly implicating the Jesuits as moral (if not material) authors in the attempt against king Dom José. In short: according to their accusers, the Jesuits, “to complete the disastrous work of dissolving the Christian union, civil society and universal desolation, reached the height of the most sacrilegious and execrable impudence, arming the vassals against their sovereigns with permissions and incentives”.<sup>80</sup> This is followed by the question of secrecy, or the accusation of the alleged systematic use of the breach of the secrecy of confession by Jesuit confessors for the purposes of the corporation’s political, social, and economic

---

<sup>78</sup> G.W. Leibniz, *Discours sur la théologie naturelle des Chinois plus quelques écrits sur la question religieuse de Chine*, Paris: L’Herne, 1987. See especially the four letters to Father Antoine Verjus and the essay “De cultu Confucii civili”. Christian Wolff’s *Oratio de Sinarum Philosophia practica*, [1721], Hamburg: F. Meiner, 1985), in which he stresses the agreement of Confucian moral philosophy with the philosophy of correct human reason, without having to appeal to a divine revelation in order to sustain or found it.

<sup>79</sup> *Compêndio Histórico*, “Apêndice”, §§ 117 and 116.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibidem*, § 232.

interests, using the information gathered in the confessional “for the reprehensible ends of their economic government of the world”.<sup>81</sup>

At the end, we are referred to an Italian book, *Confrontação da doutrina da Igreja com a doutrina da Sociedade dos Jesuítas* (Confrontation of the doctrine of the Church with the doctrine of the Society of the Jesuits), which had just been translated into Portuguese and published in Lisbon, at the *Oficina Régia* in the year 1770. This other document of the international anti-Jesuitical serves the purpose of repeating for one last time the thesis of intellectual, moral and even theological and religious reprobation of the members of the Society of Jesus’ memory. Reading such a book, one concludes the same thesis that had been inculcated throughout the *Compêndio histórico*: “that the Authors of the University Statutes established in it, in all the schools which they dominated, the Peripatetic Logic and the Ethics and Metaphysics of Aristotle, in order to destroy not only Evangelical Morals and Christian piety, but also the dogmas of the Church; [...] that neither could the *estragadores* (ruiners) of the said dogmas ruin them if the Schools were directed by the Holy Scriptures, by tradition, by the councils and by the holy fathers; as fortunately happened in the first eleven centuries of the Church and as was practiced in the University of Coimbra before the statutes...; nor is it credible that so many men worked with so many and such laborious toils to ruin the dogmas of the faith and its fundamentals without being Atheists, separated from all belief in God and from all idea of a future and eternal life, nor could human malice think of any other reflex means to such an execrable and abominable end than those of the aforesaid Peripatetic Logic and those of the aforesaid Ethics and Metaphysics of the Atheist Aristotle, who with identical objects and identical Stratagems, abandoned all knowledge of God and eternity to establish in forgetfulness of it the temporal interests of wealth and political predicaments in the Courts of Philip and Alexander, which he corrupted with his sectarian and perverse doctrines, so, and in the same manner as the Authors of the said statutes practised it for these last two centuries in this Royal Court, while their influence dominated therein”.<sup>82</sup>

If irony were permitted with such a serious thing, one would say, *mutatis mutandis*, that the true and only original sin and source of all other sins and nefarious crimes and “atrocities”, “*terriblenesses*” and “damages” caused by the accused authors or compilers, or even plotters of the University of Coimbra’s Statutes and by all the Jesuit doctors (despite the fact they were not that university’s Professors of Major Studies in Theology, Civil and Canon Law, Medicine and Mathematics) and, finally, by all the members of the Society of Jesus and this same Society as a whole - their only and true sin is a “philosophical sin”: their having chosen Aristotelianism, the philosophy of Aristotle, the Arabic-Peripatetic philosophy. Not through “invincible ignorance” or “erroneous awareness”, but through

---

<sup>81</sup> *Ibidem*, § 261.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibidem*, §§ 263 e 264.

pertinacious and deliberate obstinacy. Not because they did not have or did not know any better options, but because it was this perverse, carnal, worldly and atheistic philosophy that suited them to carry out their perfidious plan to provoke general ignorance and to accomplish their project of economic and political domination of the world.

In all the Renaissance and modern literature critical of Aristotelianism or anti-Aristotelianism, I know of no case that reveals such a fierce rage against the Stagirite philosopher, not even in the heated debates of the 15th century between supporters of Plato (Gemistos Plethon and John Bessarion) and of Aristotle (George Scholarios and George of Trebizonda).<sup>83</sup> Only one case has a flagrant parallel with the anti-Aristotelian zeal of the authors of the *Compêndio histórico*. And, amazingly, it is none other than Martin Luther! For him, too, scholastic theology was a “monstrous theology whose head is Aristotle” (*monstrosa theologia cuius caput est Aristoteles*). And the Greek philosopher is dubbed in the crudest ways: as a “devastator of pious doctrine” (*vastator piae doctinae*), “public and professed enemy of the truth” (*publicus veritatis vel ex professo hostis*), “rancid philosopher” (*rancidus philosophus*), “the most impious of dissimulators among philosophers” (*impiissimus inter philosophos simulator*), “prince of darkness” (*princeps tenebrarum*), “seducer of scholastic doctors” (*seductor scholasticorum doctorum*). It is he who declares that “all of Aristotle is to theology as darkness is to light” (*Breviter, totus Aristoteles ad theologiam est ut tenebras ad lucem*); or that “almost the whole of Aristotle’s Ethics is terrible and inimical to grace” (*Tota fere Aristotelis Ethica pessima est gratiae inimica*); that it is not true what is said, that “he cannot be a good theologian who is not trained in the philosophy of Aristotle,” but precisely the reverse: “to be a good theologian one must ignore the philosophy of Aristotle”; and many others of the same kind.<sup>84</sup> Would the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* know, would the minister of king José I, who commissioned the work, know that they had in it such a commendable predecessor?

---

<sup>83</sup> On this controversy, see James Hankins, *Plato in the Italian Renaissance*, Leiden: Brill, 1991, esp. pp. 193-263.

<sup>84</sup> See: Friedrich August Nitzsch, *Luther und Aristoteles*, Kiel, Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1883. In the monumental reference edition of Luther’s writings (Martin Luther, *Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, Weimar, Weimarer-Ausgabe, 1883 and ff) there is hardly a volume in which Luther’s criticism of the pernicious influx of Aristotle, scholastic philosophy and reason into theology does not occur. Be it a selection: 1:226,313,355,508ff; 3:423; 5:898ff, 412; 6:29,457,508ff; 7:282, 722ff, 810ff; 8:98; 9:4; 10-I:2,96; 12:414ff; 17-II: 27, 363; 39-I:176; 445;776; 51:189; 56:349. Luther does not intend to substitute the tutelage of Aristotle for that of Plato or any other philosopher, but by faith in Scripture, and from this above all by the doctrine he read in Paul’s Letter to the Romans, with only his Augustine as adviser.



## 5. ARISTOTELIANISM AND JESUITISM: WHAT CORRELATIONS?

One of the persisting ideas throughout the *Compêndio histórico*, as we have been pointing out, is the association of the Jesuits and their teaching to Aristotelianism, to the philosophy of Aristotle, to Aristotelian-Scholastic philosophy, or Arabic-peripatetic-Scholastic Aristotelianism. The Society of Jesus is insistently “mimicked” with pejorative epithets, as being the “Aristotelian Society”, and its writers and teachers as being “Aristotelian-Jesuitical doctors”, “Aristotelian Theologians”, “Aristotelian and Atheist Theologians”.<sup>85</sup> As we have seen, it can be said that the real sin of the Jesuits is a “philosophical sin” - that of following Arabic-Scholastic Aristotelianism; not, therefore, that of “invincible ignorance”, which would unaccountable them for such a crime, but that of the pertinacious, incorrigible and wicked obstinacy, which makes the Society of Jesus a real “Arsenal of Hell”.<sup>86</sup> The Jesuits are, as we have seen, accused of being the only ones responsible for the pernicious validity, in the Portuguese University, of scholastic Aristotelianism.<sup>87</sup>

What truth has this association and this labelling, this absolute and univocal correlation between Jesuitism and Aristotelianism? What scholastic Aristotelianism or Aristotelianism was that cultivated by the Jesuits? What distinguished the Ignatians so much from what was being done by other religious orders in Portugal, Europe and even throughout the Catholic world? What even distinguished Jesuit Aristotelianism from that Aristotelianism which, after the anti-philosophical and anti-Aristotelian fundamentalism of Luther and his most radical followers, would also be cultivated, from the last decade of the 16th century and into the 17th and 18th centuries, among reformed, Lutheran and Calvinist philosophers and theologians? These are the questions to which I would like to suggest, with imperative concision, some indications of an answer.

It should first be borne in mind that Aristotelianism does not appear in philosophical history as a defined system of doctrines, but as a fruitful tradition of thought, which was sometimes transmitted, sometimes received, sometimes rediscovered, inspiring or even shaping different moments or forms of culture, characterised by different dominant problems, sometimes more scientific and naturalistic, sometimes more anthropo-psychological and spiritualist, sometimes more metaphysical and theological, sometimes more logical and dialectical, sometimes more ethical and political, and often combining even

---

<sup>85</sup> *Compêndio Histórico*, “Apêndice”, §§107, 114, 160 e 164.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibidem*, § 233.

<sup>87</sup> See: Paula Carreira, “Aristóteles e o Marquês de Pombal: História de uma má relação”, in José Eduardo Franco and Ricardo Ventura (coord.), *A sombra dos demónios. Para uma história da cultura em negativo*, Lisbon, Edições Esgotadas, 2019, pp. 77-86 this essay’s core consists of a judicious analysis of the anti-aristotelianism of the *Compêndio histórico*. See also: Francisco da Gama Caeiro / Amândio Coxito, “Aristotelismo em Portugal” (Período medieval/Séculos XVI-XVIII), *Logos. Enciclopédia luso-brasileira de filosofia*, vol. 1, Lisbon/São Paulo, Editorial Verbo, 1989, cols. 433-449.

with other philosophies, especially Plato's. Thus one can speak of a Greek Aristotelianism, a Latin Aristotelianism, an Arabic and Jewish Aristotelianism, a medieval scholastic Aristotelianism, a Renaissance Aristotelianism, a Baroque and modern Aristotelianism, and all of them, moreover, assuming different versions, depending on the thinkers who played a leading role in them. In the case of scholasticism, some of its sub-schools are well known (Thomists, Scotists, Durandists, Bielists), depending on the tradition they claimed to inherit, which conflicted among themselves, and which also had their masters and respective chairs at the University of Coimbra.

Secondly, it should also be borne in mind that the continuity and even the intensive return of Aristotle in the 16th-17th centuries is not a Jesuit and Portuguese issue, but a general European phenomenon, with some very rare exceptions. In fact, it dominated without interruption in the universities and one can even say that, from the end of the 16th century and throughout the 17th century, there comes to be a general cultivation of Aristotelian-scholastic philosophy, not only in Catholic universities, but even in the universities of the other faiths that emerged from the Reformation (notably among Lutherans and Calvinists). It is in this panorama that the Jesuits are also included. And if there is something relevant in this common trend, it is precisely the active, pioneering and mediating role played by the Jesuit professors of the *Colégio das Artes* de Coimbra, the authors of the *Curso aristotélico conimbricense*, Pedro da Fonseca, commentator on Aristotle's Logic and Metaphysics, and above all Francisco Suárez with his philosophical summa *Disputationes metaphysicae*, a work that would become a true philosophical compendium of Modernity with interdenominational use and reference.<sup>88</sup>

This common Aristotelianism - this new and general return to Aristotle or rebirth of metaphysical Aristotelianism - must be situated, first of all, within the broad movement of restoration or rebirth of Aristotelianism, and also of the rebirth of scholasticism with Thomistic matrix, which began in the 15th century and continued in the 16th and 17th centuries. Alongside, nevertheless, the criticisms by many over the scholastic Aristotelianism or the pseudo-Aristotelians and, in fact, also precisely thanks to these criticisms, which forced the reading and rediscovery of a more genuine thought by the ancient phi-

---

<sup>88</sup> See: Amândio Coxito, "A filosofia no Colégio das Artes", in *História da Universidade em Portugal*, vol. 1, t. II, *op. cit.*, pp. 735-762. By the same author, "Aristotelismo e antiaristotelismo no pensamento português dos séculos XVI e XVII", in Luís Alberto Cerqueira (org.), *Aristotelismo e antiaristotelismo: Ensino da filosofia*, Rio de Janeiro, Editora Ágora da Ilha, 2000, pp. 161-178; Also: Cristiano Casalini, *Aristotele a Coimbra. Il "Cursus Conimbricensis" e l'educazione nel collegio di Arti*, Rome, Anicia, 2012 (Portuguese trans.: *Aristóteles em Coimbra: O "Cursus Conimbricensis" e a educação no "Collegium Artium"*, Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, 2015; English trans, Nova Iorque, Abingdon, 2017) and M. S. Carvalho, *O curso aristotélico [...]*, *op. cit.*; See also: A. A. Banha de Andrade, *Contributos para a história da mentalidade pedagógica portuguesa*, *op. cit.*, pp. 86-90; António Manuel Martins, "A recepção da Metafísica de Aristóteles na segunda metade do século XVI", in Luís Alberto Cerqueira (org.), *Aristotelismo e antiaristotelismo: Ensino da filosofia*, *op. cit.*, pp. 93-110.

philosopher from a direct reading of his own texts. Such an Aristotelian revival had several phases and several features, which allows one to unhesitatingly speak not of a Renaissance and proto-modern and modern Aristotelianism, but of several, as has been highlighted by this long and complex period's most recent philosophical historiography.<sup>89</sup> It is within this broad and diverse movement that the scholastic Aristotelianism by the Jesuits of Coimbra is implanted, which can be inscribed in the line of the renewal of Thomistic-Aristotelian scholasticism that began in the second quarter of the 16th century at the university of Salamanca with Francisco Vitoria, Melchor Cano and Domingo de Soto. Various intellectuals, educated in this "School of Salamanca" or who taught there, would become professors of theology at the University of Coimbra, and two stand out: the Dominican Martín de Ledesma and the Jesuit Francisco Suárez.

The era was fertile in new problems and new challenges, raised both by the knowledge that had been acquired in the meantime from new worlds and new forms of humanity and human cultures, and through theological debates raised by the rupture of unity in the Catholic faith fulfilled by the Protestant reform movements. These movements, at first, broke with philosophy and reason or whoever came up with such weapons. That, as we have seen, was Luther's fundamentalist position. But, on the Lutheran side, Philip Melanchthon, possessing a solid and vast humanist culture, patiently and persistently contradicting Luther, did not despise Aristotle, but rather appreciated and followed him

---

<sup>89</sup> For a general view, see: Charles B. Schmitt, *Aristotle and the Renaissance*, Cambridge, Mass. & London: Harvard University Press, 1983; Idem, *The Aristotelian Tradition and Renaissance Universities*, London: Variorum, 1984; Idem, *Aristote et la Renaissance*, Paris:PUF,1989; Eckhard Kessler, Charles H. Lohr and Walter Sparr (Eds.), *Aristotelismus und Renaissance. In memoriam Charles B. Schmitt*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988; F.E. Cranz, *A Bibliography of Aristotle Editions, 1501-1600*, Baden-Baden: Verlag Valentin Koerner, 1984; Marco Forlivesi, "Aristotelismo e Aristotelismi tra Rinascimento ed età Moderna", *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica*, 96 (2004), pp.175-194; Gregorio Piaia (a cura di), *La presenza dell'aristotelismo padovano nella filosofia della prima modernità. Atti del Colloquio internazionale in memoria di Charles B. Schmitt* (Padova, 4-6 settembre 2000), Rome/Padova: Antenore, 2002. See also the special issue on the magazine *Lo Sguardo.net, Rivista de Filosofia* on the theme "Di Aristotele si dice in molti modi" (n.º VII, 2011)- with emphasis on the article by Mário Santiago de Carvalho Carvalho, "Sulle spalle di Aristotele. Sul non-aristotelismo del primo corso aristotelico dei Gesuiti di Coimbra", pp. 51-66), which approaches 'non-Aristotelianism' (i.e. on the innovative aspects of the authors of the Conimbrian Course, beyond the commentary on Aristotle's works, and not only because they put forward new hypotheses, which would be taken up later, even by Kant (e.g. the idea of "imaginary space"), but also by the recourse they make to other philosophers, besides Aristotle, in line, as a matter of fact, with a hermeneutic tradition ruled by the perspective of the essential concordance or complementarity between the philosophies - mainly Aristotle's with Plato -, the philosophers and their most qualified interpreters, whether Greek, Latin, Alexandrian, Neoplatonic or Arabic, and of the different tendencies among the scholastics themselves, and, in theological matters, obviously, also of the call of the Fathers of the Church - above all Augustine - and of the tradition of Christian Neoplatonism represented by Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagite) and their medieval and Renaissance commentators; highlight also the interview given by Costantino Esposito on the original Aristotelianism of Francisco Suárez (pp. 27-32).

more than any other philosopher, prizing not only his sure method of philosophical enquiry and exposition but the general moderation of doctrines. He even devoted several writings and courses to commenting on his works on psychology and anthropology (*De Anima*) and on Ethics, works that were flatly rejected by Luther as inspired by the devil and totally contrary to the Christian faith. The moderate and far-sighted humanist from Bretten, who justly deserved the title of *Praeceptor Germaniae* for his immense work in organising education in reformed Germany, left the door open for the return of Aristotle to Lutheran universities. It was at the turn of the 16th to the 17th centuries that an important return to Aristotle took place all over Europe, which already benefited from the direct philological and hermeneutical access to his works, made possible in the meantime by the humanist culture of the 15th and 16th centuries. It was recognised that Aristotle was better suited than any other philosopher to provide the tools for the theological debates between the various religious denominations (between Lutherans and Calvinists, between Calvinists, Lutherans and Catholics). And not only his Logic, but also his Metaphysics and Ethics were required to clarify many points in the theological, ethical, and anthropological debates. Recourse to Aristotelian categories and to the Aristotelian mode of investigating truth was unavoidable if one really intended to seriously proceed in these debates and reach some conclusion, and not to remain in vague rhetorical considerations, or to engage in superficial attacks on both sides, or simply to take irreducible refuge in the defence of a twofold truth, that of reason and that of faith, thus admitting the irrationality of Christian faith matters.

This general movement of returning to Aristotle and rediscovering the usefulness in his philosophy was to take place not only in Catholic universities, but also in Lutheran and Calvinist universities. Among the Lutherans, the efforts by the physician, philosopher and theologian Nicolaus Taurellus are in this line, with his work *Philosophiae triumphus* (1673) and above all with *Synopsis aristotelis metaphysices ad normam christianae religionis explicata, emendata et completa* (1593), which not only established metaphysics as a topic worthy of academic research in the Lutheran tradition, but is animated by the purpose of reconciling philosophical truth with theological truth, something that was not guaranteed - rather compromised - in the anti-reason, anti-philosophical, anti-Aristotelian, and anti-scholastic fundamentalism by Luther and his followers. Similarly, Cornelius Martini, professor at Helmstedt, publishes a work entitled *Disputationes metaphysicae* (1604-1606) - with the same title as one by Jesuit Francisco Suárez, published in 1597 - which is followed by a *Metaphysica commentatio compendiose, comprehendens universam metaphysices doctrinam* (1605). Martini, who also rehabilitated Aristotle's Logic against the Ramists (*Adversus ramistas disputatio de subiecto et fine logicae*, 1596), is said to have been the first to have taught Aristotelian metaphysics in a Protestant university and to have expressly taken Thomas Aquinas's *De ente et essentia* and Aristotle's *Metaphysica* as his models.

Among the Lutherans, we should also mention Jacob Schegt (Tübingen), author of an *Organum aristotelicum* (1577), a work that is influenced by Zabarella in its return to the classical conception of Logic as a universal instrument of scientific reasoning. This was at the time challenged by Pedro Ramo's rhetorical Dialectic, which followed in the wake of Rudolfo Agricola's *de Inventione dialectica*, much simplified though it might be, in a line that would be pursued later by the Port-Royal Grammarians and Logicians, of which the editors of the *Compêndio histórico* are so fond; and Daniel Cramer (Wittenberg), author of an *Isagoge in metaphysicam aristotelis* (1594). Among the Calvinists, mention may be made of Rudolph Goclenius (Marburg), whose *Isagoge in peripateticorum primam philosophiam* (1598) is also animated with the purpose of presenting a "Christian Aristotle".

As can be seen from the brief sample (from which the production in Catholic countries is excluded, as it is considered redundant here),<sup>90</sup> even by their titles, but above all by their declared purpose and their effective content, all these works are in line with the efforts which were being undertaken, on the Catholic side, at the same time by the Jesuits of Coimbra, by a Pedro da Fonseca, by the authors of the *Cursus conimbricensis*, but above all by Francisco Suárez with his *Disputationes metaphysicae* (Salamanca, 1597).<sup>91</sup> Therefore, the thesis defended in the *Compêndio histórico* regarding the ignoble singularity and perfidious Aristotelian obstinacy of the Jesuits of Coimbra falls apart, if we take into account this broader interdenominational European philosophical-theological panorama of the time, which had the philosophy of the Stagirite as a common basic reference.<sup>92</sup> Or else we will have to be led to think that the ancient pagan philosopher's

---

<sup>90</sup> On this, see the abovementioned text by Paul Richard Blum, "Der Standardkursus der katholischen", *op. cit.*, pp. 127-148. In Catholic countries, this return to Aristotle - and to his interpreter Thomas Aquinas -, which in some universities already began in the second quarter of the 16th century (as was the case of Salamanca), was strongly encouraged by the decrees of the Tridentine Reformation.

<sup>91</sup> In this respect, for the authors of the *Compêndio histórico*, Fonseca and Suárez are considered only as those who "transfigured shapelessly sound Metaphysics" (it is not said what this "sound Metaphysics" is!) and as "the writers who most refined the vices and ineptitudes of vulgar Metaphysics:" (*Compêndio Histórico*, fl. 167, note § 54. On Fonseca, see: António Manuel Martins, "Pedro da Fonseca e a recepção da Metafísica de Aristóteles na segunda metade do século XVI", *Philosophica*, 14 (1999), pp.165-178. On Suárez's Metaphysics, see the various essays collected in: Adelino Cardoso, António Manuel Martins, Leonel Ribeiro dos Santos (coord.), *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617): Tradição e modernidade*, Lisbon: Colibri, 1999. I highlight in particular José Pereira's, "The Achievement of Suárez and the suarezianisation of Thomism", pp. 136-156.

<sup>92</sup> For a luminous overview of this process, see Lewis White Beck, *Early German Philosophy. Kant and his Predecessors*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969, pp.115-138; and Charles B. Lohr, "Metaphysics", in C. B. Schmitt *et al.* (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988, especially pp.609-638. For a broader and more detailed perspective, see: Peter Petersen, *Geschichte der aristotelischen Philosophie im protestantischen Deutschland*, Leipzig, F. Meiner, 1921 (reimpr. 1964); Max Wundt, *Die deutsche Schulmetaphysik des 17.Jahrhunderts*, Tübingen, Mohr (Siebeck), 1939 (reprint: Hildesheim: Olms, 1992); Emil Weber, *Die philosophische Scholasdtik des deutschen Protestantismus im Zeitalter der Orthodoxie*, Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle & Meyer, 1907; Ernst Lewalter,

capacity for perversion was much broader and more refined than the zealous authors of the *Compêndio histórico* imagined!

The truth is that, in order to attack Catholics, Jesuit or otherwise, and Calvinists, Lutherans needed a metaphysical Aristotle, not the one that Melanchthon had cultivated and repeatedly recommended. Likewise, Calvinists needed the metaphysical Aristotle to debate with Catholics and Lutherans. But where do Lutherans and Calvinists in central and northern Europe go for this new logical and metaphysical Aristotle they need? No less than to the Iberian thinkers, and in particular to Francisco Suárez and his monumental work *Disputationes metaphysicae*, which became the benchmark of philosophical-theological teaching and debate not only in Catholic universities but also in Protestant ones (Calvinist and Lutheran) throughout the 17th century and the first decades of the 18th century. Since the last decades of the 16th century, the Iberian Jesuits (at the time of the union between the two crowns) had provided the schools of Germany and the Netherlands with their masters and doctors and their writings. Therefore, interdenominational debate on the academic level was inevitable in those times of affirmation and defence of the respective orthodoxies. The first German edition of Suárez's *Disputationes metaphysicae* dates back to 1600 (Mainz) and its effect was immediate and widespread. Students could be forbidden to read Suárez since he was Catholic, but their teachers read and quoted him, and even adapted him. While, for example, the German Catholic philosophers confined themselves to using the work of the Granadan or to paraphrasing it, the Protestants had no qualms about taking it up, subjecting it to some minor adaptations. Thus, the *Opus metaphysicum* by Christian Scheibler (1612), a professor in Giessen, constitutes the main Lutheran adaptation by Suarez, which would earn its author the epithet "Protestant Suárez". In turn, Jakob Martini in Wittenberg and Henningus Arnisaeus in Helmstedt, both disciples of the aforementioned Cornelius Martini, were other "outstanding importers of Suarezian metaphysics into the fortresses of Lutheranism".<sup>93</sup> Jakob Martini, professor of Logic and Metaphysics in Wittenberg since 1602, restores Aristotelian Logic (in the wake of Jacopo Zabarella) in one of his very first works (*Logicae peripateticae libri II*, 1603) and, like his master, adopts and adapts Suarezian neo-scholastic metaphysics in *Theorematum metaphysicorum exercitationes, continentes universam Metaphysicam in formam scientiae compendiose redactam* (1603) and also in his *Disputationes metaphysicae* (1619). While, on the Calvinist side, Clemens Timpler (in Heidelberg and Steinfurt) was the

---

*Spanish-jesuitische und deutsche-lutherische Metaphysik des 17.Jahrhunderts*, Hamburg: Ibero-American Institut, 1935; Karl Eschweiler, "Die Philosophie der Spanischen Spätscholastik auf den deutschen Universitäten des XVI. und XVII. Jahrhunderts", in: *Spanische Forschungen der Görres-Gesellschaft I*, Aschendorff, Münster, 1928, pp.251-325; W. Sparn, "Die Schulphilosophie in den lutherischen Territorien", in: H. Holzey and W. Schmidt-Biggemann (Eds.), *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie. Die Philosophie des 17. Jahrhunderts*, Band 4, Basel: Schwabe, 2001, pp. 555-562.

<sup>93</sup> Lewis White Beck, *Early German Philosophy. Kant and his predecessor*, op. cit., p. 123.

main representative of the Suarezian Calvinists, through his work *Metaphysicae systema methodicum* (1604).

Obviously, these method and basic doctrine appropriations and approximations among theologians and philosophers of the different religious denominations, which, in some authors, even reveal themselves as beginnings of efforts towards a genuine theological ecumenism (along the lines of Melanchthon's conciliatory Protestantism, as was the one led by the forgotten Lutheran theologian Georg Callixtus (1586-1656), professor in Helmstedt), did not take place without arousing strong resistance in the more fundamentalist sectors of the respective orthodoxies (which existed among Catholics as well as Calvinists and Lutherans). These fed a permanent doctrinal conflict on theological and moral matters, not only interdenominationally, but also within each of the religions, in the case of Catholics, in the first phase between Jesuits and Dominicans (as was the conflict between Luis de Molina and Domingo Bañez over the problem of reconciling the doctrine of the efficacy of divine grace and that of the freedom of the human will), and then, above all and increasingly, between Jesuits and Jansenists.<sup>94</sup>

Unequivocally, Francisco Suárez, the only Jesuit who, in the two hundred years of history of the University of Coimbra recounted in the *Compêndio histórico*, held a Chair of Theology at that university for around 18 years, thus became an interfaith European reference, with his magnum opus in Metaphysics being known to all, commented on by many, imitated by some and used by most.<sup>95</sup> In this way, all the major European universities had at their disposal the same scholastically-based vocabulary and the same agenda or the same list of questions and even of solutions or ways of addressing them. For more than half a century all philosophers and theologians had a common starting point and shared a consensus on some essential points: the rejection of the "double truth", of Pyrrhonism, scepticism and the irrationalism of faith, the search for a compatibility or harmony and conciliation of reason with faith, of philosophy with theology. Thanks to Suárez and his Aristotelian and scholastically-inspired metaphysical work, and beyond the differences that certainly existed, the more or less heated debates and even the mutual accusations and provocations, there was a common philosophical lingua franca through-

---

<sup>94</sup> See: Kenneth G. Appold, "Academic Life and Teaching in Post-Reformation Lutheranism", in Robert Kolb (ed.), *Lutherian Ecclesiastical Culture, 1550-1675*, Leiden/Boston, Brill, 2008, pp. 65-116; M. Friedrich, *Die Grenzen der Vernunft. Theologie, Philosophie und gelehrte Konflikte am Beispiel des Helmstedter Hofmannstreits und seine Wirkungen auf das Luthertum um 1600*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.

<sup>95</sup> As Lohr writes, "Metaphysics", *op. cit.*, p. 615, thanks to the clarity, comprehension, systematic character and originality of the thought expounded in his *Disputationes metaphysicae*, "Suárez fixed the method of teaching Metaphysics for several centuries, not only in Catholic schools, but also in Protestant academies and universities". See also: Paula Oliveira e Silva, "As *Disputações Metafísicas* nas encruzilhadas da razão ocidental", in: José Francisco Meirinhos / Paula Oliveira e Silva (org.), *As Disputações Metafísicas de Francisco Suárez. Estudo e Antologia de Textos*, Oporto, Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto, 2011, pp. 3-24; Marco Sgarbi (ed.), *Francisco Suárez and His Legacy*, Milano, Vita e Pensiero, 2010.

out Europe, which guaranteed open doors for theological and philosophical debate. And this language's matrix was Aristotelian, a renewed Aristotelianism, read in its original sources, not despising its most relevant readings and even the scholastic tradition, especially in the version of Thomism, also returned to its sources. And all this thought out anew and presented in a new way in response to the old problems but also to the new theological, philosophical, ethical, anthropological, juridical problems that were imposed in that very misconfigured and dramatic beginning of modernity.

There is no better way to sum up what this Suarezian domination across Catholic and Protestant Europe meant, as the creation of a basic community of intellectual transaction and communication, even beyond and despite denominational differences, than to quote what Lewis White Beck, as well-informed as he is a perceptive historian of German philosophy of that period, has written about it: "The degree to which this keeping open intellectual doors between the different churches has reached can best be seen in the remarkable case of the last of the great scholastics, Christian Wolff. He was a Lutheran, who taught at a Calvinist university [Marburg], who obtained his title [Baron] from a Catholic Prince [o elector of Bavaria], and his works were used as textbooks in Catholic universities".<sup>96</sup>

The authors of the *Compêndio histórico* are proud of presenting as their reference authorities, besides the Arminian Hugo Grotius, some Lutheran authors - Samuel Pufendorf, Christian Thomasius, G. W. Leibniz, Christian Wolff himself, the historian of philosophy Jacob Brucker - setting them in contrast to the wicked Jesuit "schemers", contaminated with "rancid Aristotelianism" and corrupt scholasticism. But they reveal at the same time ignorance or unwillingness to acknowledge how much precisely these philosophers and many others of lesser stature have expressly acknowledged they owe to these Jesuits, who were in fact the restorers of a more genuine Aristotelianism and a more genuine Scholasticism at the dawn of modernity.<sup>97</sup> This Aristotelian-Scholastic ballast of modern thought, persistent especially in its scholastic form, has been studied and recognised by recent philosophical historiography. And the Jesuits are part of it, as

---

<sup>96</sup> Lewis White Beck, *Early German Philosophy. Kant and his predecessors*, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

<sup>97</sup> Leibniz, who, according to his biographers, had been reading Suárez since he was a teenager, wrote in the *Nouveaux Essais sur l'entendement*: "il faut rendre cette justice aux Scolastiques plus profonds, comme Suarés (dont Grotius faisoit si grand cas) de reconnoître qu'il y a quelquesfois chez eux des discussions considérables. Comme sur le continuum, sur l'infini, sur la contingence, sur la réalité des abstraits, sur le principe d'individuation, sur l'origine et le vuide des formes, sur l'âme et les facultés, sur le concours de Dieu avec les Creatures etc. et même en Morale, sur la nature de la volonté et sur les principes de la justice; en un mot, il faut avouer qu'il y a encore de l'or dans ces scories, mais il n'y a que des personnes éclairées qui en puissent profiter". G. W. Leibniz, *Die Philosophischen Schriften*, vol. 5, Hildesheim, Olms, p. 412. Surely the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* did not count themselves among those "enlightened individuals" of which the philosopher of Hanover speaks, capable of still seeing "gold in the dross" of Scholasticism!



an admittedly qualified party, and their influence is recognisable even in those who may be considered the great philosophers of the period: Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz, Wolff. Contrary to what the *Compêndio histórico* would have us believe, the Jesuits were not in fact the only ones who returned to Aristotelianism and made it the basis for their teaching.<sup>98</sup> They had wide company in this return to the ancient philosopher, whether among the other doctors and professors of philosophy and theology of other Catholic religious orders, or among the doctors and professors of the Reformed denominations, with special emphasis on the Lutherans and Calvinists. What is more: as I think I have shown, their Coimbra philosophers and theologians, namely Pedro da Fonseca and, above all, Francisco Suárez from Granada, were intensely appreciated, read, assimilated, adapted and imitated by them. The authors of the *Compêndio histórico*, with all the erudition they boast in the numerous notes that fill the pages of their account, did not realise this. But if they had seen it, perhaps they would have found there only one more of the refined and Machiavellian “atrocities” of the so-called Jesuits: that of having even managed to pervert their own opponents, making them take their Aristotelian poison!

In the revival of the metaphysical Aristotle, the Jesuits of the *Colégio das Artes* of Coimbra undoubtedly had a very special role, who translated and commented on the fundamental works of the Stagirite - the *Lógica* and the *Metafísica* (Pedro da Fonseca), the *Ética*, the *De anima*, the *Física* (by the authors of the *Curso Aristotélico Conimbricense*) -, or who produced a redefining synthesis of the whole of Metaphysics, such as the one carried out by Francisco Suárez. These thinkers and teachers made the Aristotelian text a direct and first-hand reading, having learned the criteria of reading and hermeneutics from the humanists of the 15th and 16th centuries. Already, therefore, theirs was not an “Aristotelian-peripateticism”, as the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* crudely characterise it. But, at the same time as doing so, those thinkers put Aristotle’s text and thought - thus restored in its most faithful textuality and reinterpreted in his commentaries contrasted with the best hermeneutical tradition of Aristotelianism and scholastic thought, with emphasis on Thomas Aquinas and John Duns Scotus - in critical and interpretative dialogue with the philosophical, theological and scientific questions of their own epoch. Such authors must with full rights be considered as part of the broad movement of restoration of Aristotelian philosophy carried out in the early modern period. And this work was not limited to didactic function but contained originality and speculative vigour of its own. Even if the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* could not see anything of value in this im-

---

<sup>98</sup> As Teófilo Braga had already warned and has been increasingly recognized by the philosophical historiography of the early Modern period, Aristotelianism was the reference of philosophical teaching not only among the Jesuits of Coimbra, but also in the other colleges surrounding the University, and even in European universities. It was a fate, for lack of a better option: the alternative was the “fanciful subjective systems” in the manner of Bruno, Telesio and others.

mense, profound and original monument of thought which gives body to such a work as *Disputationes metaphysicae* by Francisco Suárez, this work has not, however, failed to make its silent history of speculative fruitfulness, not only among Catholic, Lutheran and Calvinist theologians, but also among philosophers of the first magnitude such as Descartes, Leibniz, Wolff, Kant, Hegel, Heidegger.<sup>99</sup> And just as much can be said of other works by the philosopher from Granada, such as *De legibus*, where they read and learned (and Grotius was able to recognise this)<sup>100</sup> those who usually appear in the pages of the *Compêndio histórico* as having been the founders of modern natural law and the law of nations (Grotius, Pufendorf, Thomasius, Wolff), discovering those drafters of the *Compêndio histórico* thus amazed and dazzled, in outsiders and those from afar, what they had long had there clearly laid out in their house and right in front of their eyes, but did not want to read. If they had really read the writings of Grotius, it would certainly not have escaped their notice how often the name of the ostracised and abjured Aristotelians, scholastics and also Iberian Jesuits is invoked in them, and the ample use he makes of their theses. As for the others, namely Pufendorf and Thomasius, they no longer need to do so, since they took their ideas directly from the Dutch philosopher-theologian and jurist, believing them to be their first source. But had the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* at least ever read the writings of the so-called Iberian thinkers whom they wholesale and altogether reject? Or did they talk about them and take them as reduced to the common clichés and stereotypes that circulated?

But one can say even further. A significant part of the legacy of thought of many of the thinkers listed in the summary and always negative appreciations, but blunt accusations

---

<sup>99</sup> Let the latter bear witness: the *Metaphysical disputes* is not a commentary or a gloss on scholasticism, but an effective “recreation” of that speculative tradition inspired by the Aristotelian text, in which everything that was important was heard, but profoundly transformed and polished by the exquisite chisel of a truly original thought. This work, says Heidegger, “represents the moment when Greek ontology was transformed into the Metaphysics and transcendental philosophy of Modernity” (Martin Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit*, § 6) Whether he is aware of it or not, Descartes, one of the philosophers who most influenced modern philosophy, depends entirely on this work of Suárez at the level of the terminology he uses, and Hegel’s *Logic* itself still implants itself in the subsoil of Suarezian metaphysics.” Elsewhere: “Suarez, with his *Disputationes Metaphysicae* not only had a great influence on the further development of theology within Catholicism, but, together with his order colleague Fonseca, acted strongly on the formation of Protestant Scholasticism in the 16th and 17th centuries; and the depth and philosophical level of both are far higher than what Melanchthon achieved in his commentaries on Aristotle”. (Martin Heidegger, *Die Grundprobleme der Phenomenologie*, Gesamtausgabe, Band 24, p. 112, *apud* José Enes, “Suárez e o regresso ao momento ontológico de Parménides”, in Adelino Cardoso *et al.* (coord.), *Francisco Suárez [...]*, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

<sup>100</sup> In his letter to Cordesius (15 October 1633), Grotius writes that Suárez was “of such subtlety in philosophy, that there can hardly be anyone like him” (*in philosophia... tantae subtilitatis, ut vix quemquam habeat parem*), *apud* José Pereira, “The achievement of Suárez and the Suarezianization of Thomism”, in Adelino Cardoso *et al.* (coord.), *Francisco Suárez...*, *op. cit.*, p. 156.

and recriminations of the *Compêndio Histórico* has in recent years been the object of attention of researchers and has led to the discovery and revelation of materials from their teaching, some already known, others unknown and unpublished, which are proof of the existence of a vast community of innovative thought, which, including the Jesuits, goes far beyond them. These thinkers, among whom are professors from the Portuguese universities of Coimbra and Évora, but also professors from Spanish universities (Salamanca, Valladolid and others), belonging to various religious orders, have been included in the felicitous designation of the “Iberian Peace School”.<sup>101</sup> Now, what is found in these thinkers is something that really only after the Second World War became generally known in the idea that all humanity, in its diversity of races, peoples and nations, constitutes one and the same human race and one sole universal community, which is before and above the states and which must be governed by a law that corresponds to it, based on the “authority of the whole world” (*auctoritas totius orbis*) and which has effective coercive force. This was the natural right defended by the Iberian scholastics and, among them, the Jesuits, not the supposed statist and absolute “natural right” of the sovereigns. Ideas that today we consider of common understanding, such as that of popular sovereignty, of the universal human community, of a universal right of peoples and peoples that defends them against the arbitrariness of absolute and tyrannical powers, are brilliantly exposed by those thinkers, in whom the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* and its “Appendix” can only find perverse “enemies of the human race”.

That which is called a universal law of the nations, and after Kant a “cosmopolitan right” (*ius cosmopoliticum*), which assists all men by the simple fact of having been born on the same earth, which belongs to no one more than to another, gives substance to that *auctoritas totius orbis* which Francisco Vitoria spoke of as the foundation of the true *ius gentium* and which Suárez also defended as a fundamental natural right valid for all men in all times and places, corresponding to his idea of the universal human community.<sup>102</sup> With this idea, these Iberian thinkers were within their time, thinking about the new

---

<sup>101</sup> See: Pedro Calafate e Ramón Emilio Mandado Gutiérrez (dir.), *Escola Ibérica da Paz. A consciência crítica da conquista e colonização da América 1511-1694*, Preface by Antônio Augusto Cançado Trindade, Introduction by Pedro Calafate e Ramón Emilio Mandado, Santander, Ediciones Universidad de Cantabria, 2014; See also: VV. AA., *A Escola Ibérica da Paz nas Universidades de Coimbra e Évora (séculos XVI e XVII)*, vol. I: *Sobre as matérias da guerra e da paz*, Dir. de Pedro Calafate (with introductory studies by Pedro Calafate and Miguel Nogueira de Brito, and coord. by Ana María Tarrío and Ricardo Ventura, includes texts by Martín de Azpilcueta, Martín de Ledesma, Fernão Rebelo, Francisco Suárez); vol. II: *Escritos sobre a justiça, o poder e a escravatura*, Dir. e coord. de Pedro Calafate, Coimbra, Almedina, 2015 (includes texts by Luis de Molina, Pedro Simões, António de São Domingos, Fernando Pérez).

<sup>102</sup> Pedro Calafate, “La idea de comunidad universal en Francisco Suárez”, *IHS. Antíguas Jesuítas en iberoamérica*, vol 5. nr. 2, 2017, pp.48-65. And also: Leonel Ribeiro dos Santos, “ O *ius cosmopoliticum* de Kant: Um legado da “Escola Ibérica da Paz” na tardia Modernidade?», in: *Homenagem ao Professor José Augusto Martins Ramos*, CHUL (in press).

problems born from contact with new forms of humanity and culture, but they were also ahead of their time and the immediate centuries that followed, in which a state-centric and Statolatric vision prevailed, as was that of the absolutism and regalism defended by the Marquis and his ideologues of service, who previously preferred to read and force to read the primer of the absolute rights of sovereigns and even tyrants, through the manuals of their much appreciated Heinetius,<sup>103</sup> and this when the clamours of the peoples were already being heard, who would soon unleash revolutions, taking Bastille, deposing kings and above all claiming the rights of citizens and then the rights of men and peoples. Thus, showing that sovereignty is the privilege of peoples and citizens, not kings. It was Suárez - an unequivocal theorist of popular sovereignty, at a time when defenders of the divine right of kings and the *suprema potestas* of monarchs were beginning to emerge - who could indeed be invoked to defend the right of resistance and, at the extreme, even to legitimise the regicide of a tyrant, as he is so often accused of throughout the pages of the *Compêndio histórico*, as if he were committing a crime against majesty. He did so, however, as a defender of the sovereignty of the community of men and of the natural right of peoples and the majesty of citizens, and to remind kings of their true place and function and that the power they arrogate to themselves is not their own, nor does it emanate directly from God, but is delegated (or 'transferred' to them) by the community of men, which is the real holder of it. Only at the distance of two centuries from the writing of the *Compêndio histórico* did the bold ideas and innovative theses of Suárez and many of those other thinkers, forgotten or considered only as obsolete Aristotelians or scholastics to be purged and definitively forgotten, become evident and accepted as basic principles of law.<sup>104</sup>

## 6. CLOSING ARGUMENTS. BEYOND THE COMPÊNDIO HISTÓRICO, WHAT REMAINS TO BE CONSIDERED.

As for the causes of the decadence and ruin of the University of Coimbra in the modern age, we must reject as totally inadequate the idea that there was a single and universal cause and that it was precisely the Jesuits and the statutes that are attributed to them. We must also reject as false the idea of a national singularity and a singularity of the University of Coimbra and that this singularity was caused precisely and intentionally by the Jesuits and their Arabic-Aristotelian-scholastic teaching and their supposed adoption and practice of Aristotelian morality.

It is necessary to widen the scope of the approach and to see the university's situation in a broader landscape, in which other factors and actors not taken into account by the au-

---

<sup>103</sup> Johann Gottlieb Heinecius (1681-1741), *Elementa Iuris civilis secundum ordinem pandectarum commoda auditoribus methodo adornata* (Naples, 1764).

<sup>104</sup> See Pedro Calafate, "A ideia de soberania em Francisco Suárez", in: Adelino Cardoso *et. al.* (coord.), *Francisco Suárez (1548-1617). Tradição e modernidade*, Lisbon, Edições Colibri, 1999, pp. 252-263.

thors of the *Compêndio histórico* can be identified. The incomplete or incorrect inventory of the causes prevents the correct diagnosis of the disease and the right decision on the therapy to be adopted. And so, it is not to be expected that there can be regeneration and cure of the sick organism. But it can also result from this defect of inventory and subsequent misdiagnosis that, having identified as a cause what really is not, one comes to eliminate, as an obstacle, that which could even be an important adjunct to the solution.

We shall not waste time on the aspect of the frustrated or meagre achievements of the promised Pombaline lights in the field of culture and teaching, even university teaching, of the little that was built and the much that was destroyed, perhaps needlessly, a matter on which there is vast and certainly very nuanced and even contradictory literature.<sup>105</sup> We will only point out some tasks which, if they are accomplished, may shed more light on the subject which, being the subject of the *Compêndio histórico*, is in fact more omitted or obscured than really illuminated.

In the first place, it is important to correct the simplistic perspective, totally devoid of historical sense, which is reflected in the amalgamation of times and which leads the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* to consider two centuries of modern Portuguese history as a single long moment, a single-fibre fabric, as if nothing had happened in the university and the kingdom in those two centuries beyond the supposedly continuous damage done by the Jesuits. The situation in the second half of the 16th century or at the end of this century is not the same as it was in the third quarter of the 18th century: what was relevant there ceases to be so after two centuries, since contexts have changed, the agenda of problems deemed relevant is different, the partners, the interlocutors and the addressees of philosophical discourse are different, and tastes have also changed, in a century that discovered the relevance of taste.<sup>106</sup> The intermediate times between those extremes also

---

<sup>105</sup> I only quote this passage by José Esteves Pereira (our translation: “One would understand, in the most desired sense, that the *Compêndio histórico* was the rescue of a Tridentine corset that had been causing the decadence of the country, and that from the Pombaline liberation would arise space for free examination. But this was not what the Pombaline text announced and this is not what happened either. In the application of what was intended to reform there was undoubtedly an opening to a method more experimental than formal, perhaps more proclaimed than generally practiced, invoked and read some Newton. But we must not forget that the cultural and educational policy presupposed in the *Compêndio* is contemporary with the lists diligently organised and updated by the *Real Mesa Censória*, which did not allow, for example, any vehemence of “philosophical”, Voltairian or Rousseauist reading, or even more innocuous”, José Esteves Pereira, “Prefácio” a Marquês de Pombal/Junta de Providência Literária, *Compêndio histórico da Universidade de Coimbra [...]*, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

<sup>106</sup> Jacob Brucker (in *Historia critica Philosophiae*, vol. IV, parte I, Lipsiae, Impensis Haered, Weidemanni et Reichii, 1766, pp.146-147) gave three reasons which seem to me pertinent to explain the progressive abandonment and rejection of Aristotelian and scholastic philosophy throughout the 18th century: the progressive cultivation of a rational philosophy of mathematical make-up or inspiration (actually, more rhetorically than effectively such), based on supposed “clear and distinct intuitions”, which tended to replace the demonstration techniques of Logic; the cultivation of a more elegant language and a freer liter-

have peculiar aspects and problems that differentiate them. It is not all the same time, the same scenario, the same protagonists, the same people in charge. Other factors must enter into consideration and into the equation. The study of the cultural, scientific and pedagogical history of the last decades has identified other protagonists that are important to understand what was happening in the university, namely at the level of the struggle for power and for places of influence. At the same time, many studies have revealed that the Jesuits were not all made of the same cloth, as the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* paint them. The contrast, even in teaching, between Jesuits and Oratorians was actually not as real as was thought and sometimes still continues to be claimed. The criticism by some, like Verney, towards the Jesuits and their teaching, of which he was the victim (or beneficiary?), must be taken in large part as rivalry for clients and benefits, a strategy which was common among religious congregations, led by their members who had or managed to achieve some or greater prominence in the circles of power.<sup>107</sup> But why was and still is so much emphasis given to Verney and to his pedagogical and philosophical work, and is there silence or forgetfulness of an author who was a contemporary of Verney, such as the Jesuit Father Inácio Monteiro, teacher of a vast “eclectic” and “free” philosophy, to mention but one example?<sup>108</sup> This professor of the *Colégio das Artes*, where he published, for the use of his students, *Compêndio dos elementos de mathematica necessarios para o estudo das sciencias naturais e bellas letras* (1754 and 1756), which Banha de Andrade says was better titled “*Compêndio de física moderna*”. After the expulsion, he published a work in seven volumes, *Philosophia libera seu eclecticica* (Venice, 1766), in which he set out the

---

ary expression in the exposition of philosophical ideas (a matter of *taste*, therefore); and the progressive spread of experimental science and its methods of validating truth. On this general orientation of Philosophy in the second half of the 18th century towards an aesthetic sense, in content and form, see: Leonel Ribeiro dos Santos, *A razão bem temperada. Do princípio do gosto em filosofia e outros ensaios kantianos*, Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, 2022,, especially ch. 1 (“Da Metáfora ao Princípio do Gosto na Filosofia”, pp.33-88) and ch. 3 (“Kant e a questão da Popularidade e da Linguagem da Filosofia”, pp.135-194).

<sup>107</sup> See: Cf. António Alberto Banha de Andrade, “Pombal e os Oratorianos”, in *Contributos para a história da mentalidade pedagógica portuguesa, op. cit.*, pp. 419-433; and also: Iverson Geraldo da Silva, “O projeto anti-jesuítico: Verney, os Oratorianos e a aliança com o Estado português”, *Sacrilegens*, vol. 10, n.º 2, 2013, pp. 96-108: <https://periodicos.ufjf.br/index.php/sacrilegens/article/view/26759> (accessed October 7, 2022).

<sup>108</sup> There are others, however, who share this “free and eclectic” spirit, such as the also forgotten Jesuit Father João Leitão, author of *Conclusiones analytico-eclecticicas pro universa philosophia* (Eborae, 1758), a work that presents the condensed content of his lessons. In the Preface to the Reader, the author writes: “Far be it from us, in our search for the truth that is scattered among the different sects of philosophers, to swear by the word of any Master. We glory in being disciples of all”. Without analysing the work, Banha de Andrade makes a brief reference to it (cf. *Contributos para a história da mentalidade pedagógica portuguesa, op. cit.*, p. 399). Like those of Inácio Monteiro, this work also deserves some attention from scholars of 18th century Portuguese philosophical culture.

content of his teaching over several years in Coimbra, which he had taken up during his exile in Ferrara. In this work, Aristotle, though still an essential reference, is only one among many other philosophers, especially modern ones (Descartes, Gassendi, Locke, Newton, Leibniz...), who are called upon to complete him, to discuss and problematise his positions or contrast his arguments, when it comes to addressing any topic, whether of rational philosophy or natural philosophy and experimental science. But other works followed: one on Logic: *Ars critica rationis dirigendae, seu Philosophica humanae mentis institutio. Logica communi usu nuncupata* (Venice, 1768), and another, in two volumes, of metaphysics, natural theology and psychology: *Philosophia rationalis eclecticica. Metaphysica [...] Naturalis Theologia atque Psychologia* (Venice, 1770).<sup>109</sup>

Also, with regard to the recurrent accusation of resistance to the assimilation of modern philosophers on the part of the Jesuits, one must take into account the different times being taken into account. But, in the first place, it must be borne in mind that these modern philosophers were far from having general recognition even among themselves, since they took diverse positions and all came very convinced that they were in possession of the truth, even those who professed some form of Pyrrhonism. However, with very singular exceptions, none of them offered a clear system of philosophy that clarified all fields of knowledge and thought. In most cases, they merely shed some light or made exploratory observations or judicious considerations on one or another particular aspect. Which to choose, then? It was only after the 18th century that some distance began to be gained in order to be able to assess the consistency and relevance of these new philosophical proposals and, once the dust had settled on the polemics, once the works had been sifted through to assess what was consistent grain and not just chaff, only then did we begin to see a significant reception of the doctrines of these thinkers in academic circles. And the first receptions are generally more of a gloss or of vague, inflated rhetoric of praise than of true exegesis, of comprehensive hermeneutics and critical assimilation. It should be borne in mind, on the other hand, that the vast majority of the so-called modern philosophers were uncompromising thinkers, unconnected to scholastic functions and unconstrained by the formal protocols of the School (vocabulary, mode of argumentation, literary genre, language), who did not write for scholastic functions, but had as

---

<sup>109</sup> See António Alberto Banha de Andrade, “Inácio Monteiro e a evolução dos estudos nas aulas dos Jesuítas de Setecentos”, in *Contributos para a história da mentalidade pedagógica portuguesa*, pp. 335-351. The author lists the progressive assimilation by some Jesuit teachers of modern philosophical systems (Descartes, Newton, Gassendi and others) and even of cosmology and experimental physics, highlighting the figure of Inácio Monteiro. Comparing him to Vernei, Banha de Andrade goes so far as to classify the Jesuit as “a relevant figure of the Portuguese Enlightenment, perhaps on a higher level than that of Luís António Vernei or Teodoro de Almeida” (p. 345). Although several studies have already been devoted to him (they are referred to by Banha de Andrade, *ib.*, pp.350-351), his thought still awaits the extensive study it deserves and his works the re-edition. See also: Amândio Coxito, *Estudos sobre a Filosofia em Portugal na Época do Iluminismo*, Lisbon, Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda, 2006, pp.41-42.

their target audience men of the world, who wrote in national languages and made use of free and elegant styles.

Consider a case that the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* and much even recent literature considers exemplary. The supposed “Cartesianism” of the authors of Port-Royal (Arnauld and Nicole) and of their much-celebrated *Logic or art of thinking*, a “Cartesianism” that would have been adopted in Portugal by the Oratorians. One does not, however, fall for the notion that it is more a vague air of Cartesianism than an effective and true Cartesianism assumed at the level of Metaphysics, Physics and Cosmology, dualistic Anthropology, Theology and provisional Morals. Let us look at the assessments of the Jansenist Pascal, the friend of Nicole and Arnauld (and, with them, author of the *Lettres provinciales* and the *Écrits des curés de Paris*, against the Jesuits), regarding “Descartes inutile et incertain” (in Physics), and unforgivable for his misleading natural Theology, with which he opened the way to the deists, for having needed God to create the World, he immediately dismisses him, leaving the creature in total autonomy. Even among the modern philosophers of the same time, there was no consensus on the essential questions they were dealing with. Rather, complete dissent was the norm. This was natural, for many of them understood their work as mere “essays”, adventurous explorations, “investigations” or “some thoughts on” some subject, not as “treatises” of confirmed truths. In order to understand how Cartesian metaphysics was received by some of the most prominent philosophers of the time (Hobbes, Mersenne, Gassendi and others), read their objections, to which he replied, sometimes harshly. It was not until well into the second half of the 18th century, starting with Kant, that one really began to think about what the famous “*cogito, ergo sum*” (or *je pense, donc je suis*) meant for the history of human thought and reason. And Cartesian idealism is thus rehabilitated by the philosophies of Germanic idealism, at the same time as it is overcome by them. And as for Cartesian Physics, one thinks of Christian Huyghens’ criticism of its author’s relapse into dogmatism, subordinating and constraining Physics once again to a new Metaphysics; or one thinks of Leibniz’s criticism, who accuses the author of the *Discours de la méthode* of practising a systematic contempt for all others and warns him of an obsession with entering into polemics with the Jesuits at all costs, taking their reluctance to answer him as a sign of contempt; or in the criticisms of Voltaire (who had in common with him that he had been a pupil of the Jesuits), confronting Descartes’ natural philosophy with Newton’s system, saying that the Frenchman’s is a “mere essay” whereas the Englishman’s is “a masterpiece”. This philosopher who presented himself as having a philosophy all made up of an unbroken “chain of clear and distinct reasons”, was in fact read by his own peers as having sown by his works not founded and self-evident truths, but ingenious “fictions”, “deceptions” and “errors”. Moreover, some points of Cartesian philosophy were even considered incompatible with Catholic doctrine, and the philosopher’s works were listed in the *Index librorum prohibitorum* (1663),



thirteen years after the author's death, Many Jesuits suffered the consequences of their having dared to take an interest in the philosophy of the philosopher, who had been a pupil of the Society at the College of La Flèche, where he studied Philosophy in the Coimbra Course and where he also read Suárez's *Metaphysical disputes*, since he makes common use of the terminology of this Jesuit professor from Coimbra.<sup>110</sup>

If we want to consider what happened in relation to another unavoidable modern philosopher, which, at least rhetorically, the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* seem to cherish so much, the Englishman Isaac Newton, it must be said that his cosmological philosophy did not escape controversy and had as competitors that of Christiaan Huyghens and Descartes himself, not to mention that of Kepler and Galileo. One thinks of the criticisms made by Leibniz in his *Correspondence with Clarke*. It was only at the beginning of the first half of the 18th century that it began to be assimilated in some European scientific academies and universities. On the other hand, the idea so cherished by some modern philosophers (and also by the authors of the *Compêndio histórico*) of a philosophy of mathematical or geometrical features, as the great and saving promise for the sciences and for philosophy, was in fact, even in its most convinced promoters much more rhetorical than actually and consistently practised,<sup>111</sup> and, as the philosopher Immanuel Kant would show since his youth, such an idea and desideratum, which refers to a Platonic (or Pythagorean-Platonic) matrix of Philosophy, would have been, throughout history the main originator of the vice of dogmatism in Philosophy.<sup>112</sup>

It is in this context that we must address the question of the insistently proclaimed Jesuit pedagogical immobility and conservatism, the inability of the Society of Jesus to introduce innovations in its teaching, incorporating the perspectives of the most recent philosophers. This thesis has been contradicted by the evidence of abundant recent research that categorically refutes it. But there are, besides, documents that show how the efforts made by the Jesuits for the renewal of their courses were stopped by the monarch's provision or by order of the *Mesa da Consciência e Ordens*. Thus, by royal provision of 23 September 1712, the rector of the *Colégio das Artes* was informed of the prohibition of

---

<sup>110</sup> See: Leonel Ribeiro dos Santos, "A fecundidade do erro. Para uma história das receções do Cartesianismo", in: *Retórica da evidência ou Descartes segundo a ordem das imagens*, 2.<sup>a</sup> ed., ver. rev. and enlarged, Lisbon, CFUL, 2013, pp. 171-189; Nicholas Jolley, "The Reception of Descartes' Philosophy", in John Cottingham (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Descartes*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1992, pp. 393-423. António Alberto Banha de Andrade, "Descartes em Portugal nos séculos XVII e XVIII", in *Contributos para a história da mentalidade pedagógica portuguesa*, *op. cit.*, pp. 169-190.

<sup>111</sup> See, regarding the subject in Descartes: Leonel Ribeiro dos Santos, *Retórica da evidência ou Descartes segundo a ordem das imagens*, *op. cit.*, especially pp.40-44.

<sup>112</sup> On this, see: Giorgio Tonelli, "Der Streit über die mathematische Methode in der Philosophie in den ersten Hälfte des 18.Jahrhunderts und die Entstehung von Kants Schrift "Über die Deutlichkeit"", *Archiv für Philosophie*, 9 (1959), pp.37-66; and Leonel Ribeiro dos Santos, *A razão sensível – Estudos kantianos*, Lisbon, Colibri, 1994, cap. II: "A filosofia como análise e reinvenção da linguagem", pp. 39-67.

introducing into the chairs of Philosophy a form of lesson different from that which had hitherto been observed and mandated by the statutes, and that “if there is any alteration in this matter, you should avoid it, trusting in your zeal not to consent to this new introduction”. Commenting on this document, Teófilo Braga says that the changes that the Jesuits wanted to introduce aimed at “compromise with modern philosophical doctrines”. Their claim was not granted, but they were resilient. The Jesuits insisted on their request and only four decades later, by royal decree of 13 January 1751, was the intended modification of their Philosophy Course authorised.<sup>113</sup> Obviously, they would not have time to carry out such reforms! Such was the situation. However, in the hundreds of pages of the *Compêndio histórico* there is not the slightest mention of this type of “hindrance” and “damage” the Sovereign (or the Crown) did to the development of the arts and sciences in his university and his kingdom.

I would like to include one last note about the *Compêndio histórico*'s<sup>114</sup> furious anti-Aristotelian rant. As we have seen, the references that are made to Aristotle and Aristotelian philosophy, always in bulk and without any analysis, besides indicating a crass ignorance on the part of the authors of the work regarding the evolution of scholastic Aristotelianism from the 13th to the 18th century. It is not, however, a matter of the existence of a “blind hatred” and an “insensible rancour” (to use Teófilo's words), which certainly have no rational foundation, but must have some pathological reason, either on the part of the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* or on the part of the commissioner of the work.<sup>115</sup> But

---

<sup>113</sup> Cf. Teófilo Braga, *História da Universidade de Coimbra*, *op. cit.*, p. 409-411

<sup>114</sup> See the already mentioned essay by Paula Carreira, “Aristóteles e o Marquês de Pombal”. The author points (p.86) to only one passage in the whole *Compêndio histórico* na qual, no § 53, where there seems to emerge a vague perception on the part of the authors of the work that the corruptor was not Aristotle, but that it was his *Metaphysics* that had been vitiated by his first interpreters and by the Arabs who introduced it into medieval Europe. We have already seen that this accusation could apply to the Arabs and some medieval people, but not to the Jesuit interpreters and commentators, who knew Greek and some of whom even prepared editions and translations of the Aristotelian texts from their language of origin and had at their disposal and used the 16th century editions of the works of the Stagirite prepared by the humanists. In any case, this incision in no way alters the general verdict of reproach and condemnation that is explicated throughout the work, whether concerning the moral and intellectual character of the philosopher himself, or the intellectual quality of his philosophy, “the perversion of his spirit and the corruption of his customs”. (*Compêndio histórico*, fl. 207).

<sup>115</sup> Teófilo Braga speaks of the “irrational” way in which the *Compêndio histórico* attacks the Jesuits for their Aristotelianism: “In the blind hatred with which the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* attack the Jesuits of the *Colégio das Artes*, for ruining the dogmas of the faith, turning irrationally against Aristotle in the following way: “Nor for so execrable and abominable an end could human malice excogitate other reflex means than those of the aforesaid Peripatetic Logic, and those of the aforesaid Ethics and Metaphysics of the atheist Aristotle, who with identical objects and identical stratagems abandoned all knowledge of God and eternity, to establish the temporal interests of wealth and political predications at the courts of Philip and Alexander, etc. “.” (Teófilo Braga, *História da Universidade de Coimbra*, *op. cit.*, p. 411 and ff.). And Teófilo continues: “Such an insensible rancour against the greatest philosopher of mankind

the despotic minister and his adjutants could well use this work to attest to the complete intellectual and moral disqualification of Aristotelian philosophy in any of its forms; they could then decree the eradication of Aristotelianism (Arabic, Scholastic, medieval, Jesuit and any others) from the new statutes of the University of Coimbra; the minister could even, as was his style, expunge and erase with his own handwriting the name of Aristotle (as if he were a ghost) and any reference to his philosophy in a work that he himself had prescribed as obligatory and approved for use in the new discipline of Philosophy.<sup>116</sup>

---

can only be justified by the adage: ‘The rage of the ass, that bites the packsaddle. On the same criteria as the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* are still those who attribute to the scholasticism of the Middle Ages and to the Aristotelianism of the Renaissance the mental sterility [...] The appreciation of the Conimbricarian Philosophy or of Aristotelianism in Portugal, sustained by the Jesuits, after a clear judgment of Aristotle, is convenient for us to see how the incomparable philosopher was understood“. But on another page of his work (p.409) the historian seems to endorse to the Jesuits of Coimbra the accusation made by the authors of the *Compêndio* of remaining attached to their Aristotle, when their European confreres were already opening up to other modern philosophers, which is denied by what is better known today (see studies by Banha de Andrade and others mentioned above. In the light of what has already been said, what the historian says about Coimbra Aristotelianism as being a “crystallisation of the Aristotelianism of the Middle Ages” is not fair either. Teófilo writes: “Coimbra’s philosophy was a crystallisation of Middle Age Aristotelianism, maintained by special circumstances in the *Colégio das Artes* [...] While in the other European Jesuit colleges, slight transactions with the new philosophical doctrines of the Baconian and Cartesian renovations were allowed, in Coimbra, the stability of scholasticism was respected, as if in the midst of the indiscipline of vague theories and scientific empiricism, a stronghold was opened to the spirits with the motto: Let us return to Aristotle. The editors of the *Compêndio histórico do estado da Universidade de Coimbra*, though deprived of the criterion of literary history, recognised this fact and consigned it to their opaque report”. (*ibidem*). On the Aristotelianism of the Conimbricarians, in addition to what we have already explained above, see: Banha de Andrade, “A Renascença dos Conimbricenses”, in: *Contributos para a história da mentalidade pedagógica portuguesa*, *op. cit.*, pp. 61-98. In this same volume, several other chapters deal with aspects of the Conimbricenses’ thought and its irradiation. On the “Curso Aristotélico Conimbricense”, for a contextualisation, description and updated evaluation, see: Mário Santiago de Carvalho, *O curso aristotélico* [...], *op. cit.*; Cristiano Casalini, *Aristotele a Coimbra* [...], *op. cit.*

<sup>116</sup> In transmitting to the rector of the University and co-author of the *Compêndio histórico* and the new *University Statutes* - D. Francisco Lemos - the royal order for the use of the Compendiums by Genovesi approved by the *Real Mesa Censória*, the minister adds a personal letter, dated April 13, 1773, eloquent in tenor and manner, revealing himself not only as the Supreme Censor of the Kingdom, but also as the Supreme Judge in matters of Philosophy - (for once Plato’s desideratum will have been fulfilled: if not the King, at least his all-powerful minister should be a philosopher!) -, as follows: “Having just written a letter to you on the subject of the royal approval to publish Antonio Genovesi’s *Institutions of Logic and Metaphysics*, I will now inform you of an observation I made, which is as follows: That in the third paragraph of the Prolegomena there are words which I have cancelled, and which I believe can and must be omitted in the print that is again made. For although I see that this *Compêndio* deals only with Logic, and not with Metaphysics, in which the University Statute has impugned Aristotle, the name of such an abominable Philosopher should always be sought to be forgotten in the Lessons of Coimbra rather than to be presented in the eyes of the Academicians as a worthy Corinthian of Philosophy. And furthermore, it is not so certain, as Genovese says, that Aristotle gave the most complete Rules of this Art. Nor can this be said at the present time, in which the most reliable Rules are those which are furthest removed

The old philosopher from Stagira, whom the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* accuse of having as one of the negative traits of his curriculum and moral character the fact that he had been an emperor's praetor, had lived in the courts and had only taught a perverse morality of dissimulation to courtiers, would also have learned from the people of the court to be resilient and to be able to survive - and along with him his philosophy - such blows of despotic power. In the same years that the minister was practising such high (and droll) deeds of his government, the Aristotle he outlawed, ostracised and expelled from the kingdom's schools (following in the fate of those who had mentored him), was quietly busy providing the means for what was to become a decisive epistemic revolution, paving the way for the development of the science of living organisms ("organised beings", "organised bodies"), giving rise to the birth of modern Biology, which would consummate the overcoming of the deterministic, mechanical and geometric paradigm of understanding nature (of Descartes and Newton) and of Linnaeus' own Natural History, by the organic and teleological paradigm, thanks to which it was possible to understand the logic of the functioning and reproduction of living organisms and also of the organisation of human societies and of the State itself: animals are not machines and neither is the State, but it is rather an organism in which each member must be considered not only as a means but simultaneously as an end, constituted by free beings and governed by laws born of the united will of all.<sup>117</sup> But this last part above all was a lesson that neither the minister nor the editors of the *Compêndio histórico* would like to hear, both of them being devoted readers of the Bible of regal absolutism written by Heinetius.<sup>118</sup> But the study of "organised beings" or living beings had made it clear to naturalists practising Natural History that it was impossible to reject principles and notions that modern scientists and philosophers (for whom mechanical causality and geometry were enough and

---

from the same Aristotle. [... Suppressing the intermediate words, which are cancelled again, the said paragraph will be simpler, free of doubts and more in accordance with the spirit of the New Statutes". *apud* Teófilo Braga, *História da Universidade de Coimbra*, *op. cit.*, pp. 475-476. The minister fully assumed the function of "Maximum Censor of the Kingdom" and did not leave the task in the hands of others. He would do the same with a work by Heinetius, correcting it himself of the concessions made by the German philosopher and jurist to Aristotle. See Manuel Lopes d'Almeida, "Documentos da Reforma pombalina (1771-1782)", vol. 1937, Doc, CVI, pp. 167-179. In a Letter from the Marquis, dated February 4th 1775, to Rector D. Francisco de Lemos (*apud* José Antunes, "Notas sobre o sentido ideológico da reforma pombalina", *op. cit.*, p. 180, note 93), we read: "Heinetius, or because he was a sectarian of some ancient philosophers, who idolised Aristotle, did not go too deep into his doctrine to know its errors and contradictions; and especially the spirit of corruption that he spread through his terrible *Systema de Moral* [...] It was not fair, that [...] the aforementioned Book was printed, as it was composed and published by Heinetius".

<sup>117</sup> Immanuel Kant, *Crítica da faculdade do juízo*, Lisbon, INCM, 2017, p. 307, § 65.

<sup>118</sup> Johann Gottlieb Heinecius (1681-1741), *Elementa iuris civilis secundum ordinem institutionum: Commoda auditoribus methodo adornata* (Naples, 1764). Often referred to in the *Compêndio histórico*, it would be made compulsory in the Law Course of the University of Coimbra by the new statutes of the University.

for whom everything in nature was reduced to matter and the latter to mere extension and movement) had dismissed as useless or eliminated as obstacles, despite the repeated protests of a Leibniz: “final causes”, “substantial forms”, “entelechy”. These notions, or what was meant by them, now return in new form and with new names, under the invocation of the heuristic presupposition of a principle of the “finality of nature” and that of an “internal active principle” of formation (*nisus formativus* / *Bildungstrieb*), and this thanks to the work of scientists and philosophers (among whom the naturalist J. F. Blumenbach in the newly created naturalist *Bildungstrieb*). Blumenbach, at the recently created University of Göttingen, and Immanuel Kant, at the University of Königsberg), who thus accomplished the transition from 18th century Natural History to 19th century Biology, instituting the new paradigm of organic and teleological thought, of biological thought in sum, which would also shape the form of thought of the so-called “human sciences”, and whose matrix is unmistakably Aristotelian.<sup>119</sup> Teófilo Braga, who also analysed the case brought against Aristotle and his philosophy (which the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* involve and implicate in the case they bring against the Jesuits and their teaching), could thus say, despite his profession of positivist faith (or also because of it!), that “it was the nineteenth century that achieved the conditions for judging Aristotle’s work. [...] When the comparative criterion, which initiates the study of vitality, and the criterion of historical affiliation, which makes societies and their products the objects of a new science, predominate, Aristotle still and always appears as an initiator. Comte’s judgment, determining his influence on Biology and Sociology, restores to Aristotle his place before modern thought”.<sup>120</sup>

But, long before Auguste Comte, others of greater greatness had done so. Like Kant, in the *Logic*, in the recovery of Aristotelian language for his philosophy and even in the doc-

---

<sup>119</sup> See: Wolf Lepennies, *Das Ende der Naturgeschichte. Wandel kultureller Selbstverständlichkeiten in den Wissenschaften des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts*, Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1978. The biological theory known as “epigenesis”, proposed in parallel by the two authors mentioned, without their actually knowing it or having it in mind, was thus named by William Harvey, in his work *Exercitationes de generatione animalium* (1651), precisely to characterise the Aristotelian doctrine of generation. Cf. Leonel Ribeiro dos Santos, “Formação e significado epistémico-filosófico do pensamento biológico de Kant”, in: *Ideia de uma heurística transcendental. Ensaios de Meta-epistemologia Kantiana*, Lisbon, Esfera do Caos, 2012, pp. 131-175 (especially p. 144, note 23).

<sup>120</sup> Teófilo Braga, *História da Universidade de Coimbra*, *op. cit.*, pp. In fact, the 19th century witnessed a new and fruitful revival of interest in Aristotle’s philosophy, beyond the one mentioned by Comte and Teófilo. This was evidenced, in Germany, by the critical edition of his writings by August Immanuel Bekker (1831-1836), still a reference today, and, in France, by, among others, the works on Aristotelian philosophy by Jules Barthélemy Saint-Hytaire and Octave Hamelin, and the various works dedicated to Aristotle and his philosophy by the Austrian philosopher Franz Brentano (the best known of which is *On the manifold meaning of Being in Aristotle*, 1862), which are acknowledged to have been at the origin of the phenomenological thought of Edmund Husserl, which, in turn, will have a fruitful manifestation in contemporary philosophy, the most significant being that led by Martin Heidegger.

trine of the categories, but above all in the critical rehabilitation of the teleological vision of nature, which would lead to the overcoming of geometrism and strict mechanism, that strange, apparently unlikely alliance of Plato with Democritus that inspired many philosophers in modern times. Or like Hegel, who, well aware that what is called Aristotelian philosophy or Aristotelianism had assumed many forms over time, the so-called “scholastic philosophy” being one of them, which gave great development to speculative metaphysics and formal logic, but did not constitute the most authentic form of that ancient philosophy, he himself proposes to rediscover, for he said, in his *Lessons on the History of Philosophy*, that if “one wanted to take philosophy seriously, one should begin by taking lessons from Aristotle”.<sup>121</sup>

He could not imagine the zealous minister of the kingdom and his most faithful and devoted collaborators, but, in truth and after all, very unenlightened co-authors of the *Compêndio histórico*, that the “abominable” and “rancid” philosopher, whom with so much hatred and rancour they had ostracised, expelled and expurgated from the new university studies, to be definitively forgotten, that author of works such as *Da geração e da corrupção* and *Das partes dos animais* (which the Jesuit Manuel de Góis had also commented on and discussed in their despised *Curso Conimbricense*), that outlawed Aristotle would, after all, survive them and, in fact, could always be of some use even for the Coimbra lessons of the new Botany course created by the new University Statutes. These statutes, with which the minister so much wanted to Europeanise and modernise the country, were actually already behind the movement and spirit of the times, not so much in their substance and content or in the new disciplines they proposed, but above all in the narrow and petty spirit that informed them.<sup>122</sup>

It is not surprising that the authors of the *Compêndio histórico*, being so close to the political power or even compromised with it, by the convinced adherence or by the vile interest of perquisites and sinecures, do not realize that the political situation experienced in the kingdom from the end of the 16th century until the middle of the 18th century had at least some influence on the state that the university had reached. The “shattered and vacillating crown”,<sup>123</sup> which they speak of in Prelude II, should indeed be the first topic to be considered by them in their report: the responsibilities, in the matter of the uni-

---

<sup>121</sup> G. W. F. Hegel, *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Philosophie*, II, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1971, p.148.

<sup>122</sup> There is an immense literature on the Pombaline reform of the University, its inspiration and models, its purposes, its merits and demerits. For a comprehensive synthesis, see: José Eduardo Franco, “A reforma pombalina da Universidade portuguesa...”, como primeira parte da “Introdução” ao *Compêndio histórico...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 17-58, where a selective bibliography on the topic is also appended and commented. See also: Joaquim Ferreira Gomes, “Pombal e a reforma da Universidade”, in VV. AA., *Como interpretar Pombal?*, *op. cit.*, pp. 235-254; Ana Cristina Araújo (coord.), *O Marquês de Pombal e a Universidade*, *op. cit.*

<sup>123</sup> *Compêndio histórico*, fl. 13.

versity, of those who governed, or should govern did not govern, or rather misgoverned the nation in those two centuries. In reality, what is evident is the persistent situation of instability, crisis and political confusion in the country, for lack of a clear and mobilizing political governance that would congregate national energies, also on the scientific and pedagogical level. King John III had this project, no doubt, but not even he was able to establish it on solid foundations, and his expectations were dashed in his own day (the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* will say that this happened precisely because he was the first victim of the “Jesuit scheming”!) And then there was the successive wear and tear of the episodes of the dynastic crisis after the death of king Sebastian. Sebastião, followed by the 60 years of demobilisation and stagnation of the kingdom with the Philippine government, made by delegation or proxy from Madrid; and then, the one caused by the very long War of Restoration (lasting 28 years), by the search for recognition of the restored monarchy, by the dispersion of the scarce human and other energies and means by an Empire spread all over the globe from east to west and continuously harassed by other countries, which, well aware of the weaknesses of the kingdom, took the opportunity to try to extend their own colonial domains, conquering those of the Portuguese. Only in the first half of the 18th century did the kingdom begin to gain some stability and even recover financially from a century and a half of confusion, wear and tear and profound political and economic crisis, as well as cultural, scientific and educational crisis, but this too was mainly wasted on the consumption of luxury and, moreover, there were always more urgent matters to attend to. The persistent lack of a Head (underneath the “shattered and vacillating crown”) to govern it turned the kingdom into an agency for opportunistic merchants of interests, favours and privileges, with whoever occupied the functions of governance at the time without having an idea or an organic project for the Country. Nobles, religious orders, either long-established or recently arrived, and many others who, through some pretext or stratagem, were able to make the most of this wave of plundering and distribution of whatever blessings and crumbs there were, and they had no qualms about chasing away, by persecution, insult or slander, those who stood in their way or in their business and interests. The university, the arts and sciences, or those responsible for them, were not in the front rank of the imploring, and were certainly the last place to which the rulers or the rulers of the day looked, as long as they kept quiet and maintained their routine functioning.

One must, of course, also take into account the strong constraints imposed by what has been called the “Tridentine corset”,<sup>124</sup> or the situation and the religious and doctrinal context created by the Catholic response to the Protestant reform movements, from the second half of the 16th century. It is in this context and as a response to it that the Society

---

<sup>124</sup> José Esteves Pereira, “Prefácio”, in Marquês de Pombal/Junta de Providência Literária, *Compêndio histórico da Universidade de Coimbra* [...], *op. cit.*, p. 13.

of Jesus was born. And that context and the tasks it imposed on the Catholic universe will give a very peculiar character to that religious institution, to the scope, the content and the style of its missionary and pedagogical action. The constraints were reflected very directly in the teaching, marking the limits of orthodoxy, but also defining the priorities of the teaching of Theology and Morals and also, in content and form, those of the teaching of Philosophy, which was considered to be propaedeutic to the teaching of theology and Morals. The adoption of Scholasticism, which was intended to be renewed by a return to the sources of Thomism and, through these, also by a return to the sources of Aristotelian philosophy itself (meanwhile incomparably much better known than it was and could be in the time of the Angelic Doctor), was not a choice of the Jesuits or any other religious order that wanted to have responsibilities in university or pre-university teaching. It was a condition of existence and subsistence of identity, in a country that remained faithful to Catholicism and with a vast empire to evangelise. And the analytical, disputative, polemical, dialectical, contentious character that the treatment of these theological, moral or philosophical matters acquired at the time, and which would continue through the 17th and 18th centuries, also has to do with this de facto condition-situation that was common to the countries of Europe;<sup>125</sup> and this also had the effect of making such matters the centre or focal point of speculative efforts and debates, leading to less consideration of others, as was the case with the new perspectives in the natural sciences, often feared for the pos-

---

<sup>125</sup> This also happened in the universities of Catholic and Protestant countries, as mentioned above. And it must be said that it did not have only the negative aspects that are pointed out. Melanchthon, in his *Institutiones Rhetorices*, referring to the “judicial genre,” wrote: “We teach these precepts, whether for judging the propositions of others, or for instructing adolescents for controversies in the study of the Letters [by Paul], or for ecclesiastical matters. For ecclesiastical disputes for the most part bear a certain resemblance to forensic certitudes. Indeed, laws are interpreted, antinomies are resolved, that is, propositions which seem to be in conflict, ambiguities are clarified, disputes are disputed sometimes as to the question of law, sometimes as to the question of fact, the advice of the facts is sought”. *Elementorum rhetorices libri duo*, Witebergae, Schleich, 1582, p. 29. Kant, moreover, may have taken the idea for his famous “antinomies of reason” - which constitute the core part of his *Critique of Pure Reason* which is the “Transcendental Dialectic” where he practices what he calls a “polemical use of reason” - from this Lutheran theological literature of controversy, he who said that controversies between systems were still the only thing that had prevented human reason from falling either into the boorish indifference of scepticism or into the drowsiness and death of dogmatism. See: “Kant’s Begriff der Antithetik und seine Herkunft aus der Protestantischen Kontroverstheologie des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts”, *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte*, 16 (1972), pp. 48-59. Kant became familiar with this method when he attended (between 1741-1744) the courses of the theologian Franz Albert Schultz, author of a work entitled *Theologia thetico-antithetica seu collegium thetico-polemicum et morale*, which was part of a tradition of controversial Reformed theology, in which other names such as Paul Anton (*Colloquium antitheticum universale fundamentale*, Halae, 1732) and Johann Wilhelm Baier (*Collatio doctrinae pontificiom et protestantium*, Jenae, 1686) stand out. See my essay: “Paz perpétua em Filosofia”, ou “uso polémico da Razão”? – Pensamento Antinómico e Princípio de Antagonismo em Kant, *A razão bem temperada. Do princípio do gosto em filosofia e outros ensaios kantianos*, op. cit., pp. 489-517.



sible or real danger they could represent to the doctrines at the time considered canonical or orthodox. The authors of the *Compêndio histórico* insist on negatively and pejoratively characterizing as formal, sterile, and empty that disputative dialectical practice, which, in order to address a given question, brought into play the different perspectives on it and the respective proponents who advocated them. They recommend the elimination of this practice, replacing it with an assertive and synthetic textbook teaching. In the case of Philosophy, the textbooks that expounded the thought of the “abominable Aristotle” were replaced by those of a professor of Metaphysics, Ethics and Economics at the University of Naples, Antonio Genovesi, who, thus elevated - (but, as seen above, only after he too had been duly corrected by the minister himself!) -, is established for several decades in the role of master of philosophy of successive generations of young students Coimbra, despising the national production, Verneyan or other, that there was at least no less quality.<sup>126</sup> Such authors did not realize (or perhaps they did, but precisely they recognized the danger of it!) that controversies, disputes and philosophical, theological or even scientific polemics were and are an effective exercise of freedom of thought and a practice of the intellectual acumen of analysis, interpretation of assumptions and reasons, as the only way to reach the real understanding of the doctrines either in their fundamentals or in their coherence and consequences. Through them, truth is made explicit and proved, science is done and advances. The elimination of this, I am no longer saying in Philosophy, where inevitably there would follow the very negation of this discipline as a free exercise of reason, but also, for example, in Theology (where the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* believe that a knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, of the writings of the Fathers of the Church, of the Councils and of History of the Church is sufficient), the expulsion the expulsion, I say, of dialectics and debates in these matters will perhaps guarantee a knowledge that can serve to make erudite arguments or dissertations, but beyond biblical, patristic, conciliar or historical erudition, what real understanding of the foundation and coherence of doctrines and their systematisation and hierarchisation will it provide? Such authors do not realize that it is in those very texts they recommend (and which, incidentally, were not absent from the teaching they condemn so much), beginning with those of the Holy Scriptures itself from the Old or New Testaments, that controversies exist and it is there that all theological questions are born. And what is patristic literature? A serene sea which no tide of doubt or controversy disturbs? And the Councils? Were they not all the result of controversies about the understanding of doctrines, which ended in sometimes very difficult consensus, painstakingly and painfully achieved not through authoritative dogmatic assertion, but through prior free discussion and reasoned argumentation? *Mutatis mutandis*, the same or even more could be said of the teaching of the Laws and Canons themselves,

---

<sup>126</sup> See, by Pedro Calafate, the entry “Genovesi ou Genuense, António”, in *Logos, Enciclopédia luso-brasileira de filosofia*, vol. 2, Lisbon/São Paulo, Verbo, 1990, cols. 819-824.

since these too are not devoid of ambiguities, which require interpretation and a decision regarding their meaning and application, which are not resolved by mere erudition that can be gleaned from the History of Law or even from the protocols of juridical Hermeneutics, which usually serve more to ensure self-justification and confirmation of positive laws than to understand their respective pertinence and justness.

In short, to step away from analytical, disputative and polemical teaching, one falls into dogmatizing synthetic-compendium teaching and uncritical and unique thinking, even if dictated by the “Enlightenment” of the monarch or of his “enlightened” minister and his trained intellectuals of management. The *Compêndio histórico* was also going in the opposite direction of the spirit of the times, since, a little more than a decade after its publication, another understanding of what was contained in the motto of the “Enlightenment” (or the “*Aufklärung*”) was already being heard: *sapere aude! Selbstdenken*, dare to know, think for yourself, dare to “make public use” of your reason, come of age, emancipate yourself!<sup>127</sup> These were definitely not the “Enlightenment” of the minister and his intellectuals on duty.

There was, however, another even more decisive cause of permanent blockage to the development and progress of the arts and sciences and of the university itself that must be taken into account, and this one too is, as such, completely silenced in the pages of the *Compêndio histórico*. It is the Inquisition, which established and imposed in the kingdom a persistent culture of fear of thinking and of the crime of opinion, preventing the freedom to think and to express or publish one’s own ideas and to give them to discussion and appreciation in the public and even in the academic space. Such an institution had been created to combat heresies and defend Catholic orthodoxy, but throughout its duration it also hunted its victims in different domains and for different reasons (Jews, New Christians or sympathisers of these, sympathisers of the reformers or those considered to be related to these, fond of the modern ideas of utopian and revolutionary philosophers). The religious congregations themselves and their respective constitutions and councils (including those of the Jesuits) internalised the need for self-control of the entry or cultivation of new ideas in their interior, so that their members would not fall prey to the Inquisition. Hence, a general culture of denunciation flourished in the kingdom, used and exploited opportunistically and in an interested manner against adversaries (or even competitors) in any field whatsoever (in politics, in business, in prestigious and well-performing public positions, in religion, in teaching, in missionary work), which led to fear, to imprisonment, to the confiscation of goods, to banishment, to death. This institution and the culture it promoted was not, however, entrusted to the Jesuits, who did not hold the office of

---

<sup>127</sup> Thus, by Immanuel Kant’s own handwriting, in his “Answer to the question: What is ‘Enlightenment?’” (“Beantwortung der Frage: Was ist Aufklärung?”) [1784], *Kants gesammelte Schriften*, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1968, Band VIII, pp. 35 e ss.

Chief Inquisitor or any other important functions, but were rather the permanent object of suspicion by that Court for their support to the cause of the New-Christians and saw some of its members become victims of it and of its procedures, the most notable being Father Antonio Vieira (the “turbulent one”, as the *Dedução cronológica e analítica* calls him, devoting a whole section to him, drawing a completely negative portrait of him) and elder Fr. Gabriel Malagrida, who, with his sermons, disturbed the purposes and dreams of the Minister of Mons. The same minister would denounce him to the Holy Office (at whose head, opportunely and nepotistically, his brother Paulo de Carvalho had been placed), and sentence him to death by garrotting in a public square, after displaying his despotic power and personal hatred shamelessly through the streets of the city, with orders that after his death “his body was to be burned and reduced to dust and ashes so that there would be no memory of him or of his grave”.<sup>128</sup> The most surprising thing is that even this institution, with all its accumulated history of hateful methods, was attributed by the minister, in his new *Regimento do Santo Ofício*, to the complete responsibility of the Jesuits. In this *Regimento*, which is said to have been dictated by the minister himself to the kingdom’s Secretariat officer José Basílio da Gama, the Society of Jesus “is reviled, being attributed all responsibility for the legislation and procedures that made that tribunal a symbol of terror. The Inquisition would have been nothing more than an instrument of Jesuitism to oppress the country”.<sup>129</sup> But despite the shameless lie and ignoble slander of such assumptions, the cynicism of the minister does not stop there: this odious institution for blocking freedom of thought and the expression of thought and opinion was not abolished by him, but only reformed and nationalised. It was transformed from an instrument of control of religious orthodoxy and of repression of the diffusion of any new theological, philosophical or scientific ideas which might constitute a threat to that orthodoxy, to a reinvested instrument for the defence of the regalist political orthodoxy of the absolutist state, thus controlling and preventing it, with perfidious means and no less rigorous and ferocious violence, the freedom of production and access to culture and science, of thought and the expression of thought, now targeting and persecuting above all the new heretics who are the “philosophers”, more dangerous to the occupants of the thrones than to the guardians of faith and the temples.<sup>130</sup>

Ironically, the monarch who in 1537 definitively established the Portuguese University in Coimbra and, much like the ones that existed in France (of Santa Barbara, in Paris, and

---

<sup>128</sup> *Arrest des inquisiteurs, ordinaire, et députés de la Ste. Inquisition Contre le Pere Gabriel Malagrida, Jesuite*, Lisbonne, Antoine Rodrigues Galhardo, 1761, p. 123.

<sup>129</sup> On the real authorship of the *Regimento*, see: José Eduardo Franco e Carlos Fiolhais, “Historiografia antijesuítica em Portugal”, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

<sup>130</sup> Cf.: Joaquim Romero de Magalhães, “A Universidade e a Inquisição”, in: *História da Universidade em Portugal*, vol I, t. II (1537-1771), pp. 971-988, *op. cit.*; Luís de Oliveira Ramos, “A Inquisição pombalina”, in VV. AA., *Como interpretar Pombal?*, *op. cit.*, pp. 111-121.

of Guienne, in Bordeaux), created there a *Real Colégio das Artes* (1548), which he immediately tried to staff with teachers trained abroad or brought from abroad, thus launching the conditions for a future autonomous development, is the same king John III who since 1531 had endeavoured to introduce and, in 1547, finally instituted in his kingdom the Court of the Holy Office or the Inquisition, for the prevention and control of heresies, thus guaranteeing, without perhaps realising it, the most effective antidote with which they would be neutralised and in fact killed. And right from the start (with the intrigues that arose in that Royal College between “Parisians” and “those from Bordeaux”, the latter being denounced to the Inquisition as suspects of heresy), the hopeful promises of that frustrated attempt of true reform of the studies of arts and the university, even so exaggeratedly exalted as a flourishing and golden age by the authors of the *Compêndio histórico*.<sup>131</sup> And it was this same monarch who, between those dates, in a pioneering gesture among all European monarchs (but a truly sinister gesture and of very dire consequences, according to the authors of the *Compêndio histórico* and the *Dedução cronológica*), welcomed those “invaders” into his kingdom. These were Ignatius of Loyola’s first disciples (1540), to whom, in 1555, in the midst of the confusion caused by the aforementioned intrigues in the recently founded *Colégio das Artes*, he would hand over this College (as far as we know, at the suggestion of the Spanish Dominican Martin de Ledesma, professor of Theology at the university); This would become the real bone of contention, the germ and the reason for the genesis of what constitutes the substance and the root of the many misunderstandings on which the *Compêndio Histórico* is based, nourished and forged.

---

<sup>131</sup> See: Mário Brandão, *A Inquisição e os professores do Colégio das Artes*, 2 vols., Coimbra, Acta Universitatis Conimbricensis, 1948/1969.

“History is written by victors” - that is a common saying. But the reverse is possibly just as true: Those who have the power to write history, that is, to define what was and how the present has become, could end up as victors. At the very least, the hope of giving historical legitimacy to one’s own political actions drives political decision-makers not only in our day, and especially when they make controversial decisions. Pombal is a particularly striking example of this: his far-reaching, sometimes radical reform measures and often unscrupulous actions against political opponents needed a special justification, which in the enlightened 18th century was no longer formulated with a view to eternal life and the salvation of mankind, but with reference to this world and the historical progress of mankind. The historiographical works initiated and supervised by Pombal convey an image of history in which the evil powers are clearly identifiable: It is the Jesuits whose dark machinations provide the welcome explanation for all the ills of the present. The Pombaline anti-Jesuit historical works constitute an important testimony, fundamental not only for the history of Portugal, but for the historical culture of the Age of Enlightenment as a whole. The contributions gathered here explain and comment on the great Pombaline historical works and thus make an important contribution to the understanding of the ideologization of history that characterizes our modernity up to the present.

Christine Vogel  
*Universität Vechta*

VECHTA - LISBOA - ARACAJU

