endroits altérer les textes cités, en particulier l’Histoire de la mission. C’est ainsi qu’il faut lire :

je ne l’heus jamais [l’esprit] plus tranquille (p. 79) ; vos ames soient préservées (2e citation de la p. 104) ; ECCE LEVABO (p. 108, n. 3 — cf. p. 270) ; ne cheminant nullement a pied (p. 121, n. 2) ; ne se polluoyent (p. 132) ; pour sauvegarde (1re citation de la p. 162) ; mignardises (fin de la 1re citation, p. 170, mal référencée car tirée des ff. 270v-71r) ; la conversion de ces nouveaux enfants (p. 172, n. 2) ; cela les faisait rentrer (p. 175) ; où l’on n’eu[s]t sceu (p. 185, n. 1) ; avant que je vinse (2e citation de la p. 214) ; enflammant (p. 221) ; attifets (deux dernières citations de la p. 231 — cf. p. 170) et Pour l’égard de la nourriture ce sera (n. 4) ; pour y mieux (p. 241) ; son pauvre cœur tressailloit (p. 247) ; l’acquisition (1re citation de la p. 249) et reconnoissoient (2e citation, mal référencée car tirée du f. 338r — lire ensuite, dans le texte, l’Evêque de Grasse) ; l’attention et la force de son Ame (2e citation de la p. 256) ; et istas quis enjurit ? (p. 267) ; Propterea [...] gentem tuam non necabis ultra (p. 268) ; assumit vestimentum (2e citation de la p. 277). Sans doute faut-il rétablir, dans la pièce versifiée reproduite p. 274, pour au v. 3, puis pourvoir au v. 12.

Il n’est rien là au demeurant qui ne puisse être aisément corrigé. Ainsi serait revêtue des atours qu’elle mérite cette suggestive étude d’un passé commun, libéralement offerte aux lecteurs de par-deçà par une universitaire de par-delà.

DENIS BJAÏ, Université d’Orléans


This formidable book revolves around three fundamental questions. Did the Jesuits in their roles as confessors at the four major courts of Vienna, Madrid, Paris, and Munich have any influence over war policy? Was there a particular “Jesuit war policy” or even a position on the relationship between war and religion? Did the superior general of the society have any particular agenda? The answers to these questions are pursued over nine chapters of impressive scholarship.

Chapter One establishes the context for this study. Bireley takes us through the basic issues of the Reformation, the Council of Trent, the creation, political hierarchy, and early work of the Jesuits in Rome, and the political situation of the Holy Roman Empire. Most illustrative, however, is the presentation of early Jesuit activity in France, Spain, and Austria. In France, despite rising Gallicanism and the positions of the Parlement and the University of Paris theologians against them, the Jesuits gained a firm footing in the
service of Henri III and Louis XIII. This gave them an almost guaranteed position as royal confessors. In Spain, however, the Jesuits were never so firmly established; they could not supplant the older orders or the Inquisition. They were unopposed in Vienna (with the emperor, upon whom they relied to influence his cousin in Madrid) and in Munich (with Maximilian of Bavaria).

Chapter Two takes us into the early stages of the war — the Bohemian rebellion — focussing on the efforts of the superior general, echoing the papacy, trying to turn the efforts against the rebels in the Empire and against the Huguenots in France into holy wars. The rhetoric of the letters is fascinating and illustrates three Jesuit objectives: unite the major Catholic powers against the Protestants at all costs; support Maximilian in his efforts to take the title of elector away from Frederick; and moderate relations between the three Habsburg archdukes (Carl, Leopold and Ferdinand) to avoid potential schisms at the heart of the Habsburg inheritance. The role of the confessor was two-fold and dangerous: advance the goals of the church and society, and create no schisms with the major personalities. Bireley skilfully illustrates through primary evidence that, one by one, the confessors in France and Germany began to conform more to the national position under which they worked than to the international position of the society itself. Chapter Three illustrates this point with a focus on France in the pre-1630 period.

With Richelieu’s anti-Habsburg philosophy dominating, Bireley illustrates the developing (and problematic) Jesuit position, focussing on the Huguenot issue and the Duchy of Mantua problem. As was echoed in Bavaria, the confessors were clearly becoming too involved in politics. Indeed, a militant faction was in emergence. Against the superior general’s efforts, Jesuit polemicists were even beginning to write against each other, undermining the society as a whole. This problem is examined in Chapter Four, which also explores the process through which religious motivations were being replaced by political ones, changing the nature of the Thirty Years’ War itself. Chapter Five follows up with an examination of the increasingly “nationalist” tendencies of certain Jesuit polemicists and royal confessors. Division and nationalism bring us to the three key chapters of the study — six through eight.

Chapter Six examines nascent absolutism in France and Spain as dominated by Richelieu and Olivares, and explains how the war has lost the “holy” element for all but a few extremists. The Jesuits began appealing to the political elites to moderate their activities or end the war itself. Bireley concentrates on France — the court of Louis XIII — and the juxtaposition of Jesuit confessors involving themselves in schemes to re-unite the king with his wife and mother, and for and against the cardinal, leaving their superior general in the delicate position of having to soothe ruffled feathers all around. Chapter Seven changes political scene (to the Empire) and examines the Jesuit involvement in the negotiations at Prague, highlighting their division on the issue of concessions
to the Protestant powers at a time when the emperor was taking less notice of religious advisors and the society had to elect a new superior general. Chapter Eight basically expands on these issues, showing the Jesuits walking a tightrope, balancing between their support of Habsburg hegemony, the need for peace, and their desire not to concede too much to the Protestants, all revealing their still active “militant/moderate” division. Of course, the 1640s witness other major events, and Jesuit involvement is not forgotten. The death of Louis XIII and Richelieu, the rise of Mazarin, the Fronde, the rise of Jansenists, the revolts of Catalonia and Portugal, to whatever degree, all gave them problems. I think it would have been illustrative if Bireley could have taken us through a little more in-depth examination of Jesuit pamphleteering at this time, as what little he does certainly whets the appetite for it.

By way of conclusion, Bireley returns to his three questions and some sober reflections on the key points. Clearly, the Jesuits did have a profound impact on war policy in Austria and Bavaria, but less so in France and Spain, and Bireley explains why this was so. The question over a “Jesuit” war policy clearly had two sides — an earlier militant side and a later emerging and clashing moderate side. And we have clearly seen other divisions not directly tied to this issue: Jesuit Gallicans vs. Habsburg sympathizers, advocates on either side concerning concessions to Protestants. With regard to the agendas of the superior generals, although we see hints of particularism in their letters and decisions, they mostly struggled throughout the period simply to keep the society’s reputation and authority intact, while allowing no variance from papal policy.

All told, this book presents a masterful display of academic acumen and archival dexterity, and I recommend it unreservedly.

ANDREW A. CHIBI, University of Leicester