

Stanisław Salmonowicz

THE TORUŃ UPROAR OF 1724

The Toruń uproar of 1724, called the Thorner Blutbad or the Thorner Blutgericht in German Protestant historiography, is the only event in the history of Toruń which has won lasting international renown for itself.¹ We can add that even up until today this renown has been much more lasting in European historiography and historical journalism than the historiographical career of such fundamental documents and events of Polish tolerance as the Union of Sandomierz of 1570, as the Confederation of Warsaw of 1573, or finally the Toruń *Colloquium Charitativum* of 1645.² Numerous authors of syntheses and text-books on European history, and particularly on the Church history of Europe, very often overlook the important facts from the history of Polish religious tolerance mentioned above, but nearly always mention the events of 1724, at length too, though often inaccurately.³ So that we can number the Toruń affair of 1724 amongst the ranks of the relatively few stereotyped facts which, perpetuated from text-book to text-book, lead their own calm existence amongst the columns of successive elaborations of a general character from the history of Europe or the history of central-

¹ T. Schieder (*Deutscher Geist und ständische Freiheit im Weichsel-lande. Politische Ideen und politisches Schrifttum in Westpreussen von der Lubliner Union bis zu den polnischen Teilungen 1569 - 1772/1793*, Königsberg 1940, p. 128) maintains that the Toruń affair "ist tatsächlich das einzige Ereignis aus der Geschichte der Westpreussischen Städte geworden, das über den engeren Raum des Ostens hinaus ganz Europa beschäftigte."

² The French historian A. Jobert has broken this tradition with an important monograph, *De Luther à Mohila. La Pologne dans la crise de la chrétienté 1517 - 1648*, Paris 1974.

³ Cf. the discussion amongst the editorial staff of "Kwartalnik Historyczny" under the title of *Obraz Polski w historiografii obcej [The Image of Poland in Foreign Historiography]*, "Kwartalnik Historyczny," vol. LXXVIII, 1971, pp. 331 - 353.

eastern Europe. The fact itself, the mythical history of the Toruń uproar, its function and significance as a historiographical stereotype, as well as the history of the political propaganda which created this lasting myth, point to the weight of the problem, and the necessity of looking at it through the eyes of a modern historian.

A questionnaire of the fundamental queries which are connected with the subject might be ranked as follows: 1) The genesis and background of the Toruń conflict. 2) The events of the uproar of 16 - 17 July, 1724. 3) The political determinants of the Toruń affair. 4) The trial and verdict. 5) The international activity of Protestant states in the affair and the problem of implementing the sentence. 6) Propaganda and historiography in respect of the Toruń uproar. Before passing on to consideration of the state of research and attempting to present an overall interpretation of the rôle of the Toruń uproar, we must briefly recall the most important and incontrovertible facts from the course of the uproar itself.

The direct cause of the outbreak of the uproar in the royal city of Toruń, governed by the Lutheran patriciate, was a Catholic ecclesiastical ceremony organized by the local Jesuits: on 16 July, 1724, during the course of a procession in the cemetery of St. James' Church in the New Town, there were scuffles between students of the Jesuit college and Lutherans looking on—without due respect in the opinion of the Catholics. As a result of the scuffles, the city guard arrested one of the Jesuit students. The quarrel between the boisterous students of the college and the city authorities over the release of this student led to various further incidents, in the course of which the college students for their part locked in the college one of the students of the local Protestant school. On the Monday afternoon (17 July), which was traditionally a time of rest for a significant proportion of the trades journeymen, things led to the gathering of a crowd of Lutherans near the college and cloister of the Jesuits. The fact that at this time both sides released the detained students did not save the situation, and events proceeded according to the logic and psychology of mass phenomena. The anti-Jesuit psychosis of the crowd, sparked off by various rumours, caused the Lutherans to storm the Jesuit buildings. The Jesuits offered no

resistance, and no blood was shed, but the college building was totally sacked and demolished, the monks and students were maltreated, and what is worse, objects of religious worship, amongst other things, were destroyed, and together with furniture, books and similar objects, they were burnt in a pile in front of the college.⁴ It is also an irrefutable fact, though one which later was in some degree obscured in all descriptions of the uproar emanating from the city authorities, that these authorities, particularly the reigning President Rösner, but also the city guard, showed surprising passivity and took no energetic action at all aimed at restoring order in the city. One can variously interpret the lack of decision, or other intentions, guiding the city authorities, but the fact of their passivity and failure to carry out the obligations incumbent upon them remains grounds allowing no room for justification. Why, for example, did President Rösner, who lived within a short distance of the Jesuit college, arrive at the scene of events only after midnight, that is to say, after the uproar, which lasted several hours, was already over? The most likely hypothesis is the following: President Rösner had nothing against the Jesuits coming to grief with the agitated Lutherans, though very likely he was not expecting such far-reaching consequences from the action of the mob.

The uproar finished in the early hours of Tuesday morning. The problem arose of the consequences of events which had led to the most severe anti-Catholic outburst in Toruń since 1688. And here, before we pass on to a description of the Jesuit proceedings and the trial, we must take note that, initially, the city authorities completely failed to appreciate the gravity of the situation: they believed in the precedents of the 17th century, and were not expecting the universal indignation of public opinion in the country against Toruń. They doubtless reckoned that, as in 1688, numerous arguments could be smoothed over simply with

⁴ The burning of a wooden figure of the Virgin Mary and several holy images brought about the dubbing of the participants in the uproar as blasphemers guilty of a crime against religion, which incurred the threat of the heaviest penalties in every penal code of that time. Thus subsequent Protestant accounts attempted to negate the fact that objects of worship had been burnt, and it was even maintained (considerably later) that it was the Jesuits themselves who destroyed the images, the burnt remains of which were presented to the court.

material compensation. But meanwhile the Jesuits had appealed against the city not only to the central authorities, but had roused Catholic opinion amongst the nobility throughout the country.⁵ Assuming that the uproar was provoked and made possible only thanks to the support or passivity of the city authorities, the Jesuits indicted those authorities in the persons of President Rösner, Mayor Zerneck and others for responsibility for the events of the uproar. From that moment on, the city courts ceased to be competent to judge the affair of the uproar in the city, since the only court for examining disputes with the authorities of royal cities in the first instance was the Assessorial Court in Warsaw, which belonged to the special royal courts.⁶ The Toruń affair suddenly became the top issue in the eyes of the nobility and—what is more important—in the eyes of the Sejm which had been called. On 29 July, Augustus II, striving to win over the opinion of the nobility at the Sejm which had been called, signed urgent summonses to the council and city of Toruń to appear before the assessorial court within a fortnight's time. It seems that the king, wanting to continue the treaty of the political forces from 1717, but threatened by the permanent opposition of the Grand Lithuanian hetman Ludwik Pociąg, was seeking support above all in the Chamber of Deputies. The court faction both aimed at reinforcement of royal power in general, and, as regards the royal cities, took up a position favouring centralization efforts, which was not without its effect on the course of the Toruń affair. For the king the denominational views were entirely secondary. In a word, the social and political determinants of the Warsaw decisions ran deep: meeting halfway those who demanded punishment of the Protestants as an example, Augustus II reinforced his position in the state.

In reply to the summons, the Toruń authorities drew up

⁵ Cf. R. Frydrychowicz, *Die Vorgänge zu Thorn im Jahre 1724*, "Zeitschrift des Westpreussischen Geschichtsvereins," vol. XI, 1884, p. 82. Frydrychowicz' description was the first in-depth attempt to re-create the Toruń affair.

⁶ In German publications one meets with unfounded views concerning the competence of the assessorial court in respect of cities in Royal Prussia. This court examined appeals from city courts and passed judgement in the first instance in cases against city authorities. In principle its sentences were final.

a formal document in which they presented from their side the course of events on the days of 16 - 17 July. On 13 August, Ch. Klosmann, the city clerk, stood before the assessorial court in Warsaw in the name of the Toruń authorities. After some debate between the parties—the trial was conducted according to Polish law, and thus by lawsuit and orally (and not by inquisition and in writing, as in the regulations of the *Constitutio Criminalis Carolinae* in force in German countries)—the court resolved to appoint a commission, whose task was to carry out an investigation on the spot in Toruń, and present a report to the court. Many dignitaries sat on the commission who were to turn out particularly ill-disposed towards Toruń, either out of religious zeal (as in the case of Krzysztof Szembek, Bishop of Włocławek), or perhaps on account of disputes with the city waged earlier (as in the case of Jerzy Lubomirski). In the composition of a commission comprised of dignitaries from Royal Prussia and the Polish Crown there was not one Protestant. At that time only a few Protestants throughout the Commonwealth still held state positions. The commission stayed in Toruń from 16 September to 13 October. In Polish law the parties themselves provided the evidence for the trial, and in this case for the work of the commission: "*Nach hergebrachtem Rechtsgange und ausdrücklicher Vorschrift der eben erwähnten Vollmacht reichten beide Parteien ihre Puncta Interrogatoria ein, d.h. Behauptungen, welche jede durch vorgeschlagene Zeugen erhärten wollte.*"¹ The statements of both parties, largely the controversial ones, were at that time published in print. In accordance with Polish law, the commission did not use torture on the witnesses, and also rejected proposals in this direction in respect of the suspects. Thus the material for the evidence was gathered without physical pressure on the part of the commission, which did not, of course, exclude tendentiousness in their evaluations. A visit to the Jesuit college also took place, with the aim of confirming first-hand the damage which had been inflicted.

Meanwhile, in Warsaw the Toruń affair had become the subject of violent speeches in the Sejm. Practically no-one

¹ S. Kujot, *Der Thorner Tumult 1724. Aus Anlass zweier Schriften von Franz Jacobi*, Thorn 1897, p. 37.

questioned the fact that the decision in this matter lay with the court, but recalling previous disputes with Gdańsk and Toruń, in which the Warsaw decisions had never been fully implemented, three demands were made: for expedition of the proceedings, the supplementing of the composition of the assessorial court with assessors from the Sejm (from the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate), and an assurance that the court's decisions would in fact be enforced. When the time for the court session was fixed in Warsaw, it turned out in Toruń that no-one from the council members or the mayors wanted to travel to Warsaw to defend the interests of the city in general or the accused in particular. The Toruń delegation sent to Warsaw was composed of wholly secondary figures who had no connections at all at the royal court: "*Durch einen, nicht erkläbaren Missgriff hatte man Männer gewählt, welche mit dem Geiste der polnischen Nation, des polnischen Hofes und der Polnischen Gerechtigkeitspflege fast ganz unbekannt waren, und nicht von den Mitteln wussten, den Ränken der Jesuiten und ihren Anhänger einen kräftigen Widerstand entgegen zu setzen.*"⁸ Neither does the material in our possession explain why Rösner remained totally passive, and did not seek assistance from Augustus II, who had been personally well-disposed towards him since the time when Rösner had stayed at the court. The passivity and misguided legal tactics of the Toruń Council can probably be explained by the tactics of playing for time, which was bound up with the phenomena of the weakness in executive power, as of the authorities for the administration of justice in the gentry Commonwealth in the first half of the 18th century. However, the Council did not take into account the significant agitation of gentry opinion, nor the action of Augustus II, who personally expedited the court proceedings to satisfy that opinion. Augustus II fixed the time of the trial for 26 October, 1724. The assessorial court held session under the direction of the chancellor, and its composition was supplemented by additional assessors from amongst the senators and deputies. In this way, however, two of the active members of the Toruń investigatory commission—Szembek and Lubomirski—also found them-

⁸ F. Dörne (W. F. Zernecke), *Thorns Schreckenstage im Jahre 1724*, Danzig 1826, p. 44.

selves within the complement of the court by the king's decision, which could not but have its effect on the judgement. At the trial, the Jesuits presented their accusations and inferences, which even went beyond the question of the uproar itself (a demand for restoration of the Church of Our Lady Mary into the hands of the Bernardines, and other demands concerning Catholic rights). The Jesuits concentrated their case not on the journeymen who started the uproar, but on the representatives of the city authorities. Boguszewski, Toruń's defender, lodged formal objections and requested an adjournment of the case, since he did not have the necessary documents. The court did adjourn the case, but only until 30 October. On 30 October, apart from the Jesuits, additional citations were lodged against the city by the Bernardines, the Benedictines (concerning the profanation of the cemetery of St. James' Church) and the Toruń Catholic furriers, demanding the right for Catholic artisans to belong to guilds in Toruń. In the course of the trial, the Toruń side demanded annulment of the work of the commission and renewed investigation. At the decisive moment of the trial, Boguszewski, on the basis of the instructions of the city authorities, "did not raise the question of the events themselves of 16 and 17 July in his speech," but only put forward formal objections.⁹ We should note that this could not but give rise to the opinion amongst the body of the court that the accused were afraid to take up discussion of the merits of the case and sought salvation in legal evasions. The court, accepting the case as resolved on the basis of the material gathered, published a decree on 16 November, 1724. These are the most important clauses of the judgement :

1. President Rösner and Mayor Zernecké have been sentenced to death on the count of responsibility of the city authorities for allowing the uproar and indirectly contributing to its outbreak through failure to take appropriate action. 2. 12 direct participants in the uproar are sentenced to death by beheading, some with additional aggravations such as punishment for the profanation

⁹ W. Gastpary, *Sprawa toruńska w roku 1724 [The Toruń Affair in 1724]*, Warszawa 1969, p. 83 ; cf. the important comments of reviewers on this work : J. Staszewski ("Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce," vol. XVIII, p. 233) and E. Cieślak ("Rocznik Gdański," vol. XXXII, 1972, No. 1, pp. 177 - 185).

and burning of sacred objects (cutting off of the hand, and quartering after death). 3. The commander of the city guard, certain officials, and other participants in the events have been sentenced to punishment by imprisonment or fine. 4. The regulations ensure the censorship of Toruń publications from the Catholic point of view, and sentence two pastors, K. A. Geret and E. Oloff, to banishment from the city, as inspirers of the anti-Catholic protests. 5. The judgement, affirming the force of the law of 1638 concerning Catholic rights in Toruń, orders that half the numbers of the city authorities be representatives of the Catholic population, bans any discrimination against that population in respect of admission to city law, to guilds and the like, and, on the demand of the Bernardines, returns into their hands the Church of Our Lady Mary, together with the cloister buildings in which the Toruń school was housed. 6. Accepting that the existence in Toruń of the college and the school was a permanent cause of disturbances, the judgement orders the removal of the school: "*ad aliquam tamen villam viciniorem civitatis vel locum extra civitatem separatum scholam seu studium transportari acatholicis permittimus.*"¹⁰ 7. The regulations impose the covering of the costs of implementation of the sentence, as of the payment of damages to the Jesuits, on the city. 8. However, the judgement contains an appeal to the Jesuits: "*... ut studiosos scholas suas frequentantes in modestia disciplinae debita contineant eosque coerceant et advertant, ne injuriis, contumeliis et violentiis acatholicos afficiant.*"¹¹

Implementation of the sentence was dependent on the plaintiff taking an oath, with six others, affirming the guilt of those convicted by the court. This so-called swearing-in of the initiators of the action—a relic from the Middle Ages—was applied in Polish court practice right up to 1768. One must emphasize that this oath did not replace the court's findings of proof, but only, so to speak, additionally and definitively reinforced them. A struggle took place at various levels on the question of whether

¹⁰ Quoted after S. Kujot, *Dokumenty do sprawy toruńskiej z r. 1724* [*Documents Concerning the Toruń Affair of 1724*], "Rocznik Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk w Poznaniu," vol. XX, 1895, p. 287.

¹¹ *Ibidem*.

and to what degree the severe Warsaw sentence would be carried out. On one side there was intervention from the Protestant powers—to which question I shall return in the further course of my argument—but without result. The judgement aroused numerous objections in Warsaw, too, in respect of that part of it relating to punishment of the participants in the events and of the Toruń mayors. Certain dignitaries made efforts to get the sentence alleviated. The adherents of leniency placed special hopes in Augustus II, whom it would be difficult to suspect of any religious fanaticism. The king, however, because of his overall internal policy—perhaps international, too—remained entirely indifferent. In such a situation, the question of whether the Jesuits would take the oath anticipated by the sentence was of fundamental significance. We know today from the secret Jesuit meetings at the time,¹² that even amongst them, from the beginning, there were votes for saving Mayor Zernecke from punishment. In general the view prevailed, and this despite the intervention of *nuncio* Santini, that the swearing of the sentence was indispensable for all its provisions to be put into practice. As a result, after the Jesuits had taken the oath demanded by the sentence, the commissaries who had arrived in Toruń to carry out the sentence of the court, set about its implementation. Zernecke and especially Rösner had sufficient time beforehand to save themselves by escaping, but did not do so.¹³ Rösner was convinced till the last that he would be pardoned by the king. But only Zernecke, for whom the Jesuits interceded, was given a pardon. Of the remaining 13 sentenced to death, two remained uncaught, and, thanks to the Jesuits, one (Heyder) regained his freedom after receiving the Catholic faith (the Jesuits withdrew their charges against him), and as a result, the sentence passed on 9 participants in the uproar and on President Rösner as the tenth, was carried out in Toruń on 7 December, 1724.

¹² Cf. E. Waschinski, *Die Acta consultationum der Thorner Jesuiten und der Prozess von 1724 in neuer Beleuchtung*, "Mitteilungen d. Westpreussischen Geschichts-Vereins," vol. XVII, 1918, pp. 17 - 26.

¹³ The Council in Toruń was informed of the verdict by post on the evening of 18 November. Rösner remained free, but despite being forewarned by an officer of the guard that he had received the order for his arrest, he did not leave his home and was in fact arrested the following day.

I shall return in the course of further argument to the question of an evaluation of the Toruń judgement against a broader background, here we must merely indicate that we are agreed as to the fact that the sentence was severe, since it cost the lives of 10 people in an affair embracing incidents where no-one lost their life. But one must emphasize that practically all uproars were severely punished in the law of that time, whilst liability for offences against religion was one of the gravest in both Polish and German penal law. Evaluation of the remaining provisions of the judgement must vary. The appropriation of the Church of Our Lady Mary and the buildings of the school from the Lutherans must be criticized. The school, though, did not cease to exist—contrary to numerous erroneous assertions in the literature on the subject—but, despite the judgement, continued its activity a few dozen metres away from the Church of Our Lady Mary on the premises of a boarding-school.¹⁴ Likewise, the printing-house was left in the untied hands of the city. A long and bitter struggle raged over implementation of the provisions aimed at guaranteeing part equal rights to Catholics in Toruń: the Lutherans in general and the élite of the patriciate in particular did not want to allow the Catholics to participate in the city authorities. Every kind of argument was put forward, and various methods employed. A classically conservative argument of the time was even repeated by a contemporary historian of Protestantism: “the Catholics did not even possess suitable people.”¹⁵ Directly after publication of the verdict, 4 Catholics, led by the Toruń postmaster and man of letters J. K. Rubinowski, joined the Council. In the following years—1725-1729—the Council did not allow new elections, so as to preclude the 50% figure of places for Catholics demanded by the judgement. The Jesuits lodged many complaints that the Council was not carrying out the provisions of the judgement. Only in 1729 were places in the Council and at the Bar partially taken by Catholics, but

¹⁴ On the troubles at the Toruń school—insignificant overall apart from the painful loss of buildings—cf. S. Salmonowicz, *Toruńskie gimnazjum akademickie w latach 1681-1817* [*The Toruń Academic School During the Years 1681-1817*], Poznań 1973, pp. 60-65.

¹⁵ Cf. W. Gastpary, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

in the following years the rights of the Catholics were again infringed after various ups and downs: in 1753 the staff and organizational situation in respect of the city authorities was no different to the situation before the uproar. The monopoly of the Lutheran patriciate, artificially maintaining the position of numerical superiority of the element of German-Lutheran origin, had a detrimental effect on the Polish population, composed predominantly of Catholics.

I indicated at the outset that the problems of the Toruń uproar must be presented against a broad genetic and overall political back-cloth. However, the inadequate state of research is a problem here. As regards the course of the Toruń events, the trial and the judgement, the situation is relatively satisfactory.¹⁶ The progress of events in rudimentary but also sufficient outline, reduced to the known elements, does not in principle give rise to any doubts. Knowing the trial customs of the epoch, one must reject lots of exaggerated colour and details, with which both parties tried for various reasons to "highlight" their accounts, arguments, accusations, testimonies. The fundamental task of the historian is to constantly check conflicting accounts and arguments, and to keep in mind their chief aim: legal or propagandist. We do not possess complete material on the history of the trial itself or on the legal side of the judgement in the Toruń affair.¹⁷ However, the critically formulated remarks of Protestant authors writing on this matter, but without command of any knowledge of Polish administration of justice, or of the court procedure specific to Poland, mainly consist in misunderstandings. We should note that the fact that the procedural regulations of those times might give rise to surprise or criticism in the modern reader is one

¹⁶ The most significant works are: S. Kujot, *Sprawa toruńska z r. 1724* [*The Toruń Affair of 1724*], "Rocznik Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk w Poznaniu," vol. XX, 1894, and F. Jacobi, *Das Thorner Blutgericht 1724*, Halle 1896. Cf. also S. Kujot, *Das Thorner Blutgericht*, Kamm 1911.

¹⁷ W. Gastpary (*op. cit.*, p. 63), however, erroneously asserts that there is a shortage of the minutes of the examinations conducted by the commission. Dr. K. Maliszewski discovered these in the Branicki collections from Sucha (Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych [Central Archive of Historical Documents]). This material clears up some of the gaps in the elaborations to date.

thing, but assertions that, in the case which interests us, the court acted in violation of those formal regulations are something else. So that, without negating either the climate of religious intolerance in which the court proceedings took place or the political ramifications of the judgement, one must assert that, in the light of the factual and legal findings of the court, it is difficult to define the judgement as so-called *Justizmord*. One can consider the judgement harsh, unjust and so on, but there are no grounds for negating the procedure by which it was issued, or its legal premises. Certain procedural problems still remain unclear, of which I have written elsewhere.¹⁸

The political background to the Toruń judgement related to the internal history of the Commonwealth of those years has practically been ignored in more recent studies. The matter deserves some attention, however, since, in order to understand the ramifications of the Toruń judgement, and its considerable severity, we must take a most serious look into the play of political forces operating in the Commonwealth in the period from 1717 to 1724, and likewise see any and all international determinants bound up with this play, and in particular take into account both Augustus II's policy in respect of the nobility, and his political plans.¹⁹ Our knowledge of the political history of Augustus II's second period of rule in the Commonwealth is still not very great, but some rich material from Dresden is awaiting research, which should throw much light on the question of the political ramifications of the Toruń judgement. Similarly, the international campaign of the Protestant states in the matter of the Toruń judgement and the problem of the implementation of its provisions has been inadequately considered in elaborations up to the present. We do not possess one work which considers the Toruń affair as an element in international policy of that time. G. Rhode's study devoted to English policy on this question bears

¹⁸ Cf. S. Salmonowicz, *O problematyce politycznej i prawnej t.o. tumultu toruńskiego z 1724 r.* [Political and Legal Problems in Respect of the So-called Toruń Uproar of 1724], "Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne," vol. XXIV, 1972, No. 1, p. 232.

¹⁹ J. Staszewski writes about this in the review quoted; cf. also J. Feldman's remarks, *Sprawa dysydencka za Augusta II* [The Dissent Issue in Augustus II's Times], "Reformacja w Polsce," 1924, pp. 108 - 109.

witness to the fact that many possibilities exist here.²⁰ One thing is certain, that the Protestant propaganda which agitated public opinion in many Protestant countries, did not hide behind the motives and aims of the policy of individual Protestant countries, who were taking care of their own power interests against the background of the Toruń affair. So that Frederick William I, Prussian king, found strong support in this affair in England for some time, for reasons entirely non-religious, and attempted to gain the support of Peter the Great as well. A change in English policy, and Peter the Great's death, cancelled out Berlin hopes of conducting an active policy in respect of Poland.²¹

In the publications devoted to the Toruń affair to date, it has been torn away from genetic problems, from the realities of the life of the city. Pastor Efraim Oloff, a worthy preacher of Polish Toruń Lutheranism, but also an ardent opponent of Catholicism, wrote thus about the genesis of the uproar: "*Die Gelegenheit aber und die eigentlichen Ursachen zu diesem betrübenden Tumult sind wohl, wie es nicht kann gelaugnet werden, theils schon unterschiedliche vorhergegangene Dinge und Facta von Seyten de H. Patrum, welche schon längst eine Erbitterung in dem Gemüthe des gemeinen Mannes ersteckt hatten...*"²² According to the uniform Lutheran opinion, the only culprits in the situations in Toruń which led to anti-Catholic uproars (in 1606—twice, 1639, 1682, and 1688) were the Jesuits and their protectors, the

²⁰ Cf. G. Rhode, *England und das Thorner Blutgericht 1724*, "Historische Zeitschrift," vol. CLXIV 1941, cf. also L. R. Lewitter, *Peter the Great and the Polish Dissenters*, "The Slavonic and East European Review," vol. XXXIII, 1954. England, disturbed by the Spanish-Austrian rapprochement, felt the need to draw closer to Prussia and Russia, and the Toruń affair was a convenient platform for a proclamation of the solidarity of the Protestant states. Cf. also G. Rhode's expansive study, *Brandenburg-Preussen und die Protestanten in Polen 1640 - 1740*, Leipzig 1941.

²¹ Schwerin, the Prussian envoy in Warsaw at the time, even put forward a plan for occupation of Toruń by Prussian forces "called in by the population." In fact, however, no-one was ready for any new European conflict, and Frederick William I was too careful to risk independent action; cf. also the remarks of D. Bayne Horn, *Great Britain and Europe in the Eighteenth Century*, Oxford 1967, p. 31 ff. Chancellor Szembek expressed the Polish attitude towards foreign intervention when he asked the rhetorical question: "how would the Protestants in Königsberg react if the Catholics pulled down their church?"—quoted after W. G a s t - p a r y, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

²² S. K u j o t, *Dokumenty...*, p. 177.

Chełmno bishops. Nobody perhaps in the Lutheran camp considered the discrimination against Catholics in the town to be intolerant, since the intolerance of the other side somehow threw a veil over their own, vehement attitude.

The historian must look at the genesis of the uproar more widely, not only through the prism of the religious history of Toruń, but also through that of its socio-political history, especially from 1660 on.²³ The demographic history of Toruń also has yet to be written. In the Toruń of the 16th century, the Reformation was victorious chiefly in its Lutheran version. However, from the end of the 16th century a revival of the Catholic society began in the city (and also of the activity of the orders). The further course of events in the 17th and 18th centuries repeatedly underwent certain changes in connection with the new immigrant waves—mainly of German origin and connected with Protestantism. The demographic calamities of the years 1703 - 1710 hit the poorer element, mainly Catholic. As a result of the new wave of German immigrants, very much supported by the Lutheran patriciate, there came about renewed reinforcement of the rôle in the city of a Lutheran element of fresh provenance, and thus not familiar with the complicated city relations.²⁴ We must see

²³ S. Hartmann recently focussed attention on the social foundations of the religious conflicts in Toruń, *Thorn im Nordischen Krieg 1700 - 1721*, in: *Thorn Königin der Weichsel 1231 - 1981*, ed. by E. Jähnig and P. Letkemann (= "Beiträge zur Geschichte Westpreussen" 7), Göttingen 1981, p. 335: "[...] die konfessionellen Konflikte in Thorn oft nur vordergründig waren und ihre eigentliche Ursache in sozialen und ständischen Gegensätzen hatten. Sie können als Vorspiel zu den Vorfällen des Thorner Blutgerichts im Jahre 1724 angesehen werden, die zwar durch einen konkreten Anlass ausgelöst wurden, jedoch nur den Kulminationspunkt einer längst vorhandenen Entwicklung darstellen."

²⁴ On the rôle of the immigrant element cf. Z. Szultka, *Rola i znaczenie społeczno-ekonomiczne ludności napływowej Torunia w świetle księgi przyjęć do prawa miejskiego z lat 1703 - 1793* [*The Rôle and Socio-Economic Significance of the Immigrant Population of Toruń in the Light of the Book of Admissions to City Law During the Years 1703 - 1793*], "Zapiski Historyczne," vol. XXXVII, 1972, No. 1, and K. Górny, *Ze studiów nad stosunkami ludnościowymi Torunia w XVIII w.* [*From Studies on Demographic Relations in Toruń in the 18th Century*], "Acta Universitatis Nicolai Copernici," Historia XI, 1977. Reinforcement of the rôle of the German element in the city after 1710 also emerges from the partial findings of S. Hartmann. It is a fact that the Toruń Lutheran seniors Efraim Praetorius (+1723) from Gdańsk, and K. H. A. Geret (from 1723) from Franconia exacerbated religious polemics with their orthodoxly rigid stance and anti-Catholic attitude in the complicated conditions prevailing in Toruń.

the course of religious affairs in Toruń against the background of the demographic history of the city. In general, I would define the former as uneasy coexistence, since it is a fact that representatives of several religions live together in the city in a permanent and lasting way. It would be difficult to define this coexistence as peaceful (even between the Calvinists and Lutherans), but one must remember that, right up to the 18th century, the only guarantee of avoiding religious strife in Europe appeared to be in striving towards maintaining religious uniformity between individual territories. The fluctuating balance in the uneasy coexistence of different faiths in the city was a resultant of a kind of the fact that in the Commonwealth, from the first half of the 17th century, the Catholics were of decisive significance in politics, whereas in Toruń, self-governing by dint of royal privileges, the monopoly of power remained in the hands of the small group of the local, exclusively Protestant patriciate, which conducted its own religious policy in the city (with its language and nationality implications). This policy amounted to the defence not only of religious attitudes, but also of the segregation allowing preservation of the monopoly of power in the city. So that both camps were intolerant in their own way, and in so far as existing conditions allowed. We know, of course, that the defensively intolerant attitude of the persecuted minority is one thing, and the attitude of the majority discriminating against its enemies another. The point is, that in Toruń Lutheranism and Catholicism emerged in both of these rôles simultaneously as it were: the Protestant faiths had been persecuted since the times of the "Deluge", in terms of the Commonwealth as a whole, but in the concrete circumstances prevailing in Toruń the Catholics were persecuted, and it was the Lutherans ruling the city who persecuted them. Of course, no-one is denying that the Jesuits represented the aggressiveness of the Counter-Reformation in Poland. But we need only recall the customary assemblage of facts from their fortunes, to see that it was not the Jesuits who dictated their conditions to Toruń: 1606: the first expelling of Jesuits. The cessation of school activity until 1612. 1626 - 1629: the second expelling of Jesuits. In 1638 the Sejm passed a law which was supposed to guarantee safety for the Jesuits in Toruń. 1656 - 1660:

the expelling of the Jesuits by the Swedes. In 1703, the Swedes did not expel the Jesuits, but devastated their property, etc. Swedish brutality towards the Catholic orders in Toruń was always attributed by the Catholics to the hostile inspiration of the city authorities. There was undoubtedly a connection between the wave of ill-feeling towards Protestants in Poland and the times of the Swedish wars. Swedish acts of violence brought about a general hatred for the Lutherans. An immense rôle here was played by the anti-Swedish and anti-Protestant propaganda of the Catholic clergy. It is a fact that relations between the college and the city were permanently strained during the years immediately preceding the uproar of 1724.²⁵

The Catholic-Protestant disputes in Toruń were above all bound up with the question of the public nature of Catholic church festivals. For a long time, the city council only permitted processions within the confines of the cemetery surrounding St. John's Church. The constrained compromise reached in 1643 between the city and the bishop, in which the organization of a Corpus Christi procession was permitted on a strictly limited basis, settled the bitter disputes for a while. The orthodox Lutheran circles did not wish to honour this agreement, however. An attempt at reviving the procession after a gap of many years caused by the Swedish wars ended in the anti-Catholic street riot of 1682. An agreement of 1683 also went unobserved by the Lutheran side, and in 1688, a dangerous uproar broke out against the bishop of Toruń on the occasion of the Corpus Christi procession. The affair ended happily for the city, with the payment of compensation, since the other regulations of the agreement were not enforced. In the second half of the 17th century, the religious climate in Toruń was aggravated by reclamation demands put forward by the Catholics in respect of the former monastic churches used by the Lutherans since the 16th century. In 1667, after long disputes and a trial which they lost, the city was forced to return St. James' Church to the

²⁵ Administrative decisions of the City Council restricted the activity of the Jesuits on many occasions, cf. as an example the Wojewódzkie Archiwum Państwowe [Voivodship State Archive, hereafter WAP], Toruń, II, II, 24, pp. 76 - 78 and 83 - 84, decision of 28.07.1720.

Benedictine order. The Lutherans then rebuilt as a house of prayer the former city hall in the New Town, giving it the name of the Church of the Holy Trinity. The mass reclamations of old sanctuaries from the Protestants by way of trial were doubtless expressive of the desire to deprive them of the wherewithal to practise their religion publicly. The Bernardines' claims—put forward even before 1724—concerning the Church of Our Lady Mary together with the cloister buildings (formerly belonging to the Franciscans), must be esteemed exceptionally trying for the atmosphere in a city where the Lutheran population had numerical superiority (except for the suburbs). The religious climate both in the Commonwealth as a whole, and in the context of Toruń itself, continually worsened during the last years before the Toruń uproar. The reproaches of both sides would be long in the telling. The Lutherans resented the missionary tendencies of the Jesuits, as the rowdiness of the college students. The complaints of the Jesuits, and of other orders as well, would take up a thick volume. Economic disputes were also the order of the day (about the activity of the bungling craftsmen on the cloister premises, about the brewing of beer and the like). The existence of wholesale discrimination against the Catholics in the public life of the city was of fundamental significance: they were not allowed to fill any elective posts at all, nor posts nominated by the city authorities, access to the majority of guilds was closed, and even enrolment for the Bar, which, on the other hand, was open to any and all newcomers of Lutheran persuasion, was made difficult or outright impossible.²⁸

In weighing up the tensions which lay at the bottom of the events of the Toruń uproar, one must also point to the existence of bitter internal disputes at the core of Toruń Lutheranism (the

²⁸ Above all, the guilds which carried on disputes about the craft production of the cloisters were distinguished in Gdańsk and Toruń alike by an anti-Catholic attitude. We should add that in Toruń, the Third Order in the first half of the 18th century (after the plagues) was chiefly composed of immigrant elements. S. Herbst (*Toruńskie cechy rzemieślnicze. Zarys przeszłości [Toruń Craft Guilds. An Outline of the Past]*, Toruń 1933, p. 67) writes: "The Northern War, whilst worsening the economic situation, intensified religious and national jealousy. In the guilds where Poles were allowed, religious quarrels began, foreshadowing the participation of the craftsmen in the events of 1724."

struggle of pietism with orthodoxy,²⁷ the City Council's dispute with the Third Order,²⁸ as well as numerous personal quarrels, particularly the furious argument between burgrave Thomas and the reigning President, Rösner). Did these problems have an effect on the behaviour of certain of the representatives of the authorities during the course of the uproar, or during the course of the trial conducted against the city (the lack of unified action, the lack of support for Rösner, proclaimed as a martyr only after his death) ?

Let us pass on to the final question, hitherto barely examined, that is, of studies on the history of the propaganda organized round the Toruń affair, and of the influence of the stereotypes thus arising on the image of the history of tolerance in Poland, as of the influence in general of this stereotype on the image of the Pole in Prussian, or German, journalism and historiography. One would first of all have to carry out bibliographic searches,²⁹ and then, country by country, weigh up the character, background and ramifications of the propaganda campaigns carried out in individual Protestant countries. However, the most interesting study we should postulate would be an analysis of how, with the help of this tendentious eighteenth-century image of the Toruń events, the stereotype of the Thorner Blutbad arose in Protestant historiography in general, and German historiography in particular. Basic source research on the history of the uproar came about only at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries (Kujot, Jacobi). As

²⁷ Cf. S. Salmonowicz, *Pietyzm w dawnym Toruniu* [*Pietism in Old Toruń*], "Rocznik Toruński," vol. XIII, 1978, pp. 185-198.

²⁸ The City Council was a monopoly of the powerful St. George merchant corporation and the so-called Gelehrte. The immigrant element, which gained control of the majority of guilds, was opposed to the Council; cf. material on the Council's dispute with the Third Order in 1717, in E. Praetorius, *Documenta Thorunensia*, Ms. No. 130 of the City Library in Toruń, pp. 870-918, cf. also *ibidem*, p. 921 ff., text entitled *Arcana Magistratus Thoruniensis*.

²⁹ H. Baranowski (*Bibliografia miasta Torunia* [*A Bibliography of the City of Toruń*], Warszawa 1972) compiled from the presses of the time a list of 165 titles altogether connected with the uproar. Together with a search in the newspapers of the time, one could probably obtain a bibliography numbering a few hundred items. A small contribution is H. Sander's article, *Das Thorner Blutgericht von 1724 in zeitgenössischen niederländischen Schriften*, in: *Thorn Königin der Weichsel...*, pp. 361-368. Most important would be a detailed analysis of the subject for the German countries and for England.

I see it, these studies did not have any effect on the presentation of the events of the uproar in historiography, and in particular in the popular historical account in the German and Anglo-Saxon countries. Also interesting would be an analysis of when and how the national element, the stylization of the Toruń uproar into an episode from the Polish-German struggle, was born in German historiography. In principle the publications of the 18th century did not yet remark this element. In the second half of the 19th century, the nationalistic German interpretation of the Toruń events in terms of a national struggle began to dominate both in popular and in academic presentations of the uproar. Neither was the era of the Kulturkampf without serious significance here.

The Polish-Lithuanian gentry Commonwealth had its plusses and its minuses. For over a century, it led the whole of Europe in religious tolerance⁸⁰ and was never an absolutist state. After Rösner's execution the city authorities organized a ceremonial funeral for him. Shortly, in Toruń numerous printed panegyrics were published in his honour, in honour of a person who was, after all, convicted by the lawful court authorities. This circumstance did not evoke any repercussions worthy of mention. Shortly, a plaque in Rösner's honour was set in the wall of the church, and a medal struck in the Toruń mint. Engravings with Rösner's likeness were distributed throughout practically the whole of Europe. The propaganda campaign both before and after implementation of the sentence was directed by Berlin circles concentrated round the person of D. E. Jablonski, who himself worked on a collection rich in documentation, but also tendentious, entitled *Das betrübte Thorn, oder die Geschichte so sich zu Thorn von d. Juli 1724 biss auf gegenwärtige Zeit zugetragen . . .* (Berlin 1725). This collection, along with the work of the Königsberg erudite M. M. Lilienthal,⁸¹ became the chief basis for the subsequent

⁸⁰ Cf. J. Tazbir, *Geschichte der polnischen Toleranz*, Warszawa 1977. On the legal aspects, cf. S. Salmonowicz, *O sytuacji prawnej protestantów w Polsce (XVI - XVIII w)* [*The Legal Position of Protestants in Poland (16th - 18th Centuries)*] "Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne," vol. XXVI, 1974, No. 1, pp. 159 - 173; *ibidem* collected literature on the subject.

⁸¹ *Der Thornischen Tragödie Erster, Zweyter, Dritter Actus*. Lilienthal's text was first published in the periodical "Erleutertes Preussen" in the years 1725 - 1726, and afterwards as a separate item.

formulation, through various further amplifications, simplifications and inaccuracies, of the stereotype which developed throughout the whole of the 18th century.³² For already in 1725, the *Gespräch im Reiche der Todten zwischen Koan Diazio und Gottfr. Rössners, gewesenen Praesidenten in Thorn*,³³ published by an unknown author, summed up the affair without any beating about the bush, so that the Poles became the most savage, most abhorrent nation in Europe. If the Toruń authorities had to take Polish public opinion into account in the town itself and in its own printing-house,³⁴ then foreign countries had no restraints at all in the matter. As one of the writers of the era expressed it, the Toruń affair was good business only for the printers.³⁵ The Thorner Blutbad or Thorner Blutgericht stereotype is based on the following chief elements, which represent in sum a blatantly one-sided presentation of a complicated historical reality:

1. It belittles the significance for that era of the events of the uproar, which qualified as a crime against religion, and overlooks any and all facts bearing witness to the continual discrimination against Catholics in Toruń and to the circumstance of the repeated aggressiveness of the Toruń Lutherans in the past (most often it seems totally unaware of the existence of such a problem), and thus writes about the judgement that it was criminal, unprecedented and intolerable. Most often it treats all those convicted as entirely innocent victims. In particular, it overlooks the circumstances bearing witness conclusively to the fact that Rösner was answerable for his glaring failure to fulfil his obligations as President of the city.

³² Cf. the particularly tendentious, and expansive description of the Toruń affair in the anonymous work, *Die Schicssale de Polnischen Dissidenten von ihren ersten Ursprunge an bis auf jetzige Zeit*, vol. II, Hamburg 1770, pp. 627 - 631.

³³ *Sine loco* in 1725, cf. K. Estreicher, *Bibliografia polska [Polish Bibliography]*, vol. XVII, p. 122.

³⁴ The Jesuits, not without reason, accused the Toruń authorities of constantly taking their complaints to Berlin. Officially the Council disassociated itself from anti-Catholic propaganda, and forbade any propagation of information concerning the uproar in a form critical of the king, the court, or the Senators. A true picture of the Lutheran attitude towards the Catholics, and their fight against the implementation of equal rights for Catholics, is given in Brauer's *Chronicle for the Years 1725 - 1731*, cf. WAP Toruń, II, XIII, 54, p. 227 ff.

³⁵ Cf. B. Pompecki, *Literaturgeschichte der Provinz Westpreussen*, Danzig 1915, p. 113.

2. With such preliminary foundations, one can already begin writing expansively and exclusively about the fanaticism and bloodlust of the Jesuits and the Polish authorities alike. In addition, both the political background to the events and the question of the authorized actions of the central Polish authorities in defence of the interests of the state are overlooked. As a rule, this was accomplished by the very same pens which, in Prussian history, always glorified the Great Elector for his policy of strength and authority (as in the case of H. Roth in Königsberg, or K. L. von Kalkstein). So that whilst Prussian absolutism was glorified, the attempts of the Polish central authorities to establish order in the country were condemned as being infrequent and timid (in the name of humanism, liberalism and tolerance). Of course, any kind of reference to age-old Polish tolerance was omitted in works of this type, and a completely false stereotype was thus created of Poland as an especially intolerant nation in European terms—on the basis of one fact. Sometimes the Toruń affair was even compared with St. Bartholomew's Night in France. In this way, an event which represented a break with the Polish tradition of tolerance was promoted to the rank of a general rule supposedly holding sway throughout Polish history. This is the position in the case of the majority of summarized descriptions of the affair which have entered text-books, belles-lettres, journalism and the theatre. The lead here was taken by belles-lettres and journalism.³⁶

3. Also surprising is the inaccuracy of even the simplest outline of facts in descriptions of the Toruń affair in the works of the historians.³⁷ It seems to be a rule, for example, to give a greater number of losses than there actually were, and similarly, all

³⁶ Cf. Pompecki's statement, *op. cit.*, pp. 114 - 115.

³⁷ Despite appearances, even the date of the uproar most frequently given is inaccurate. A quotation from the well-known elaboration of the history of Europe written by the English historian M. Anderson might serve as an example of inaccuracy going beyond even the stereotyped simplifications (I quote from the French translation: *L'Europe au XVIII^e siècle*, Paris 1968, p. 331): "C'est ainsi qu'en 1719[!] lorsque la municipalité de Toruń[!] en Pologne, décida de faire exécuter un certain nombre de calvinistes[!] reconnus coupables de conduite insurrectionnelle, toute l'Europe s'émut[...]" cf. my critique of this book, "Acta Poloniae Historica," vol. XXVI, 1972, pp. 209 - 214.

provisions of the sentence are represented as having been carried out, though, as we know, a significant proportion of them became a dead letter. The impression is usually created that the victims of the sentence were innocent representatives of the city élite, and no mention is made of the fact that, outside the official responsibility of President Rösner, all the others who were beheaded were instigators of an uproar (of havoc, pillage, and particularly of abuse of objects of worship), and came from the Lutheran lower classes and petty bourgeoisie.

4. The stereotype undergoes very characteristic transformations in the period after the Polish partitions. It now speaks less about the Jesuits, and transforms the descriptions in a nationalistic direction. It no longer places the stress so much on the fact that the convicted were Lutherans, but that they were Germans, and that the sentence was issued by Poles. From here on the Toruń events were treated exclusively as an episode in the Polish-German struggle. It is worth remembering that in 1867, it was none other than Bismarck who, in a speech delivered at a forum of the parliament of the North German Confederation, referred to the Thorner Blutbad, so as to justify as it were retrospectively the rightness of discrimination against Poles in the Prussian state.³⁸

This is how the stereotype of the Toruń uproar looks in very brief outline. 150 years were to elapse before detailed source studies came about: in both the second-hand historiographic account and in the stereotypes of historical opinions the world over, the matter was already closed and to some extent remained that way. Who, after all, of the authors of synthetic works has read Kujot or Jacobi? How many authors of syntheses of European history published in the West have acquainted themselves with the history of Polish tolerance, which for some time had no equal throughout Europe? Unfortunately, these are all rhetorical questions. Right up until today, not only German, but also Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian etc. historiography has remained under the powerful influence of stereotypes manufactured by Prussian and

³⁸ Cf. R. Arnold, *Geschichte der Deutschen Polenliteratur von den Anfängen bis 1800*, Halle 1900, p. 45. Hitherto, no-one has been found to carry on Arnold's solid work, as far as the 19th century is concerned.

Russian historiography odious to Poland, and especially of the second half of the 19th century.³⁹ Via the works of German historians, the more or less unobjective views and information of the Prussian and Russian historians have found their way into Anglo-Saxon syntheses and text-books, and for the most part have remained there up until today. One must take account of the fact that this had important political significance for the history of the Polish question at the end of the 19th century, during the years 1914 - 1918, and subsequently too. *Belles-lettres* played a particular rôle in the popularization of these stereotypes in the German-speaking territories. We might mention just some of the figures and titles: Gustav Freytag and Rudolf von Gottschall, Ernst Wichert (*Die Thorner Tragödie*, 1902, 1st edition), W. Petersen (a play entitled *Gottfried Rösner*, 1913). A. Krieger, R. Pulz, K. H. Strobl and many others popularized the stereotype of the Toruń affair with sharp nationalistic flavouring as late as the Hitler period.⁴⁰ If, with the exception of Freytag, there were no eminent figures amongst these writers, many of them, and in particular Ernst Wichert, were very widely read.

Toruń, a self-governing city thanks to privileges bestowed by the Polish kings, was a city of many religions. If a religious struggle was waged there, then before 1724 it did not lead to very serious excesses. In contrast to previous uproars, whether in Toruń or in Gdańsk, in which Protestants did not bear very

³⁹ Cf. H. Serejski's treatise, *Europa a rozbiory Polski. Studium historiograficzne* [Europe and the Polish Partitions. A Historiographical Study], Warszawa 1970, rich in content, but which does not manage to treat exhaustively many currents of this subject-matter; cf. my comments ("Kwartalnik Historyczny," vol. LXXVIII, 1971, pp. 695 - 700), and also my work, *Fryderyka Wielkiego opinie o Polakach* [Frederick the Great's Views on the Poles], "Przegląd Humanistyczny," 1978, No. 3, pp. 103 - 111, referring to the subject of the creation of anti-Polish stereotypes in Germany.

⁴⁰ Cf. J. Chodera, *Literatura niemiecka o Polsce w latach 1918 - 1939* [German Literature on Poland During the Years 1918 - 1939], Katowice 1969, pp. 195 - 202. Chodera's work gives a synthetic picture of anti-Polish currents in German literature in the 20th century. Certain motifs of the creation of the Pole and Poland stereotype in the German mentality have found expression in H. K. Rosenthal's interesting treatise, *German and Pole. National Conflict and Modern Myth*, Gainesville 1976, but in fact the author chiefly concentrates on texts of a political nature from the 20th century, and does not engage in genetic problems connected with the stereotypes.

serious responsibility,⁴¹ this time the particular intricacy of the situation—as presented above—led to a different result. The sentence was very severe, but in fact, against the background of the era—and although it aroused indignation—it was not an isolated or special phenomenon.⁴² Thus the question still remains open, why exactly did the Toruń events, and not the analogous French or Austrian ones, find such a hold in the historiography and mythology of Protestantism in the 19th and 20th centuries? Why, for example, are there some historians who unhesitatingly compare the isolated Toruń occurrence with the consequences of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes? In the course of a few dozen years after the revocation of the Edict, dozens of people lost their lives in France, thousands were sent to the galleys, and tens of thousands lost their property and went into exile. Indeed, for more than a century, and thus right into the thick of the Age of Reason, persecution of Protestants staying in France persisted secretly. Why did these matters not gain such prominence for themselves in the roll of Protestant sufferings, as the Toruń judgement gained for itself? It appears that we might conclude our consideration of the Thorner Blutbad motif with the reflection that it is time for a calm, cool, comparative look at the history of religious tolerance in the Commonwealth: it is sufficient to count up the number of victims of court judgements on religious counts issued in Poland from the 16th to the 18th centuries, and compare it with corresponding statistics for the other countries of Europe, to be able to confirm the truth of the assertion that the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was a state without the stake. Only by ignoring these facts, then, can one assert that Poland, “das unduldsamste Land Europas,” justly forfeited its

⁴¹ In 1687 in Gdańsk, with complete passivity on the part of the city authorities, the Carmelite monastery in the Old Town was taken over and destroyed by a crowd of Lutherans. The city courts sentenced three participants in the disturbances to death, but in fact the sentences were only partially carried out, as a result of much pressure from the king, Jan Sobieski, and the city had to pay the monks damages. It is a fact that the passivity of the city authorities did not meet with any opposition, which may have had some influence on President Rösner's conviction that the Toruń uproar could also be settled by the payment of damages; as regards Gdańsk, cf. the description in E. Cieślak, C. Biernat, *Dzieje Gdańska* [A History of Gdańsk], Gdańsk 1969, pp. 237-242.

⁴² We only need to recall the numerous harsh English judgements

independence for this reason.⁴³ Perhaps all those who created the stereotype of the Toruń affair always had the formulation of that inference in mind, if only subconsciously.

(Translated by Phillip G. Smith)

against Catholics at the turn of the 17th and 18th centuries, based on the Draconic Ordonnance of 1648, directed against the activity of the Jesuits, the persecution of the Protestants in France in the first half of the 17th century, or in the Habsburg countries towards the end of the 17th century. It was in the Habsburg countries that the dispatch of a large group of pastors to the galleys took place, and also the so-called Blutgericht in Prešov in 1687, when many eminent Lutherans fell victim to repression. The examples can be multiplied.

⁴³ Thus writes a contemporary German Lutheran historian: H. Neumeyer, *Kirchengeschichte Danzigs und Westpreussens*, vol. I, Leer 1971, p. 146. The description of the Toruń uproar contained in this work with synthetic pretensions conclusively bears witness to the fact that the stereotype of the uproar is still very much alive.