



Latinitas in the Polish Crown and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania

Its Impact on the Development of Identities

edited by

Giovanna Siedina

BIBLIOTECA DI STUDI SLAVISTICI

— 25 —

COMITATO SCIENTIFICO

Giovanna Brogi Bercoff (Direttore), Stefano Bianchini,
Marcello Garzaniti, Persida Lazarević,
Giovanna Moracci, Monica Perotto

COMITATO DI REDAZIONE

Alberto Alberti, Giovanna Brogi Bercoff, Maria Chiara Ferro,
Marcello Garzaniti, Nicoletta Marcialis, Giovanna Moracci,
Donatella Possamai, Giovanna Siedina, Andrea Trovesi

***Latinitas* in the Polish Crown and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania**

Its Impact on the Development of Identities

edited by
Giovanna Siedina

Firenze University Press
2014

Latinitas in the polish crown and the grand duchy of Lithuania :
its impact on the development of identities / edited by Giovanna
Siedina - Firenze : Firenze University Press, 2014.

(Biblioteca di Studi slavistici ; 25)

<http://digital.casalini.it/9788866556756>

ISBN 978-88-6655-675-6 (online)

ISBN 978-88-6655-674-9 (print)

La collana *Biblioteca di Studi Slavistici* è curata dalla redazione di *Studi Slavistici*, rivista di proprietà dell'Associazione Italiana degli Slavisti (<<http://fupress.com/riviste/studi-slavistici/17>>).

Editing e progetto grafico: Alberto Alberti.

Questo volume è stato pubblicato con il contributo dell'Università degli Studi di Verona, Dipartimento di Lingue e Letterature Straniere.



In copertina: Rappresentazione della Superbia, tratta dal corso di poetica *Via poetarum ad fontes Castalidum*, 1724 (Biblioteca Nazionale Ucraina, Kiev, Ucraina).

Certificazione scientifica delle Opere

Tutti i volumi pubblicati sono soggetti a un processo di referaggio esterno di cui sono responsabili il Consiglio editoriale della FUP e i Consigli scientifici delle singole collane. Le opere pubblicate nel catalogo della FUP sono valutate e approvate dal Consiglio editoriale della casa editrice. Per una descrizione più analitica del processo di referaggio si rimanda ai documenti ufficiali pubblicati sul catalogo on-line della casa editrice (www.fupress.com).

Consiglio editoriale Firenze University Press

G. Nigro (Coordinatore), M.T. Bartoli, M. Boddi, R. Casalbuoni, C. Ciappei, R. Del Punta, A. Dolfi, V. Fargion, S. Ferrone, M. Garzaniti, P. Guarnieri, A. Mariani, M. Marini, A. Novelli, M. Verga, A. Zorzi.

© 2014 Firenze University Press

Università degli Studi di Firenze

Firenze University Press

Borgo Albizi, 28, 50122 Firenze, Italy

www.fupress.com

Printed in Italy

INDICE

M. Garzaniti	<i>Foreword</i>	7
G. Siedina	<i>Latinitas and Identity Formation in the Polish Crown and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (Sixteenth-Eighteenth Centuries). An Introduction</i>	11
Ž. Nekraševič-Karotkaja	<i>Latin Epic Poetry and its Evolution as a Factor of Cultural Identity in Central and Eastern Europe in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries</i>	21
J. Niedźwiedz	<i>How did Virgil Help Forge Lithuanian Identity in the Sixteenth Century?</i>	35
A. Osipian	<i>Constructing Noble Ancestors and Ignoble Neighbours. Uses of Cornelius Tacitus's Germania and Annales in J.B. Zimorowicz's Leopoldis triplex (1650s-1670s)</i>	49
A.W. Mikołajczak	<i>Antique and Christian Traditions in the Latin Poetry of Renaissance and Baroque Poland</i>	71
P. Urbański	<i>Cultural and National Identity in Jesuit Neo-Latin Poetry in Poland in the Seventeenth Century. The Case of Sarbiewski</i>	81
G. Siedina	<i>The Teaching of Lyric Meters and the Reception of Horace in Kyiv-Mohylanian Poetics</i>	99
V. Myronova	<i>Chancellery Latin in Fifteenth-Sixteenth Century Ukraine</i>	131
S. Narbutas	<i>Latinitas in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Chronology, Specifics and Forms of Reception</i>	145
D. Pociūtė	<i>Abraomas Kulvietis. Humanistic Origins of the Early Reformation in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania</i>	161

Constructing Noble Ancestors and Ignoble Neighbours. Uses of Cornelius Tacitus's *Germania* and *Annales* in J.B. Zimorowicz's *Leopolis triplex* (1650s-1670s)¹

Alexandr Osipian

(Kramatorsk Institute of Economics and Humanities, Ukraine)

1. Introduction

It is commonly accepted in studies of modern nationalism that according to the primordial paradigm, the 'nation' is seen as an almost eternally uninterrupted lineage uniting contemporary generations with their direct forefathers since time immemorial. One of a nation's key features is ethnic purity, which can guarantee its uniqueness and sometimes even its superiority. But before modern nationalism was invented, there were other, sometimes absolutely unexpected, imagined lineages between forefathers and their descendants in pre-modern societies. This article focuses on the question of how such imagined group genealogies were constructed at a micro-level – in one city, in one book, by one author.

According to Bo Strath, "it is not unreasonable to argue that the production of symbols, images and myths is an elite undertaking, that this construction/invention is simply the elite's manipulation of the masses"². History does not exist 'out there', waiting to be discovered, but is permanently invented in order to give meaning to the present – and to the future – through the past³. The main purpose of this article is to demonstrate how social aspirations and fears influenced historical imagination, and how this socially constructed past was in turn used to reconstruct social reality as well as social stratification and mobility. It will also address the issue of how a narrative was constructed to fill existing gaps and to build up continuity in order to restore social order and stability.

First, this article will analyze how Tacitus' *Germania* was used to provide the contemporary urban elite of one specific city with prestigious ancestors.

¹ This paper was written thanks to my fellowships at the Jagiellonian University, Warsaw University, Deutsches Historisches Institut Warschau, and Geisteswissenschaftliches Zentrum Geschichte und Kultur Ostmitteleuropas e.V. an der Universität Leipzig. I am grateful to the Foundation for promoting science in Poland, Kasa im. Józefa Mianowskiego, and to the Robert Bosch Stiftung for their financial support of these fellowships. This paper draws on, and seeks to summarize, some of the arguments and conclusions of a book-in-progress devoted to the uses of the remote past in social relations between Catholic patricians and the Armenian community in late sixteenth-seventeenth century Lemberg.

² Strath 2000: 30.

³ *Ibid.*: 26.

Second, it will demonstrate how just one sentence from Tacitus's *Annales* was used to produce a negative image of the Armenian community, seen by the Catholic patricians as their main economic and social rival.

In addition, it will investigate how the ethnic and the social were intermixed in a multiethnic city and in historical narrative in order to highlight how imagined group genealogies were used to promote or to hinder the social mobility of certain groups.

Analysis of the grammars used by actors enabled us to discover bonds, conflicts, and alliances between them. Special attention will be given to analysing the uses of the terms ambiguity (*ambiguitas*), constancy (*constantia*), and militancy (*bellicosus*). Why did Zimorowicz quote Tacitus in his work? Why were the terms *ambiguity*, *constancy*, and *militancy* so important, and how was their use influenced by the recent decades of the city's history, and by Zimorowicz's own experience and intentions?

2. Tacitus' *Germania* and German Humanists

According to Frank L. Borchardt, "the Middle Ages and the Renaissance needed no committees to compile lists of the one hundred great books. The great books were known, read, distilled, plagiarized, and anthologized" (Borchardt 1971: 1). And among these great books was Tacitus's *Germania*.

Germania was first published in 1476, and over the next five decades it was printed mostly in German-speaking countries, amounting to as many as six thousand copies (Krebs 2011: 91). It served as the foundational text for German humanists, who formed "Germany" as an "imagined community", actively "inventing traditions" set in the Germanic past (Krebs 2009: 281).

According to Christopher B. Krebs, four factors were particularly conducive to the ideological impact of *Germania* in the sixteenth century: the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation was losing its centripetal force, and the notion of a German nation correspondingly became more appealing and integrative. This emerging national consciousness rose further during the confrontation between German electors and the Curia in Rome as well as German and Italian humanists, with the former all too aware of their *barbara tellus*, the latter scornful of it. Finally, a classical text of unquestionable authority to humanistic eyes, *Germania* fulfilled deep desires: the obstinate German search for a national identity in its own right found a past characterized by specific values very different from those of Rome, a past which, in those times of instability, offered a stable foundation for nation-building (Krebs 2009: 282).

The Tacitean emphasis on Germanic customs and morals was particularly welcome, since the majority of humanists intended history to reveal the morally superior past and teach its readers to embrace long-lost values (Krebs 2009: 286).

In reaction to Germanic cultural shortcomings, apparent even to patriotically blinded eyes, emphasis was given to their morality and simple lifestyle (in

contrast to Roman/Italian decadence), and weakness was turned into strength. However, this re-evaluation of the German past relied on a second strategy, namely demonstrating that it was not as primitive as the Italians liked to assert: Celtis' promotion of the learned Druids, Bebel's collection of *proverbia* and Jacob Wimpheling's characterisation of the Germans as supreme inventors and crafters are merely three examples of this endeavour. Overnight the ancient Germans became Promethean warriors; and, for centuries to come, disappointing realities would yield to gratifying fiction (Krebs 2009: 286).

Other enduring ideas emerging at this time, growing over centuries, included the attribution of other people's achievements to the ancient Germans, the idea that noble and outstanding individuals and families were of German blood (Krebs 2009: 287). This idea was developed in the writings of Józef Bartłomiej Zimorowicz, who was a Pole, but who used Tacitean "German virtues" in a different way from those used by German humanists.

3. *Life and works of Józef Bartłomiej Zimorowicz*

Though Polish Germanophobia has a long history in pre-modern times⁴, Tacitus's *Germania* was used by Zimorowicz to provide the contemporary urban elite in Lemberg⁵ with German lineage and thereby with Tacitean "German virtues".

An old Polish saying goes:

Jak świat światem, nie będzie Niemiec Polakowi bratem.
Till the end of time, Germans will never be brothers for Poles.

⁴ An example of such argumentation may be the speech delivered in the Roman Curia by Jan Ostroróg in 1467. Similar anti-German accents were to be found in the historic arguments in the letter of July 28, 1514, which the Polish primate and chancellor, Jan Łaski, wrote to Bernardino Gallo and Maciej Miechowita. (Cynarski 1968: 9). In the course of the election campaign during the first interregnum in 1572-1573, the German candidates Maximilian Habsburg and prince Albrecht Friedrich of Prussia were seen as bearers of absolutism, which endangered republican values. Were they to be elected, their opponents predicted an influx of foreign nobility into Poland and the marginalisation of Polish nobility (Kąkolewski 2007: 22-23).

⁵ The original name of the city was *Lvov* or *Lviv*. It was renamed by German settlers in the mid-fourteenth century as *Lemburg*. In neo-Latin writings the city was named *Leopolis*. In Polish it is known as *Lwów*. From 1772 to 1918 the city – as well Galicia/Galizien province – was part of the Habsburg Empire where it was known as *Lemberg*. Under this name, the city was known in modern times in the main European languages. When writing on the period before the Polish conquest of the 1340s, the name *Lviv* is used in this article. The name *Lemberg* is used in the post-1340s period. The name *Lemburg* is used in the quotations from *Leopolis triplex* referring to the post-1340s period. The name *Leopolis* is used in the respective quotations from or references to the text of *Leopolis triplex*.

Lemberg city councillor Józef Bartłomiej Zimorowicz (1597-1677) was probably familiar with this saying. He wrote the history of the city between 1665 and 1667, and then between 1670 and 1672. Józef Bartłomiej Zimorowicz (*Iosephus Bartholomaeus Zimorowicz*) was born in 1597 into the family of a suburban mason Stanisław Ozimek. The young Zimorowicz began his career as assistant to a municipal clerk. During the 1620s, he performed the duties of a *palestrant*, comparable to a modern lawyer, and represented the Armenian community in its relations with the city magistrate. Zimorowicz glorified the victory of the Polish-Cossack army led by crown-prince Wladislaw over the Ottoman-Tatar troops in the battle of Khotyn in 1621 in a panegyric published in 1623. In 1629, Zimorowicz married the daughter of a rich jeweller and councillor (*consul*) Mikołaj Siedmiradzki (†1630)⁶. In the same year Zimorowicz obtained the citizenship of Lemberg. In 1634, when recently elected King Wladislaw IV visited Lemberg, the city council presented him with the panegyric entitled *Voice of a lion* (*Vox leonis*), written by Zimorowicz (Heck 1887). In 1635, Zimorowicz bought a house (*lapidea*) within the city walls. In 1640, he became a secretary of the city council. In 1646, Zimorowicz was co-opted into the city jury (*lawa, scabinat* – the court of the bench) and in 1648 into the city council (*rada*) and headed the self-government of Lemberg – he occupied the highest office of *burmistrz* (*proconsul*)⁷. In the same year, the Polish Crown witnessed an uprising by Zaporozhian Cossacks, led by hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky, who besieged Lemberg in September-October. In November 1648, Zimorowicz took part in the election of the new king in Warsaw, being one of the two representatives of Lemberg in the elective diet (*sejm*). In 1654, Zimorowicz held the office of city judge (*advocatus, wójt* – a head of the court of the bench) and married Sophia, the daughter of a rich Armenian merchant, Zachariasz Awedikowicz, by then deceased. Sophia died in 1655 (Heck 1897: 47). In the same year, together with many other burghers, Zimorowicz fled Lemberg besieged by Cossack and Russian troops. After his return in 1656, he married Rosalia, a daughter of the patrician Martin Grozwaier (†1653). Rosalia died in 1661. In 1663, Zimorowicz married Jadwiga, the daughter of city councillor Jerzy Krall (†1669), who gave him one son and two daughters (Heck 1897: 57).

Among the many works written by Zimorowicz on religious, lyric and historic topics, there is also a history of Lemberg – *Leopolis triplex* – his main opus. Zimorowicz started to collect source materials from the city archives in the 1650s. Some of his earlier works – such as the history of the Holy Spirit hospital – were also included in *Leopolis triplex*. The main core was written between 1665 and 1667 (Heck 1899: xxvi). Lemberg's past was described in chronological order from the thirteenth century till 1597 – the year of the author's birth. Then, around 1670, Zimorowicz continued his chronological narrative until 1633. At the beginning he added a dedication to the city's Senate and the bulk of text not directly connected with Lviv/Lemberg's history, but devoted

⁶ Heck 1894: 72.

⁷ Heck 1897: 30-31.

to the history of political and military relations between Poland and Rus' from the eleventh through to the fourteenth centuries. In 1671, Zimorowicz published a book entitled *The famous men of Lemberg* (*Viri illustres civitatis Leopoliensis*), written as a series of brief biographies of the sixteenth and seventeenth century urban patricians. When Lemberg was besieged by Ottoman, Tatar, Cossack, and Moldavian troops in 1672, Zimorowicz led the defence of the city. This siege is described in his book *Leopolis a Turcis, Tataris, Cosacis, Moldavis obsessa*, published posthumously in 1693. His last wife died in 1675, followed in 1677 by Zimorowicz himself.

Thus, Zimorowicz's life could be an example of a successful career – he was born in a suburb and finished his life as a patrician – owner of a house in the most prestigious Market square. He used his talents – judicial as well as literary – to defend and glorify the urban elite, into which he was accepted on account of his career and his marriages. Zimorowicz dedicated his main opus – *Leopolis triplex* – to the city's Senate – “eodemque calamo, fortuna priore proscripta, fascibus consularibus Musas meas suburbanas adscripsit” (Zimorowicz 1899a: 4)⁸. Zimorowicz emphasized that *Leopolis triplex* is an expression of his gratitude to the patricians who helped him make a successful career, because the Senate “manu e caeno plebeio extraxit” (*Ibid.*)⁹.

4. *Inventing Collective Genealogy in “Leopolis Triplex”: German Warriors as Ancestors of the Polish Patricians in Lemberg*

Zimorowicz entitled his main historical writing – “*Leopolis triplex*”, that is “Tripartial Leopolis”. He divided the city's history into three parts. In the first part, he described early history – Ruthenian Leopolis – from the foundation of Lviv by the Ruthenian prince Lev (Leo), son of Daniel, around 1270¹⁰. According to Zimorowicz, Lev used the new town as a place in which to store the booty that he and his Tatar allies had seized during their incursions into Poland¹¹. The second period started with the conquest of the city by the Polish king Kazimierz/Casimir III (1333-1370) in 1340. Zimorowicz named this period – “German Leopolis” – since Casimir III settled his German mercenaries there. It was they who transformed Lviv (*Lwihorod*) from a semi-barbarian town (*oppidum*) into a city (*urbs*) called Lemburg. According to Zimorowicz, by the mid-sixteenth cen-

⁸ “and with the same pen, marked by early fortune, my suburban talent is subjected to the insignias of the [Lemberg's] consuls”.

⁹ “pulled a plebeian out of the dirt with its hand”.

¹⁰ It is important to note that in the thirteenth-century Ruthenian chronicle – *Ipat'evskaja letopis'* – the existence of Lviv/Lvov was mentioned for the first time in 1256. Zimorowicz indicated 1270, since his main source for this period was Kromer's *De origine et rebus gestis Polonorum*.

¹¹ Zimorowicz 1899a: 39, 40.

ture those Germans had been assimilated by the local Polish population. Thus, he named the third part – “Polish Leopoliis” – from 1551 until his own day.

Zimorowicz delivered his concept of the temporal division of the city’s history in the opening part of *Leopolis triplex*:

Triplicem ego Leopolim in una comperio:

1270. Russicam primam, a Leone regulo Russiae condi verius coeptam, quam conditam, ideoque, ut omnia opera antiquitatis, informem, horridam, impexam, stativis militaribus, quam urbi propriorem, Lwihorod ab initio appellatam.

1340. Alteram Germanicam, per Casimirum, omnium testimonio Magnum, priore de Russis deditione accepta, flammis Polonicis expiatam, moenibus saxeis, iuribus Saxoniceis, praesidiis Teutonicis in melius mutatam, Lemburgum nominatam.

1551. Tertiam post duas priores Polonicam factam, qualis hodie usque supersat. Incolis enim primaevis in mores indigenarum uxorumque, quas ex puellis Lechicis capiebant, sensim degenerantibus, peregrinitas quoque advenarum pau latim exolevit, cultus autem popularis et vernaculus sermo externum praevaluit. (Zimorowicz 1899a: 37)¹².

At the beginning of the second part of *Leopolis triplex*, Zimorowicz included a long and detailed story about the virtues of the Germans and how they had civilized the city. In the review of the year 1345, Zimorowicz wrote: “in olim apud Tacitum proclamatum quasi inaudivisset Casimirus, multum bellicae laudi, plurimum constantiae Germanorum indulisit, regiae suae, castrorum urbiumque primariarum custodia illis credita” (Zimorowicz 1899a: 61-62)¹³. Then he quoted Martin Kromer – the most famous Polish historian of the sixteenth century – who emphasized the role of the Germans in urbanizing Poland:

Cum Poloniam atque Russiam, partim bellis superioribus et excursionibus barbarorum, partim pestilentia exinanitam, minus cultam minusque populosam esse cereret, Teutonici generis hominibus sive accitis, sive ultro venientibus agros attribuit. Quorum non exiguae reliquiae in Submontana et Hungaris finitima regione et Russia in hodiernum usque diem manent [...] Eorum cura et opera Polonia fre-

¹² “Threefold Lviv in one [city] I discover:

1270. First it is Ruthenian, founded by the Ruthenian prince Lev, or anyway planned rather than built. Therefore, like all ancient creations, it was shapeless, primitive, crude, and similar to a military camp rather than a city, initially called Lviv-town.

1340. Secondly it is German, taken from the Ruthenians by Casimir –commonly recognized as “the Great”, then purified by Polish flame, and improved with stone walls, Saxon law, a German garrison, and called Lemburg.

1551. Thirdly, after the previous two became Polish, which it is till now. Primary residents [of the city] in accordance with the indigenous habits married Polish girls and as a result gradually transformed themselves: since foreign (German) habits gradually diminished, the native way of life and the local language (Polish) replaced foreign ones”.

¹³ “In the ancient era, Tacitus testified in his Roman history that there are no other people who could surpass the Germans in warcraft or in loyalty”.

quentari et cultior esse pages et oppidis coepit. Sunt enim frugaliiores et diligentiores in re paranda ac tuenda quam Poloni, et lautius habitant¹⁴.

Then Zimorowicz interrupted Kromer's quotation to introduce his own remark: "ita ut facile etiamnum appareat per pagos et oppida iter facientibus, ubi illi, ubi Poloni habitent, videmusque ruere muros quorundam oppidorum, ab illis, quod vel nomina testificantur, conditorum, posteaquam a Polonis habitantur et administrantur" (Zimorowicz 1899a: 62-63)¹⁵.

Zimorowicz continued Kromer's quotation to emphasize not only Casimir III's particular favour to the German settlers in Lemburg, but the king's general protection of its townspeople and peasants:

Fuit autem in eos, Teutonos inquam, et in ceteros oppidanos et agrestes propensior et indulgentior Casimirus, nec eos gravioribus laboribus vel exactionibus, aut ullis iniuriis praefectorum suorum, sive adeo procerum atque nobilitatis premi passus est, animadvertendo in eos, qui aliquid eiuscemodi ausi essent, ita ut vulgo rusticorum sive plebeiorum rex vocaretur. Nec ipsos modo Teutonos iure suo Saxonico seu Magdeburgensi uti permisit, sed suis quoque Polonis id indulsit" (Cromerus 1589: 214; Zimorowicz 1899a: 63)¹⁶.

By extensively citing Kromer, Zimorowicz thus criticized the contemporary nobles whose politics had caused the decline of Polish cities and their populations. At the same time, aware of the long tradition of Polish Germanophobia, Zimorowicz found it necessary to explain Kromer's favour toward the Germans in the following statement: "Haec et plura alia in laudem Germanorum gravis scriptor idemque antistes, doctrina vitaeque laudatus, quamvis satis superque esset a Polono aemulam gentem celebrari, inter quos hereditariae rixae de gloria et de viribus pugnae, – sed virtus et in hoste probatur"¹⁷. Actu-

¹⁴ "When he [King Casimir III] saw Poland and Ruthenia, poorly civilized and sparsely inhabited due to the plague [of 1348] and constant wars, he invited Germans and granted them lands in Subcarpathia and in the borderland with Hungary. Their communities still exist in Ruthenia today [...] Thanks to their efforts and deeds, Poland began to be settled with many villages and towns, because these Germans were much far superior to the Poles in managing and developing this country" (Cromerus 1589: 214; Zimorowicz 1899a: 62).

¹⁵ "And even today anyone travelling through villages and towns can easily see where Germans live, and where Poles live. And they can see that urban fortifications need repair in those towns, which were founded by Germans, but are now inhabited and ruled by Poles".

¹⁶ "And Casimir favoured these Germans as well as other [that is Polish] townspeople and peasants. And he forbade his governors and even the aristocracy and noblemen to oppress them [that is townspeople and peasants] with works, and taxes, and other burdens. That is why he was known as the king of peasants and plebeians. He not only allowed the Germans to use their Saxon or Magdeburg law, but also granted it to his own Poles".

¹⁷ "These and many other praiseworthy examples of German habits are described in detail by the chronicler-bishop [M. Kromer], glorious of his life and talent. It is worth

ally, Kromer was born into a burgher family of German immigrants in Biecz, in southern Poland (Finkel 1883: 7). Kromer had graduated from both Kraków Academy (1530) and Bologna University (1540). In 1533-1537 he worked at the Royal Chancellery in Kraków. On his return from Italy, he became secretary to Archbishop Peter Gamrat. As the latter's personal advisor, Kromer was also his envoy and representative to Rome from 1543 to 1544. In 1545, he became secretary to King Sigismund I. Kromer was seen as one of the best Polish diplomats and frequently served as an envoy on various diplomatic missions: to Augsburg (1547), to Rome (1548) and to Vienna (1553, 1554)¹⁸. In 1552, he was ennobled and granted a coat of arms for his services to the King (Finkel 1883: 34). In 1550 Kromer worked in the royal archive and in 1555 he published his history of Poland – *De origine et rebus gestis Polonorum libri XXX*. From 1558 to 1564 he served as the Polish envoy to Emperor Ferdinand I (Finkel 1883: 35). Recalled to Poland in 1564, Kromer took the post of co-adjutor of the Bishopric of Warmia (Ermland), and in 1573 he was promoted to Prince-Bishop (Finkel 1883: 36). Thus, in the eyes of contemporary and later generations of urban upper-classes, Kromer embodied their aspirations for career and ennoblement. His life became a model for the urban patricians and, for a century, his history of Poland shaped their historical imagination. Kromer's history was published in Latin in 1555, 1558, 1568, and 1589, in German in 1562, and in Polish in 1611. Kromer's history in the Latin edition as well as in the German edition was mentioned seven times in the Catholic burghers' book inventories composed after their death in late sixteenth–early seventeenth-century Lemberg¹⁹. Zimorowicz himself called Kromer “Cromeri, florentissimi rerum Polonicarum auctoris” (Zimorowicz 1899a: 29)²⁰ and “[...] florentissimi rerum Polonicarum scriptores horumque coryphaeus Cromerus” (Zimorowicz 1899a: 55)²¹.

4.1. ROMAN FEATURES OF THE GERMAN SETTLERS IN LEMBERG: OLD AND NEW VIRTUES OF “THE PRIMARY GERMANS” IN LEOPOLIS TRIPLEX

Zimorowicz goes on to describe how the German mercenaries of Casimir III settled in Leopold and became burghers. Zimorowicz emphasized the domination of the Germans in Lemberg, which after the conquest was founded again on a new legal basis, in accordance with the German or Magdeburg law (*Mag-*

adding that [he being] a Pole praises the rival nation [Germany], with which [Poles] have inherited quarrels for glory and battles for virtues. But even rivals' virtues are praiseworthy”.

¹⁸ Finkel 1883: 12-13.

¹⁹ Skoczek 1939: 45. According to Luc Boltanski, the grammars used by individuals to legitimate their arguments draw on a limited repertory of fundamental texts identified by him as forging the social bond.

²⁰ “the most brilliant among Polish historians”.

²¹ “the most brilliant writers of Polish history and the head of them – Kromer”.

deburger Recht): “Germanis solis regimen in reliquos indigenas tutelamque urbis tradit” (Zimorowicz 1899a: 64)²².

According to Zimorowicz, “quidquid igitur sancti aut egregii Leopolis ad praesens habet, totum id a primaevis Teutonibus accepit, maxime vero pietatem in superos, reverentiam in principes, caritatem in domesticos, hospitalitatem in externos. [...] Adventu Germanorum monstrosis superstitionibus exonerate est” (Zimorowicz 1899a: 64)²³. Thus Zimorowicz juxtaposes the “superstitions” of the “schismatic” (Orthodox) Ruthenians and the good mores of the local Germans – the “true believers” of the holy Roman Church.

Then Zimorowicz counted the virtues of “the primary Germans”, mostly derived from Tacitus’ *Germania*: “[...] ad extremum, quod apud me palmare, bonos mores, quales apud Germanos plus, quam bonas leges, valere Tacitus attestatur” (Zimorowicz 1899a: 65)²⁴. At the same time, Zimorowicz transformed the primitive Tacitean Germans living their simple life in the forests into the promoters of urban civilization on the eastern fringes of Europe (*ex magistris militum magistros civium*). In 1356, Casimir III granted Lemburg – actually the Catholic urban community – the Magdeburg law. Under this year Zimorowicz included an article on the leading role of “the primary Germans” in the military and civil life of the city, with the subtitle – “Germans are teachers of war and citizens” (“Germani belli et civitatis magistri”). Zimorowicz based this story on the two well-known Roman models: 1) when the stationary military camps of legions, situated mostly on the Rhine and the Danube, gradually developed into towns (such as *Vindobona* – Vienna, *Castra Bonnensis* – Bonn, *Castrum Mogontiacum* – Mainz, *Argentoratum* – Strasbourg), or 2) when emeriti legionnaires were granted plots of land and settled on the borderlands in the *coloniae* named after Roman emperors, their relatives or powerful officials (such as *Colonia Agrippina* – Cologne). In both cases these military settlements were mostly founded on the places of the former native burghs and gradually civilized the conquered natives in a given province. Thus, Zimorowicz portrayed his “primary Germans” with Roman features:

1356. Germani belli et civitatis magistri. Germani quoque laudis avidi et propensione regia velut classico exciti, abunde votis Casimiri satis facientes, pace solertes, bello strenui utrobique fideles, prolixam regis munificentiam provocarunt.

²² “[Casimir] granted Germans the right to rule over other indigenous people and to defend the city”.

²³ “The holiest and the best that Leopolis has today, was borrowed from the primary Germans, in particular piety, loyalty to monarchs, care for their fellow citizens, hospitality to foreigners. In earlier days Leopolis had been barbarian and excluded from the mystic body of true believers [...] With the arrival of the Germans, [Leopolis] freed itself from these monstrous superstitions [...]”.

²⁴ “Lastly, what is most important for me, they introduced good habits to Lemberg, which, according to Tacitus, the Germans respect more than law”. Cf.: “boni mores valent quam alibi bonae leges” (“good habits are worth as much as good laws elsewhere”) (*Germania* 19).

Illos nondum veteranos et iam emeritos in uberes campos deduxit, legibus patriis, immunitatibus agrariis, vacationibus castrensibus demulsit, ex magistris militum magistros civium constituit, ut merito Leopoldis colonia Casimiritana dicenda esset, nisi eam pristino nomini princeps, hostibus etiam aequus²⁵, reliquisset (Zimorowicz 1899a: 67)²⁶.

The “primary Germans” brought with them the laws, symbols and practices of urban self-government, trade and handicrafts, they built churches and hospitals in Lemberg, and established a school²⁷.

4.2. ETHNIC ORIGINS AS SOCIAL MARKERS: THE PATRICIANS’ ASPIRATIONS FOR ENNOBLEMENT

There are also other differences between “the good old” Germans presented by Tacitus and those presented by Zimorowicz. Tacitus and German humanists emphasized that the Germans are “aboriginal, and not mixed at all with other races”²⁸ (“Ipsos Germanos indigenas crediderim minimeque aliarum gentium adventibus et hospitibus mixtos”); “They preserved their old mother tongue unmixed and unadulterated” (Justus Georg Schottelius, 1648)²⁹. Conversely, Zimorowicz wrote that the “primary German” settlers of Lemberg “married local Ruthenian women” (“Amazonum Russicarum confixi”)³⁰. Then they continued inter-marrying with the Poles: “Verum perpetua duarum nationum inter se mistio” (“The intermixing of these two nations [Germans and Poles] was constant”³¹). In the end, the Germans were assimilated into Polish society. One should not forget that in contemporary discourse, mingling with others was seen as a sign of degradation³². But Zimorowicz ‘married his ‘primary Germans’ with

²⁵ “gracious even to their enemies”, that is to the recently conquered Ruthenians.

²⁶ “Germans, yearning for praise, and stimulated by the king’s grace, satisfied all Casimir’s orders. Industrious in peace, brave in war, and in both situations faithful, Germans provoked the extraordinary grace of the King. He settled them, yet not veterans but merited, on the fertile fields, granted them their native law, freed them from land taxes, made them city officeholders, thereby transforming them from military instructors into teachers of citizens. Thus, Leopoldis could have been renamed Casimir’s colony, but the king, gracious even to his enemies, let the city keep its old name”.

²⁷ Zimorowicz 1899a: 68-69.

²⁸ *Germania* 2.

²⁹ Krebs 2011: 129.

³⁰ Zimorowicz 1899a: 63.

³¹ Zimorowicz 1899a: 126.

³² “Mysos vocatos, id est, *miessancy mieszani*, ex diversis gentibus” (“They are called Mysos, since they are a *mixture* of diverse peoples”) [Italic mine, A.O.] (Sarnicki 1587: 65). In the Latin text, the author includes Polish words – *miessancy mieszani* – in order to explain to his Polish readers the etymology of the name *Mysos* and the ignoble nature of these people. “The concept of purity was used to justify the position of certain social groups. In early modern Europe ‘purity of blood’ was officially essential for high status. Elsewhere the nobility often described their social inferiors as unclean in order to prevent social mobility” (Burke 1992: 63).

local women to demonstrate how the former's symbolic capital was inherited by the contemporary Polish patricians of Lemberg.

For the seventeenth-century patricians this meant abandoning their forefathers in favor of those who had preceded them in Lemberg, going all the way back to King Kazimierz/Casimir III's conquest of Galician Rus'. It is impossible to explain the reasons why Zimorowicz constructed such a history if one focuses exclusively on the surviving primary sources or on the historical realities of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Zimorowicz was not a disinterested, dispassionate observer. He was not simply describing Lemberg's urban society in his time but articulating a view of it from the standpoint of an occupant of a particular position within that society, that of an ennobled magistrate. According to Simona Cerutti, the sources that the historian uses are often (though not always) documents that make claims (rather than describe it)³³. It is time to ask questions, such as: what claims to legitimacy does Zimorowicz express? Who are these claims made to? And in what way?

Actually, the early Germans settled in Lviv long before the Polish conquest of the 1340s. These Germans were merchants and artisans, mostly from Poland and Silesia, invited by the Ruthenian prince Daniel (1238-1264) in the mid-thirteenth century. After the Polish conquest of Galician Rus' and Lviv in 1349, local German townspeople (*cives catholici*) became the dominant community as the Catholics were supported by the Polish kings. The new influx of German burghers to Lemberg, mostly from Poland and Silesia, continued during the fifteenth century and transformed them into the majority group (Skoczek 1929: 21). The Ottoman conquests in the northern part of the Black Sea region in the 1470s-1480s dramatically changed the trade in which the German merchants of Lemberg were involved. Thus, the economic power of the older patriciate radically declined in the late fifteenth century (Lozinski 1892: 39-41). In the second half of the sixteenth century, a new patriciate emerged in Lemberg. Moreover, the new patricians were newcomers to Lemberg. Some of them were migrants from German or Silesian cities, some from Pannonia/Hungary, Italy and Crete, but mostly they were ethnic Poles. The most evident example could be Paul (Paweł) Kampian (ca.1527-1600). The son of a serf, one Mikolaj Wosczyzna, Paul attended Kraków Academy and in 1556 graduated as a Doctor in Medicine from the University of Bologna. He invented his new surname *Novus Campianus* (*Novicampianus*, *Novicampius*) by translating the Polish name of his native village Nowopole – “New Field” – into Latin. In 1560, Paul Kampian settled in Lemberg and accepted urban citizenship. There, he married Anne Grynwald/Grinvalt – a girl evidently of German origin – and started his career in the independent city government. Paul Kampian was adopted into the patriciate being co-opted into the city council in 1584. His son, Martin (Marcin) Kampian (1574-1629), the embodiment of the German-Polish elite alliance in Lemberg, was the most powerful member of the city council in 1617-1627. He subsidized the city with large sums of money and controlled the most profitable fields of

³³ Cerutti 2004: 28.

communal economy. My suggestion is that Zimorowicz modelled his ‘political archaeology of virtues’ on the biography of the patrician family of Kampian³⁴. Zimorowicz called M. Kampian “princeps senatum” (“first in [the city] Senate”) and “urbis columen” (“pillar of the city”)³⁵, since Zimorowicz himself started his early career when M. Kampian’s power was at its zenith. When M. Kampian was accused of numerous abuses of Lemberg city’s budget and property by the city council, Zimorowicz defended him as a lawyer in the city court in 1627-1629.

People’s actions do not reveal their objective determination so much as their claims, intentions, and proposals (Cerutti 2004: 27). When we feel confident about who we are, we do not talk about it, and it is generally only in periods of identity crisis that we look for a new identity and social community (Strath 2000: 21). The new urban elite – constituted by the newcomers – needed a sense of common ancestry. Historical continuity had to be invented by creating an ancient past beyond effective historical continuity.

Zimorowicz deliberately called “primaevi Teutoni” (“the primary German settlers”) – whom he actually invented himself – “veteres nostri” (“our ancestors”). In the introduction to the third chapter, entitled “Polish Leopoliis”, Zimorowicz stated: “illud adtraxerunt brevique Germanos numero minores, velut mare vastum fluvios os suum intrantes, absorpserunt vel in mores, ritus habitusque suos verterunt. Abhinc igitur Polonis Germanisque unanimi manu habenas reipublicae civilis moderantibus”³⁶ (“In a short time, the German minority was assimilated by the Polish majority in the same way as a larger sea assimilates rivers. Germans accepted Polish habits, rites, and clothes. ... [Then] Poles and Germans ruled the city together”). Thus, Zimorowicz established genealogical ties between the “primary Germans”, as founding fathers of Lemberg, and the contemporary Polish patricians of the city. The virtues of the “primary Germans” became the virtues of the Polish patricians. These inherited virtues, as well as their glorious warrior ancestors, underpinned the Lemberg patricians’ ambitions for nobility status. My point is that by emphasizing the role of king Casimir III the Great as the protector of Lemberg and of townspeople in general, Zimorowicz intended to dedicate *Leopoliis triplex* to his contemporary – the Polish king John Casimir/Jan Kazimierz (1648-1668). In 1661 John Casimir granted Lemberg – or its local patricians – nobility status, because the city had demonstrated its loyalty to the king during the political and military crisis of 1648-1660³⁷. The motto “Always loyal Leopoliis” (“Leopoliis semper fidelis”)

³⁴ Zimorowicz included both Paul and Martin Kampian in the list of Lemberg’s prominent citizens (cf. Zimorowicz 1899b: 304). He also devoted a panegyric to Martin Kampian (†1629) in his chronicle (see Zimorowicz 1899a: 200-202).

³⁵ Zimorowicz 1899a: 200.

³⁶ Zimorowicz 1899a: 126.

³⁷ Zimorowicz 1899b: 330-337. In the introduction to *Leopoliis triplex*, Zimorowicz mentioned the ennoblement of the city at the Diet (*Sejm*) in a sentence: “At Leopoliim [...] publico amplissimum ordinum regni oraculo decus et munimen Russiae appellatam [...]” (“And Lviv [...] in public speeches of the general estates of the kingdom was called decoration and stronghold of Rus’ [...]”) (Zimorowicz 1899a: 4).

was applied to the city's coat of arms in 1658 by Pope Alexander VII. *Leopolis triplex*, written by Zimorowicz in 1665-1667, may be an expression of the patricians' gratitude to the king for his grace. Unfortunately for Zimorowicz, John Casimir was dethroned in 1668. This could explain why Zimorowicz finally dedicated his opus to the city council, which he called the Senate.

Moreover, while describing migrations into Lemberg, Zimorowicz emphasizes the difference in social status and the ways in which Germans and Poles settled in Lemberg. While the "primary Germans" were mercenaries at the service of King Casimir III, who allowed them to settle in Lemberg in order to protect and civilize his new domains in Ruthenia, Polish migrants were described by Zimorowicz as wretched refugees looking for food and asylum. Between 1348 and 1362, Zimorowicz recorded comparable stories about famine and the plague in Poland. In any case, he noted that numerous Poles fled their country for Ruthenia, because Casimir III gave orders that refugees should be fed from the royal food stores in Lemberg. Then the King settled survivors in Lemberg. Opening the third part (*Leopolis Polonica*) of his tripartial book, Zimorowicz wrote that because of the bad harvest in Poland in 1551, numerous people fled from Mazovia/Mazowsze province to fertile Ruthenia and some of them settled in Lemberg. Thus, Zimorowicz constructed ethnically divided genealogies of socially different strata in the contemporary Lemberg community. If the brave German warriors were ancestors of the city's patricians, the miserable Polish refugees were ancestors of the city's plebeians. This explanatory scheme follows the early modern model of Sarmatian myth that Polish noblemen are descendants of the belligerent Sarmatian nomads; meanwhile, peasants are descendants of the subjugated natives³⁸. Since urban patricians could not be 'descendants' of Sarmatians, Trojans or Romans, Zimorowicz in a more modest way provided them with German ancestors – brave warriors in royal service – whom, in turn, he portrayed with the superior German-Roman virtues.

This model also reflects the attitude typical of pre-modern societies that every ethnic group maintains its innate features of temperament and that virtues and shortcomings are hereditary, similar to titles, jobs, offices, property, social status, etc. Finally, the urban commoners could not aspire to the dominant social position in Lemberg occupied by the patricians – descendants of the brave German stock and thereby bearers of inherited noble virtues. This point was further developed by Zimorowicz in a funny story, ridiculous only at first glance. In 1578, the artisan Walęty Wąsik from Lemberg was ennobled by the King for the heroic demolition of Polotsk castle during the war against Muscovy. Wąsik was granted the noble surname Polotynski and a coat of arms. Being drunk, he behaved like a hooligan in Lemberg, was thrown into prison but soon pardoned and released by the city magistrate, because such behaviour was seen as typical

³⁸ Cynarski 1968. See also: Kulicka 1980. The same model was elaborated in Renaissance Hungary, where the nobles were proclaimed descendants of the Huns who had conquered Pannonia in the 5th century AD and then transformed aboriginal people into their serfs.

of ‘new nobles’. Nevertheless, the ‘new noble’ felt offended and went to Warsaw, probably in order to file a lawsuit against Lemberg’s magistrate in the royal court. In Warsaw, he drowned in the Vistula and, as Zimorowicz concluded, “se dedit unique secum nobilitatem submersit”³⁹ (“sunk his ennoblement along with himself”). In writing this tragicomic story, Zimorowicz emphasized the attitude of his patrician milieu that urban plebeians or ‘commoners’ should not be granted noble status even for military deeds, but that ennoblement should be reserved exclusively for the urban upper-classes.

Bernd Schneidmüller’s note of the changes in urban historical consciousness in late medieval Germany could be easily applied to seventeenth-century Lemberg:

It is important to note that urban historiography was subject to a general process by which urban society increasingly split into strata. When the patriciate emerged as an authority endowed with a God-given right to rule, urban chroniclers, when describing the origins of their city as a social body, no longer focused exclusively on the emancipation of the city dwellers from their lords ... [Now] ... city chroniclers [...] were far more interested in explaining the royal acts of favor that had fostered the development of their cities. They integrated the community of burghers into the history of the realm [...] Moreover, they avoided a conceptual divide between the sphere of the citizen and the feudal world of lords and knights. This type of urban historical consciousness was not oriented toward dissent between the commune and the lords of the town. Instead, it underscored a basic level of consent between all actors as to the overall importance of urban growth (Schneidmüller 2002: 189).

4.3. AMBIGUITY AS AN INNATE FEATURE OF THE ARMENIANS: FROM TACITUS TO ZIMOROWICZ

Since Lemberg was a multiethnic city with more or less autonomous communities/*nations* of Armenians, Ruthenians, and Jews, the dominant position of the Catholic patricians in urban society had to be defended from these groups as well. Non-Catholics (*schismatici*) were not accepted into the city community. They were not treated as “*cives*”, i.e. the citizens of Lemberg. All members of the city government were Catholics. Within the city walls there were special streets for Armenians, Ruthenians, and Jews. Economic opportunities for ‘heretics’ and Jews were also restricted⁴⁰.

Armenian merchants were well-known for their oriental trade with Crimea, the Ottoman Empire, and Persia⁴¹. They were also used as interpreters in the Royal chancery. Some of them were diplomats or spies, listed in the royal service⁴². There was an evident increase in tension between the Catholic and the Armenian communities in the second half of the sixteenth century, caused main-

³⁹ Zimorowicz 1899a: 139.

⁴⁰ Cf. Charewiczowa 1925.

⁴¹ Cf. Dziubiński 1998; Nadel-Golobic 1979.

⁴² See Baranowski 1945-1946.

ly by economic issues. Using the capital they had previously accumulated from trading with the Orient, Armenian merchants began to push their Catholic competitors out of the Lemberg market. According to the 1578-1583 tax records, there were 346 Catholics (76 percent), 85 Armenians (19 percent), and 24 Ruthenians (5 percent) operating within the city walls⁴³.

In 1589, there were 38 so-called “rich shops” trading in expensive goods. Armenians owned 22 of them, Ruthenians owned 6, Catholics owned only 8, and for the other 2 they had a trial with Armenians. Armenians also owned 19 ‘poor shops’ out of a total of 24. Instead of observing the restriction to living only in the Armenian street, Armenians slowly bought up properties outside their territorial jurisdiction. By 1538-1544, they owned 42 (16 percent) “lapidea” – three-four storey stone buildings, by 1578-1583 – 56 (19 percent), in 1600 – 70-73 (24 percent)⁴⁴.

Despite accusations of being secret partisans of the rebellious Ukrainian Cossacks⁴⁵, Armenians and Ruthenians demonstrated their loyalty to the Polish king when Lemberg was besieged by the Cossacks in 1648 and 1655. In 1654, king John Casimir granted to Armenians in Lemberg – who by that time had accepted religious union with the Roman Church – equal rights with Catholic burghers. Moreover, in a short time John Casimir ennobled four Armenian merchants who had subsidized the King and the defence of Lemberg during the war against the Cossacks led by hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky. Thus, the Catholic patricians saw their dominant position in Lemberg as being endangered by the growing influence of wealthy Armenian merchants.

Zimorowicz’s writings reflect this tension. He saw it as his duty to promote the dominant position of the Catholic patricians to whom he belonged and to stop the growth of Armenian influence in the city. Among other arguments used to criticize contemporary Armenians, Zimorowicz borrowed a sentence from Tacitus’s *Annales* (II, 56): “AMBIGUA GENS EA ANTIQUITUS hominum ingeniis et situ terrarum, quoniam nostris provinciis late praetenta penitus ad Medos porrigitur; maximisque imperiis interiecti et saepius DISCORDES SUNT, ADVERSUS ROMANOS odio et in Parthum invidia”⁴⁶ (small capitals are mine, A.O.).

For the first time, Zimorowicz used this quotation from Tacitus in his work entitled *The famous men of Lemberg* (*Viri illustres civitatis Leopoliensis*, 1671). Describing the process of settling the city, recently founded by prince Lev, Zimorowicz linked the Armenians to the Tatars, thus representing both nations as allies in their incursions into Poland⁴⁷: “Tandem ardenti bellis provincia ARMENI

⁴³ Sribnyi 1912: 9.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵ Kochowski 1859: 24.

⁴⁶ “ARMENIA HAD BEEN OF OLD AN AMBIGUOUS COUNTRY DUE TO the character of its people and its geographical position, bordering, as it does, to a great extent on our provinces and stretching as far as Media. It lies between two mighty empires, and IS VERY OFTEN AT STRIFE WITH THEM, HATING ROME and jealous of Parthia”.

⁴⁷ For a detailed analysis of the imagined Armenian-Tatar military cooperation directed against Poland, see my article: Osipian 2011.

Tatarique, ANTIQUITUS TESTE TACITO AMBIGUI, in partem virium vocati civitate-que donati sunt” (Zimorowicz 1899b: 293)⁴⁸. The rationale behind his creative reading of Tacitus was probably that, since the Armenians had been allies of the oriental Parthian nomads against the Romans in ancient times, their descendants twelve centuries later became allies of the oriental Tatar nomads who were threatening the Roman-Catholic Poles, that is contemporary Romans.

The next time Zimorowicz borrowed the same phrase from Tacitus, it was to describe the lawsuit of 1535 on the Armenians’ right to own a shop, where they could sell goat meat for their fellow believers (the shop was situated near the Catholic monastery of Corpus Christi). In this writing, Zimorowicz reinforced his criticism with quotes from Trogus: “1535. [...] Eodem tempore ARMENI nostrates, non autem Asiatici, PER TACITUM AMBIGUI, per Trogum pomposi appellati, [...]” (Zimorowicz 1899a: 118-119)⁴⁹. Thus, migration from Asia to Europe failed to change the Armenians whose “ambiguity” (or unsettled state) was the same wherever they lived.

Lastly, Zimorowicz quoted Tacitus when starting the story about the lawsuit between the Armenian and Catholic communities in 1600, resolved by the royal decree of Polish king Sigismund III: “1600. Decimum sextum saeculum cives cum Armenis invenit litigantes. ARMENOS AGREE SAEPIUS DISCORDS ET ADVERSUS ROMANOS ODIO IN ANNALIBUS SUIS ANNOTAVIT TACITUS. Neque nostrates a maioribus suis degenerarunt” (*Ibid*: 156)⁵⁰. In this text, Zimorowicz equated the contemporary Roman-Catholic community of Lemberg with the ancient Romans, representing Armenians as a constant cause of trouble.

Thus, according to Tacitus, Armenians are AMBIGUOUS mostly because of their country’s “GEOGRAPHICAL POSITION” between the Roman Empire and Parthia. Zimorowicz transformed AMBIGUITY into the CONSTANT national feature of the Armenians. Armenians are AMBIGUOUS because of their heretic faith, imagined close ties with Tatars and frequent commercial trips to the Tatar and Ottoman domains.

Ambiguity was used by Tacitus in *Annales* (II, 24) in the notion of duality, when he described the Roman army’s invasion of Northern Germany by sea. The Roman army was led by Germanicus. After their return from Germany, the soldiers told stories about fabulous “AMBIGUAS hominum et beluarum formas, visa sive ex metu credita”⁵¹. The ambiguity of Armenians was indicated by Zimorowicz once more – this time without reference to Tacitus – when he described the foundation of the Armenian church in Lemberg in 1363: “1363.

⁴⁸ “Finally, ardent in military arts ARMENIANS and Tatars, AMBIGUOUS AS TESTIFIED BY TACITUS, were invited as warriors and granted citizenship”.

⁴⁹ “... In the same year, our Armenians, being not at all Asian, NAMED BY TACITUS AS AMBIGUOUS, and by Trogus – as pompous ...”.

⁵⁰ “In the sixteenth century, burghers started lawsuits against Armenians. ARMENIANS MULTIPLIED QUARRELS AND HATRED AGAINST ROMANS AS TACITUS INDICATED IN HIS ANNALS. And our (contemporary) Armenians have degenerated from their ancestors”.

⁵¹ “Ambiguous semi-human semi-bestial creatures, things they had really seen or in their terror believed”.

Ecclesia Armenorum et s. Georgii. Eadem tempestate Armeni quoque delubrum suum hermaphroditum opera latericio erigebant [...]” (*Ibid*: 69)⁵². The metaphor of “hermaphrodite” was used in religious polemics of the time to criticize heretics. Here, this term is used to characterize Armenians and their church as an in-between community, situated between true Christians (Roman Catholics) and schismatics (Greek Orthodox) and heretics (Protestants), in the sense that Armenians’ faith is at once semi-good and semi-bad.

Armenians in Lemberg were viewed by contemporaries as a nation in transition – as semi-Catholic and semi-heretic, at once local and foreign, as loyal to the king of Poland and suspicious from the Catholic burghers’ point of view, as Christians freely doing their business in Muslim countries – closed to Western Christians – as merchants supplying Poland with oriental goods and thereby causing money flow out of the country into Ottoman domains, and as townspeople openly living a noble lifestyle. Thus, *ambiguity* was seen as a constant and innate feature of Armenians whenever and wherever they lived, and Tacitus with his authority only legitimized this attitude. Catholic patricians saw the Armenian merchants’ aspirations for social mobility based on their geographical mobility (international trade) and profitable commerce as undermining their dominant position in the city. The dominant Catholic elite thought that Armenians in Lemberg caused disorder within the social framework by their very existence. That is why Zimorowicz tried to turn Armenians into ignoble neighbours, thereby signalling their *ambiguity* to the King in the hope that he would refrain from further acts of grace and empowerment towards Lemberg’s Armenians.

4. Conclusions

Zimorowicz’s example shows the norms and practices of social relations in the small-scale urban community of Lemberg being accommodated to the dominant concepts of a large-scale society – that is of Polish nobility – precisely through that set of norms that governs debate concerning the past. Like all systems of norms, those concerning the past constitute a link between cultural concepts and social action. But unlike any other set of norms, this set is, necessarily, a code for societies to talk *about* themselves, and not only *within* themselves⁵³. Quotations from Tacitus – an authoritative ancient source revitalized by the humanists throughout Europe – constituted part of this code.

Thus, instead of evident differences, the Germans depicted by Tacitus and by Zimorowicz have much in common. Tacitus had never been to Germany and had never seen the real life of German tribes. Zimorowicz lived in the seventeenth century and could know little about fourteenth century Lemberg, having at his disposal only a few primary sources of that distant period. Both authors

⁵² “At the same time Armenians built their hermaphroditic temple with bricks ...”.

⁵³ Cf. Appadurai 1981: 218.

constructed idealized Germans. Tacitus used them to criticize morally corrupt Roman society. Zimorowicz constructed the multifunctional idealized “primary Germans” (“primaevi Teutoni”) – founding fathers of Lemberg. These idealized “primary Germans” were used by Zimorowicz: 1) as an argument for the dominant position of the Catholic patricians in Lemberg; 2) to criticize contemporary Polish noblemen whom he accused of the decline of the Polish towns founded by the German settlers and Casimir III the Great; 3) to criticize contemporary Polish aristocracy (“contra iniurios potentiorum”) – the so-called magnates – who limited the economic opportunities of burghers in comparison to the good old king Casimir III who protected the townspeople. Thus, both authors constructed idealized Germans in order to criticize their contemporaries.

This literary utopia was used for the first time by the ancient Greeks, namely in Plato’s story of Atlantis and in Xenophon’s “Cyropaedia” (“The education of Cyrus”), both written in the 4th century BC, that is during a time of deep political crisis in the Greek polis. Tacitus wrote his *Germania* around 100 AD, that is after the civil war of 68-70 AD and the assassination of the emperor Domitian in 96 AD and the coming to power of Nerva and Trajan. Finally, Zimorowicz lived during a period of political crisis for the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, constant wars with Ukrainian Cossacks, Crimean Tatars, Russians, Swedes, Transylvanians and Ottoman Empire, in the course of which Lemberg was besieged three times – in 1648, 1655, and 1672. Plato and Xenophon both located their idealized imagined countries – that is ancient Atlantis and ancient Persia of Cyrus – in a remote space and time. Tacitus used the spatial dimension to locate his idealized Germans, while Zimorowicz used the temporal one. Thus, Zimorowicz located his idealized “primary Germans” in the good old times he and his contemporaries had lost forever.

Bibliography

- Appadurai 1981: A. Appadurai, *The Past as a Scarce Resource*, “Man” XVI, 1981, 2, pp. 201-219.
- Baranowski 1945-1946: B. Baranowski, *Ormianie w służbę dyplomatycznej Rzeczypospolitej*, “Myśl karaimska. Rocznik naukowo-społeczny”, Seria Nowa, XXIII, 1945-1946, 1, pp. 119-137.
- Bogucka 1976: M. Bogucka, *Miejsce mieszczanina w społeczeństwie szlacheckim. Atrakcyjność wzorców życia szlacheckiego w Polsce XVII wieku*, in: A. Wyczański (ed.), *Społeczeństwo staropolskie*, Warszawa 1976, pp. 185-219.
- Borchardt 1971: F.L. Borchardt, *German Antiquity in Renaissance Myth*, Baltimore-London 1971.
- Braudel 1979: F. Braudel, *Les jeux de l'échange*, Paris 1979² (transl. S. Reynolds, *The Wheels of Commerce*, London 2002, 1982¹).

- Burke 1992: P. Burke, *History and Social Theory*, Cambridge 1992.
- Charewiczowa 1925: Ł. Charewiczowa, *Ograniczenia gospodarcze nacyj schyzmatyckich i żydów we Lwowie XV-XVI w.*, Lwów 1925.
- Cromerus 1589: M. Cromerus, *De origine et rebus gestis Polonorum libri XXX*, Basel 1555 (1558; 1568; Köln 1589)
- Cynarski 1968: S. Cynarski, *The Shape of Sarmatian Ideology in Poland*, "Acta Poloniae Historica", XIX, 1968, pp. 5-17.
- Dziubiński 1998: A. Dziubiński, *Na szlakach Orientu. Handel między Polską a imperium Osmańskim w XVI-XVII wieku*, Wrocław 1998.
- Finkel 1883: L. Finkel, *Marcin Kromer. Historyk polski XVI wieku. Rozbiór krytyczny*, Kraków 1883.
- Heck 1887: K. Heck, *Pobył Władysława IV we Lwowie w roku 1634. i Józefa Bartłomieja Zimorowicza Vox Leonis*, Lwów 1887.
- Heck 1894: K. Heck, *Życie i dzieła Bartłomieja i Szymona Zimorowiczów (Ozinków) na tle stosunków ówczesnego Lwowa*, Kraków 1894.
- Heck 1895: K. Heck, *Materialy do biografii Józefa Bartłomieja i Szymona Zimorowiczów (Ozinków)*, I, Kraków 1895.
- Heck 1897: K. Heck, *Józef Bartłomiej Zimorowicz. Burmistrz, poeta i kronikarz lwowski. W trzechsetną rocznicę jego urodzin*, Lwów 1897.
- Heck 1899: K. Heck, *Przedmowa wydawcy*, in: J.B. Zimorowicz, *Opera quibus res gestae urbis Leopoldis illustrantur*, ed. K.J. Heck, Lwów 1899.
- Kąkolewski 2007: I. Kąkolewski, *Między korupcją a ksenofobią. Zmiany w postrzeganiu zjawiska korupcji w Dawnej Rzeczypospolitej. Zarys problemu*, "Przegląd Historyczny", XCVIII, 2007, 1, pp. 11-26.
- Kochowski 1859: W. Kochowski, *Historia panowania Jana Kazimierza z Klimakterów ...*, I, Poznań 1859.
- Krebs 2009: Ch.B. Krebs, *A Dangerous Book: the Reception of the Germania*, in: A.J. Woodman (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Tacitus*, Cambridge-New York 2009, pp. 280-299.
- Krebs 2011: Ch.B. Krebs, *A Most Dangerous Book: Tacitus's Germania from the Roman Empire to the Third Reich*, New York-London 2011.

- Kulicka 1980: E. Kulicka, *Legenda o rzymskim pochodzeniu Litwinów i jej stosunek do mitu sarmackiego*, "Przegląd historyczny", LXXI, 1980, 1, pp. 1-21.
- Łoziński 1892: W. Łoziński, *Patrycjat i mieszczaństwo lwowskie w XVI-XVII wieku*, Lwów 1892.
- Nadel-Golobic 1979: E. Nadel-Golobic, *Armenians and Jews in Medieval Lvov: The Role in Oriental Trade, 1400-1600*, "Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique", XX, 1979, pp. 345-388.
- Osipian 2011: A. Osipian, *The Lasting Echo of the Battle of Grunwald: the Uses of the Past in the Trials between the Armenian Community of Lemberg and the Catholic Patricians in 1578-1631*, "Russian History", XXXVIII, 2011, 2, pp. 243-280.
- Sarnicki 1587: S. Sarnicki, *Stanislai Sarnicii. Annales, sive de origine et rebus gestis Polonorum et Lituanorum, libri octo*, Kraków 1587.
- Schneidmüller 2002: B. Schneidmüller, *Constructing the Past by Means of the Present: Historiographical Foundations of Medieval Institutions, Dynasties, Peoples, and Communities*, in: G. Althoff, J. Fried, P.J. Geary (eds.), *Medieval Concepts of the Past: Ritual, Memory, Historiography*, Cambridge 2002, pp. 167-192.
- Skoczek 1929: J. Skoczek, *Studia nad patrycjatem lwowskim wieków średnich*, Lwów 1929.
- Skoczek 1939: J. Skoczek, *Lwowskie inwentarze biblioteczne w epoce renesansu*, Lwów 1939.
- Sribnyj 1912: F. Sribnyj, *Studiji nad organizacijojeju l'vivs'koji Stavropigiji vid kincja XVI do polovyny XVII st.: Material'ni vidnosyny bratčykiv*, "Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva imeni T.H. Ševčenko", 1912, 111, pp. 5-24.
- Strath 2000: B. Strath, *Introduction. Myth, Memory and History in the Construction of Community*, in: B. Strath (ed.), *Myth and Memory in the Construction of Community: Historical Patterns in Europe and Beyond*, Bruxelles et al. 2000, pp. 19-46.
- Zimorowicz 1623: J.B. Zimorowicz, *Pamiętka wojny tureckiej w r. 1621*, Kraków 1623.
- Zimorowicz 1899a: J.B. Zimorowicz, *Leopolis triplex*, in: Id., *Opera quibus res gestae urbis Leopolis illustrantur*, ed. C.J. Heck, Lwów 1899, pp. 1-215.
- Zimorowicz 1899b: J.B. Zimorowicz, *Viri illustres civitatis Leopoliensis*, in: Id., *Opera quibus res gestae urbis Leopolis illustrantur*, ed. C.J. Heck, Lwów 1899, pp. 285-339.

Abstract

Alexandr Osipian

Constructing Noble Ancestors and Ignoble Neighbours. Uses of Cornelius Tacitus's Germania and Annales in J.B. Zimorowicz's Leopolis triplex (1650s-1670s)

This article investigates the invention of prestigious ancestors and the construction of collective genealogy for Lviv's/Lemberg's urban patriciate in J.B. Zimorowicz's *Leopolis triplex*. The article examines how Zimorowicz portrays his contemporary patriciate as having the virtues necessary to govern the city as well as for ennoblement by way of using quotations from Tacitus' *Germania*. It also contributes to a better understanding of how the nobility's model – Sarmatism – influenced the urban patriciate's views of its prestigious past. The case study of a single quotation from Tacitus' *Annales* demonstrates early modern perceptions about virtues considered innate for a given ethnos and inherited by its members through many generations. The article exploits the interconnectedness of the social and ethnic in forming an image of an urban community, in particular when presenting social conflict as ethnic strife (between the Catholic patriciate and Armenian merchants). It analyses how Zimorowicz tried to legitimate accelerations or delays in the social mobility of different groups of the city's population in his opus. The split produced by the political and military crisis of 1648-1660 helped to actualize the concepts of 'constancy', 'ambiguity', and 'militancy' in public discourse. This actualization, in turn, influenced the narrative concept of *Leopolis triplex*, which reflects its author's attempt to overcome the break and to restore continuity. This attempt includes, in particular, re-establishing social stratification in the city, which had been undermined during the military-political crisis of the 'Deluge'/*Potop*. Thus, the article contributes to research into the seventeenth-century urban elites' worldview, including their understanding of how the past was reshaped for present purposes.