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PREFACE.

In justice to the memory of a beloved friend and colleague, I can not refuse the request of his wife to preface this last work on which he was engaged with an explanatory statement. Gladly would I have performed also the additional service asked of me to bring down the history and literature to the present date, if it could have been done without neglecting more pressing duties which prevent me from finishing my own Church History.

This volume concludes the English translation of the Church History of Dr. Gieseler, which is too well known to need any word of commendation. It was begun by the lamented Professor Henry B. Smith, D.D., LL.D., who had finished one hundred and twenty pages, when he was called to his reward in heaven, February 7, 1877, in the sixty-second year of his age, after a long and painful struggle for life.

The remaining eighteen pages of the first part of this volume, to the close of page 138, were translated by Miss Mary A. Robinson, the accomplished daughter of the celebrated pioneer of Palestine exploration, Dr. Edward Robinson, Dr. Smith's former colleague. This includes the most valuable part of the work, as edited by Gieseler himself, according to his own plan of presenting a documentary history in extracts from the original sources.

The second and third parts of the volume embrace Gieseler's lectures on modern Church History from 1648 to 1854, published after his death (which occurred in the latter year) in two German volumes, by Dr. Redepenning (Bonn, 1855 and 1857).

The translation of the History from 1648 to 1814, page 139

1 See the Life and Writings of Gieseler in the first volume of the American edition, translated from Redepenning's sketch in, the fifth volume of the German edition.
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to 360, was assigned by Professor Smith himself to Professor Lewis French Stearns, of Albion, Michigan.

That of the History from 1814 to 1854, page 361 to 648, as also the Alphabetical Index for the last two volumes of the American edition, are the work of Miss Robinson.

Having compared large portions of the translation with the original, I can vouch for the care and faithfulness with which the difficult task has been accomplished.

The English reader is thus brought into possession of the whole of Gieseler's work, with a considerable amount of valuable additional bibliographical matter from the hand of Dr. Smith.

One brief chapter only has been omitted, that on America, which is altogether too superficial and too full of serious errors of fact and judgment to find a place in such a solid work. To Gieseler, as to most German historians of his day, America was a terra incognita, or known only from vague and conflicting reports of travelers. American Church history remains to be written. Contributions there are not a few; but no one has worked them up into an organic whole, and reduced the chaos of details to order and beauty.

Dr. Smith was just the man for such a task. He had already mastered the material, as may be seen from his valuable Chronological Tables of Church History (published New York, 1860). I fully share in the profound regret of his many friends and pupils that he was not spared a few years longer to complete this volume, and to perform the still more important service of preparing his Lectures on Systematic Theology and Apologetics for the press. During the last nine years of his life his feeble and delicate frame was shattered, and his working power impaired, although his mind remained strong and clear to the end. His gradual breaking-up excited the most painful sympathy of his friends. He took a fatal cold on the very evening on which I sailed for the Holy Land; and when, a few months later, I arrived in Jerusalem, I received the news of his translation to that higher and better Jerusalem where all doubts are solved, and pain and death are absorbed in bliss and life eternal.

Dr. Smith was one of the foremost scholars and divines of America, equally gifted for Church history, philosophy, and systematic divinity, and endowed with a delicate sense of beauty.
in poetry and art. He was equally at home in Anglo-American and German learning. George Bancroft, the American historian, after reading his Inaugural Address on Church History before the Directors of the Union Theological Seminary in 1851, formed the judgment that in Church history Smith had "no rival in this hemisphere." Dr. Tholuck, with whom he had studied at Halle and stood on terms of intimacy, told me that Drs. Hodge, Smith, and Prentiss were his "American pets." Dr. Dorner, of Berlin, was deeply affected by the news of his death, and wrote to a friend: "I esteem him as one of the first, if not the first, of American theologians of the present day, firmly rooted in the Christian faith, free, large-hearted, and far-sighted, of a philosophical mind, and unusually gifted for systematic theology." And Professor Godet, of Neuchatel, his fellow-student in Berlin, happily characterizes him as "one of the most Christian gentlemen, one of the most profound, most judicious, and most perspicuous minds, he ever met. Il dominait chaque sujet, et me dominait en en parlant."

Dr. Smith was no stranger to doubt. He fought manfully with all forms of speculative unbelief, especially with pantheism, and he came out victorious. His essays on Rénan's Life of Jesus, and the New Faith of Strauss, are among the ablest refutations of modern infidelity. He found in Christ the solution of all problems of history, the harmony of faith and philosophy. "Christ is," he says in his remarkable discourse on Faith and Philosophy, delivered at Andover in 1849, "the centre of God's revelation and of man's redemption; of Christian doctrine and of Christian history; of Christian sects and of each believer's faith; yea, of the very history of this our earth, Jesus Christ is the full, the radiant, the only centre—fitted to be such because he is the God-man and the Redeemer: Christ—Christ, he is the centre of the Christian system, and the doctrine respecting Christ is the heart of Christian theology. . . . Christianity, thus viewed, gives us all that philosophy aims after, and in a more perfect form; it also gives us more than philosophy can give; and this more that it gives is what man most needs, and what reason alone never could divine. And therefore we conclude that it is not within the scope of the human mind to conceive a system more complete, richer in all blessings. . . . The highest ideas and ends which reason can propound are really
embraced, the deepest wants which man can know are truly satisfied, the sharpest antagonisms which the mind can propose are declared to be reconciled, in the ideas, the means, and the ends which are contained in that revelation which centres in the Person of Jesus Christ our Lord."

Such are the golden truths which he taught the rising generation with the ability of a master and with the earnestness of a devout believer, and which his grateful pupils are now proclaiming from many pulpits in this country and in distant heathen lands. His devoted friend and colleague, Dr. Prentiss, has done a noble service of love by editing some of his thoughtful and inspiring essays, with a touching tribute to his memory. May it soon be followed by a biography from the pen of her who knew him best and loved him most!

We append, by permission of the author, a biographical sketch which another of his intimate friends and colleagues, Professor Roswell D. Hitchcock, D.D., LL.D., read before the New York Historical Society, March 6, 1877:

"Fourteen years ago we mourned the loss and embalmed the memory of Edward Robinson: clarum et venerabile nomen. To-day we mourn another kindred loss, and embalm a kindred memory.

"This bereavement is premature. There should have been at least ten years more of sober, steady, solid work. But the blade was too keen for its scabbard. It seems an enormous waste. Only we do not know what calls there may be for service where blades are never sheathed; and so we stand dumb once more before this tremendous mystery of death, equaled only by this other tremendous mystery of life.

"HENRY BOYNTON SMITH was born in Portland, Maine, November 21, 1815, not quite sixty-two years ago. He began life auspiciously in a happy home, in that beautiful Eastern metropolis noted for its intelligence and refinement—the birthplace of the poet Longfellow, the residence for many years of Payson, Cummings, Davels, Preble, Greenleaf, Fessenden, Shepley, and others like them, accomplished divines, scholars, advocates, jurists, and statesmen. His pastor was Dr. Ichabod Nichols, a courtly, cultured, gracious Christian gentleman. He could not have been born into a better atmosphere. He was a bright boy, of sunny, cheerful temper and winsome ways; of ready wit, eager and quick to learn.

"He graduated at Bowdoin College in 1834, in the same class with Dr. Cyrus Hamlin, of Constantinople, also a Portland boy and his life-long friend. Of the same college generation were Dr. Daniel R. Goodwin, of Philadelphia, two years before him; President William H. Allen, of Girard College, and Professor Samuel Harris, of New Haven, one year before him; Dr. George L. Prentiss, afterward his colleague here, one year after him; and Governor John A. Andrew, of Massachusetts, and Dr. Fordyce Barker, of this city, three years after him. So I think it always is in history, as in the firmament above us, the stars are clustered in constellations.

1 Faith and Philosophy: Discourses and Essays by Henry B. Smith, D.D., LL.D. Edited, with an Introductory Notice, by George L. Prentiss, D.D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary in the City of New York. New York, 1877 (pp. 496).
What students do for one another is sometimes quite equal to what is done for them by their teachers. The president of the college in young Smith's time was Dr. William Allen, one of whose daughters he afterward married.

"His more pronounced religious life began in college: this determined his choice of a profession. He studied theology at Bangor and Andover, was tutor for a year at Bowdoin, and then spent nearly two years in Germany, chiefly at the universities of Halle and Berlin, where he came in close contact with such men as Tholuck and Neander. Philosophy and history were already his favorite studies.

"He came back to the United States with the stamp of superior scholarship indelibly set upon him. For one year, from 1840 to 1841, he had charge of the senior class at Bowdoin, while the new president, Dr. Leonard Woods, was absent in Europe. In 1842 he was settled over a Congregational Church in the little village of West Amesbury, Massachusetts. Even by that plain people he was equally beloved and admired. But his constitution was delicate, and his impulses and aptitudes decidedly scholastic. From 1845 to 1847 he gave instruction in Hebrew at Andover, without giving up his pastorate; and then, having resigned the pastorate, took the chair of mental and moral philosophy in Amherst College, succeeding Professor Nathan W. Fiske, who had recently died, where he now lies buried, in Jerusalem.

"His career at Amherst answered, and more than answered, the early promise. Men now distinguished in the higher walks of scholarship and thought still feel the magnetism of his touch, and are still in motion toward the goal he set for them. Those were, perhaps, his most brilliant days. Afterward he was deeper, broader, stronger, but never more athletic and inspiring. I well remember his appearance at Andover in the autumn of 1849, when he gave his capital address on the Relations of Faith and Philosophy. His fine face was radiant; his slight frame surcharged and dilated with thought and feeling; and his clean-cut, ringing English was like the voice of a trumpet, saying 'Come up hither.'

"The year following brought him to New York, known personally to only two or three of them that voted for him. I will not say he had outgrown New England. In any other section of the country, it would have been all the same. The time had come for a field and a reputation as broad as the continent. Here in the most cosmopolitan of our American cities—real metropolis, not of commerce only, but of politics, of science, of letters, and of art—he found a congenial and responsive home. He passed over also from the Congregational to the Presbyterian fold. He did this easily, not because he cared little for either of them, but because he loved them both, as, indeed, in the largeness of his charity, he loved all who love the Lord.

"The Union Theological Seminary, already strong in the world-wide reputation of its chief professor, Dr. Edward Robinson, dates a new epoch in its history from the advent of Dr. Henry E. Smith. From 1850 to 1854 he occupied the chair of Church history, making history a science, teaching history as it was then taught nowhere else among us. At the end of these four years he was carried by acclamation into the chair of systematic theology. But here, too, the historic spirit and method dominated. The Person of Christ, instead of absolute Divine determination, was the centre of his system. How he handled this system only his pupils fully know. For subtlety of analysis, for sharpness of definition, for comprehensiveness and breadth of treatment, for vital push of intense personal conviction, he has had but few equals. To say he knew how to teach would not adequately describe him. Teaching, with him, was not so much an art as an instinct. Reason, says Tertullian, is a kind of internal conversation. Professor Smith always made the impression of having first persuaded himself of whatever he had occasion to teach others. In no bad sense of the word would I call him skeptical; but evidently some of his most sacred beliefs were trophies, and not traditions. Having conquered for himself, he could lead others to victory.

"As a preacher, it was not the fashion to praise him much. His voice was not
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strong enough for large popular assemblies. But his matter was always rich, his style felicitous, and his whole manner inimitably his own. Cultivated and thoughtful people always heard him gladly.

"His learning was encyclopedic. His studies led him out over vast territories. What he knew, he knew exactly, thoroughly, positively. And what he had once learned he appeared never to have forgotten. This was greatly to his advantage in all emergencies. As moderator of the General Assembly in 1863, the opulence, variety, and aptness of his addresses were a surprise even to some who thought they had known him well.

"The reunion, in 1871, of the long-divided Presbyterian Church is, in great part, one of the monuments of his genius. He made such statements of doctrine—statements so precise, so luminous, so fair—that good men saw where they stood together, and where, without reproach or controversy, they might stand apart. The opening sermon preached by him before the General Assembly at Dayton, Ohio, in 1864, on Christian Union and Ecclesiastical Reunion, made it almost certain that the days of separation were numbered.

"Of other monuments it is hardly time as yet to speak. In 1859 he founded the American Theological Review, which, after one or two changes, was united with the Princeton Repertory in 1872. Besides many valuable articles contributed by him, the department of 'Theological and Literary Intelligence' was peculiarly his own. He published a great deal first and last; but I am sure he spent altogether too much of his time and strength in editing, though with many and great improvements, the works of others. His Gieseler and Hagenbach have done admirable service; but the world would have been the gainer had he put forth, in the same direction, independent works of his own.

"His Tabular Church History, published in 1860, is a condensed embodiment of what he accomplished in that department. Under the head of 'General Characteristics,' he gives, with great felicity, the gist of the whole matter. But he himself was looking forward to the publication of his theological lectures as the opus magnum of his life. While in full working power, he was in no haste to bring the great and growing mass of his material into its final shape; and when at last he resigned his chair, his strength was no longer equal to the task. His notes, it may be, are sufficiently full and finished to be edited without injustice to his reputation. We shall know by-and-by, when the cloud has lifted a little from his home. Much use might, no doubt, be made of the note-books of his pupils.

"But if this should fail, all is not lost. Hundreds of Christian scholars, in all quarters of the globe, are reproducing the lessons of his class-room. Through each one of these, other hundreds are reached, and will yet be reached, till his influence shall have exceeded all measurable bounds. Who will venture to say that the Anselms and Abelards of the Middle Age have done more by their writings than they did, and are doing still, by their contact with living men? Who knows how much of what we call human learning is floating down on the tide of oral tradition?

"Dr. Smith was for a long time an invalid. Frail, at the strongest, he broke down entirely in the winter of 1869, and was never quite himself again. A year and a half he spent abroad, in Germany, in Italy, in Greece, visiting also Egypt, Sinai, Palestine, and Constantinople. Resuming work in the Seminary in the autumn of 1870, again he faltered, and again he rallied, till in 1874, in great bitterness of disappointment, he finally resigned his chair. He was, however, at the same time, made professor emeritus and appointed lecturer in apologetics. Twice he undertook his work in this new department, but each time broke down under it. But still he hoped, and still there remained so much of vitality that, in the autumn of 1876, he was chosen lecturer on the Ely Foundation, and expected to be ready for the service at the time appointed. Toward the end of December he took a severe cold, from which he never recovered. Others may have been apprehensive in regard to the
result, but he himself apparently was not expecting to die so soon. Once he spoke of having ceased to cumber himself with the things of this world, but that was all. He died on Wednesday morning, February 7, 1877.

"What now shall be his epitaph? Let this be written: Here lies an intrepid Christian scholar, who accepted life as a battle, and went into it afraid of none but God, afraid of nothing but sin."

PHILIP SCHAFF.
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INFLUENCE OF THE REFORMATION UPON THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

The Roman Catholic Church was brought by the Reformation to a state of the most violent commotion. Its firmest adherents recognized the fact that the Reformation was only the consequence of those abuses which had been unveiled, but not abolished, by the Councils of Constance and Basle. The immorality of the clergy was very generally admitted. Compare the statements, in an epistle of a provincial synod, by Anton, Archbishop of Prague, 1565 (artzheim, Conc. Germ. vii. 26): Qui dissolutam Cleri disciplinam tantarum Ecclesiae calamitatum et tot sectorum—causam—esse arbitrantur, il profecto non procul auro aberrant. Marcus Sittich, Bishop of Constance, in an address at a diocesan synod, 1567 (ibid. p. 454): Estote memores, damnatam et detestandam Cleri vitam malo, majori ex parte, ansam praebuisse;—omnem fere hujus tempestatis culsum, omnium sapientium judicio, in ejusdem flagitia, sociorum, et supinam negligentiam conjiciendam esse. Omnes sapientes peritiique viri unanimi sententia hoc serunt.
complaints against these abuses uttered with renewed emphasis, but the voices of the Reformers, much as men were disinclined to listen to them, being supported by the Holy Scriptures, which were now widely disseminated by translations among the Roman Catholics,\textsuperscript{2} gave new life to reforming views and demands even within the bounds of the old Church. Thus many of the Roman Catholics demanded the abolition of celibacy,\textsuperscript{3} improvement in popular instruction, more edifying forms of worship, and particularly the restoration of the Lord’s Supper in both forms—the wine as well as the bread.\textsuperscript{4} The peculiar doctrines of the Reformers were indeed rejected by the theologians of scholastic

\textsuperscript{2} Hieronymus Emser published in Dresden, 1527, a translation of the New Testament, “so that the people might no longer be deceived, as heretofore, but might have the real and true Word of God, instead of Luther’s word.” This translation, however, was, with few exceptions, that of Luther, so that the latter expressed his joy about it (in his Sendbrief vom Dolmetachen, 1530, Walch, xxii. 311), that though Duke George had forbidden his version, he had still recommended that of Emser: “For me it is enough, and I am rejoiced, that my work... must be helped on by my enemies, and that Luther’s book is read by his enemies without Luther’s name. What a revenge is mine!” The translation by John Dietenberger, Dominican in Mayence, 1534, is from the Vulgate. John Eck, Pro-chancellor in Ingolstadt, published his version in 1537; in the Old Testament following the Vulgate, in the New Testament the Emser translation. The latter, in the Preface, justifies the former prohibitions of all translations of the Bible, but holds that they have now become necessary, “since the common people are confused by many false versions, so that they can not tell what is the right text of the Bible, and what is man’s book.” Compare G. M. Panzer’s Geschichte der römisch-cathol. deutschen Bibeltübersetzung, Nürnberg, 1781, 4. On Faber’s French translation, see vol. iii. of this work, § 154, Note 38, p. 490; on the Italian, vol. iv. § 19, Note 4; on the Spanish, § 20, Notes 14 and 15.

\textsuperscript{3} Jo. Aventini (+1534) Annales Bojorum (first published Ingolstadii, 1554, ed. N. H. Gundling, Lips. 1710, fol.), lib. v. init., describes how Gregory VII. had raised the Papacy above the Empire, the abuses which crept into the Church in consequence, and the sad consequences which ensued, particularly on account of the celibacy imposed upon the priests.

\textsuperscript{4} So, too, the Consilium Georgii, Ducis Saxon. (In Stäudlin’s and Tzschirner’s Archiv für Kirchengesch. ii. ii. 804), drawn up about 1533, which censures very many ecclesiastical abuses, concedes (p. 403) that a married person might be admitted among the clergy: Attamen cum divina celebrare voluerit, abstineat ab uxore per triduum.—Qui vero post vota uxores duxerunt, ex quo constat eos perjuros esse, non admissi sunt ad ullos status clericales, nisi prius publicum egerint poenitentiam relictis libris et uxoribus. P. 404: Venerabile sacramentum Eucharistiae liberum sit, ita ut unicuique liceat eo vel sub una, vel sub utraque specie frui indifferenter, hoc tamen lege, ut quicque credat, unam speciem tam efficaeem quam ambas. Ge. Wicelli (then a Catholic priest in Eisleben), Libellus de Moribus veterum Haereticorum, Lips. 1537. E. 7: Absolutum exemplar christiani hominis esse judicant (Lutherani), bina vesici specie, non secus ac si dominus Jesus in hac observatione proram ac puppim aeternae salutis collocasset. Ultinam in hoc articulo idem omnes sentiremus, ut tandem, composita lice, pacis bono frui liceat! Nihil omnium est, quod perinde popularium animos commovet.
training; but the type of doctrine thus far formally sanctioned by the Church was still elastic enough to allow projects for union to be entertained; and many of the Catholic divines approximated in a marked way to the Reformers in their definitions of several doctrines, although they still adhered to the old Church. The synods held in Germany and France, however, restricted themselves to opposing the most manifest ecclesiastical abuses.  

6 Thus by the Sorbonne, 1521. See vol. iv. § 21, Note 1. Also 1535 in d'Argen-
re, l. ii. 396, and on the 10th March, 1543, in Gerdes' Hist. Evang. renovati, t. iii. l. 10, p. 87 (in Raynald, 1548, No. 79, with the wrong date, 10 Mart. 1548) by the theological faculty of Louvain, 1544, in Raynald, 1544, No. 35, and Gerdes, l. c.  

7 See the negotiations for agreement held in Augsburg, 1530, vol. iv. § 3, Note 13, and in Ratisbon, 1541, ibid. § 7, Note 41; also the Augsburg Interim, ibid. § 9, Note 3.  

Remarkable, in this respect, are the declarations of John Wild, Guardian of the Franciscans, and court preacher at Mayence, deceased 1554. During his life he printed several sermons. After his death, many of his commentaries (some in Latin) in the biblical writings were published. He recommended the reading of the Holy scriptures, and refuted the objection, that they were obscure. He was zealous against human additions to the Word: "If I must speak out the truth, our Christianity has come to be nothing else than vain Pharisaism and hypocrisy; for we see many ceremonies but little godliness, many songs and little devotion, much seeming and little truth, many words and little heart, a breaking off from some evils and no breaking off from sins, the one is enforced and the other is forgotten. When we keep the ecclesiastical order, it is something great; but when we despise God's commands, yea, sin against them daily, this does no harm." Then on Repentance and Faith: "If we want to speak aright about repentance and Christian life, we must not begin with fasting, praying, and giving alms, etc., for the wicked, too, can do these things, and yet they shall not avail them any thing before God. True repentance has its beginning, on the one hand, in the preaching or consideration of the divine law, and the knowledge of sin from our own unrighteousness, condemnation, and fear of God's judgment; on the other hand, it comes through the proclamation of the grace of God, through faith in the divine promise, and calling upon the divine name. From these two fountains—fear and faith, hatred of sin and love of righteousness—repentance must flow forth, and all this must be experienced before we come to the fruits of repentance." "By faith in Christ we are received into a state of grace, our sins are forgiven, and the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, without respect to who and what we were before." "Nullum bonum Deo gratum opus est extra fidem, immo soli fideles bona opera faciunt." "We see that the Church is full of error, sin, and turmoil; doctrine is perverted and mixed with error. Woe to all those who have brought this about." "The Church, specially in these times, is still in a very bad way. Here with sin, there with avarice, they are seeking help in every way, have tried many sorts of things, have appealed to every body—pope, emperor, council, and diet—without being able to get any good help. It has only become worse. As much as they bar up the way on one side, so that they can not come to union, so much do they bar it up on the other, saying that there must not be any reform." "Si successores Petri, eu modo protestate sua usque essent quo Petrus, nemo christianus eam potestatem impugnasset; via antem pleurique hac potestate abuis sunt (quammodum nemo est, qui nesciat), nec causa et seminarium est hujus tumultus, neque spes aliqua est, tumultum hunc saturatum, nisi tollatur causa." Comp. E. G. Dieterich, Diss. Hist. de Joanne Fero (Wild) Monacho et Conclomat. Moguntino, Teste Veritatis Evang. Altorf, 1723, 4.  

8 See the exhortations to the clergy for the mending of their morals and the faith-
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But they were now able to do this with greater success than before, because they were upheld by the general sentiment of the people, and no one could doubt that the Reformation was working benefit even to the Catholic Church, tending to a mitigation of its old corruptions.  

When the Reformers, not a little favored by the fact that the Popes were involved in controversies with secular princes, came to obtain important power even in secular relations, and were pressing onward without restraint, it began to be apparent, even in Rome, that they could no longer hinder the abolition of those abuses which were rooted in the Papacy and the Roman curia. This was unreservedly declared by a commission appointed by Paul III., in 1537, for taking counsel on this subject, and this Pope seemed willing to accede to their proposals. Hope was even held out of coming to some understanding in respect to doctrinal matters by the instructions given to the legates sent to the ful discharge of their duties, put forth by the Synods in Mayence and Cologne, 1537 (Hartshelm Conc. Germ. vi. 205); the work by Archbishop Hermann, of Cologne, Reformatio Curiae Coloniensis, 1538 (p. 231); and especially his Synodus Provincialis, Colon. 1536 (p. 235), the provisions of which are for the reformation of all ecclesiastical matters; particularly part vi. (p. 272), full directions about preaching. In France, the two provincial councils of 1532, Biterlicense (Harduini Acta Concil. ix.), and Senonense a. Parisiense (it was a council for the province of Sens, but was held in Paris), see Harduini Acta Concil. ix., 1919.


10 See vol. iv. § 19, Notes 22, 23. Although the Pope, in the Instructions he gave to his nuncio for the Emperor, Oct. 24, 1536, had still said (Raynald. 1537, Note 10): Quantum vero ad objecta nobis gravamina attinet, cum pleraque eorum sint aut manifeste falsa aut insanla, et etiam a summis Pontificibus jam castigata, poterit facile pro sua prudentia ea refellere.

11 See Contarenii et Poli Ep. vol. iv. § 19, Note 23. In August, 1540, the Pope appointed several deputations,—super reformationem, videlicet pro camera apostolica et tribunal urbis, pro Rota, pro Cancellaria apostolica; and commissioned some cardinals,—ut invigilent et curet ea, quae circa reformationem conclusa sunt, et san-
Conferences in Worms and Ratisbon in 1541, and by the concessions which these legates made on the latter occasion. But this was the last sign issuing from Rome that indicated a disposition to yield for the sake of peace.

§ 54.

NEW ORDERS.

The only hope of making effective opposition to the Reformation was in the raising up of a living, active clergy. As nothing was to be expected from the existing monastic orders in their present decline, nor yet from the secular clergy, new orders were formed in Italy for this object. The time was gone by in which indolent contemplation was an object of veneration; monasticism could hope for influence among the people only by a spiritual activity aiming at the common benefit. The Capuchins, when, in 1525, under the lead of Matthew de Bassi, they separated from the Franciscan Order, had in view at first only a narrow monastic end, which was to revive in the most precise form the abiliments and way of life of St. Francis; but the old Franciscan spirit was still living in them, and they attained great success and wide influence as popular preachers. The Theatines
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were founded in 1524 by Cajetan of Thiena, and John Peter Caraffa, Bishop of Theate (afterward Pope Paul IV.), for the sake of a more zealous cure of souls. As they were chiefly of noble rank, they attained great authority, but were never very numerous. A Venetian patrician, Jerome Emilianus (Miani), established the Somascans in 1528, at Somasca, between Bergamo and Milan, at first to take care of deserted children; they afterward formed a Congregation of regular clergy. The Barnabites also formed a union at Milan in 1530, in a similar Congregation, and bound themselves to all kinds of spiritual labor among the people.

But all these orders were overshadowed by the Jesuits. Ignatius

14

were founded in 1524 by Cajetan of Thiena, and John Peter Caraffa, Bishop of Theate (afterward Pope Paul IV.), for the sake of a more zealous cure of souls. As they were chiefly of noble rank, they attained great authority, but were never very numerous. A Venetian patrician, Jerome Emilianus (Miani), establishe

ed the Somascans in 1528, at Somasca, between Bergamo and Milan, at first to take care of deserted children; they afterward formed a Congregation of regular clergy. The Barnabites also formed a union at Milan in 1530, in a similar Congregation, and bound themselves to all kinds of spiritual labor among the people.

But all these orders were overshadowed by the Jesuits. Ignatius...
ius of Loyola, of one of the families of highest rank in Guipuscoa, a brave warrior, was disabled by a wound from serving in the army, and determined to enlist in the spiritual knighthood of the holy Virgin, and to serve her in Palestine (1521) in the conversion of unbelievers. He devoted himself for a long period to strict ascetic exercises and mystic reveries, but at last saw his need of a thorough theological training, and betook himself to the Jesuits, 1854; G. Julius, die Jesuiten, 2 Bde, 1851; Alex. Duff, The Jesuits, their origin and Order, Edinb. 4th ed. 1853; G. B. Nicolini, Hist. Jes. Edinb. 1853; E. W. Grinfield, Hist. Sketch, Lond. 1853.]

On his sick-bed he could not get romances of chivalry, which had been his favorite reading, and he now read the lives of saints in Spanish, and thus had his imagination filled with phantasies, wondrously made up of knightly and ecclesiastical elements. Compare his own confessions, Acta Antiquissima, § 6. (Acta SS. Jul. vii. 6): Ex his una erat cogitatio, quae prae caeteris ita ejus cor occuparat, ut statim cam velut immersus et absorbatus, duas, tres, quatuorque horas, quod nec ipsa pererat, illa detineretur. Ea vero erat, quidnam potissimum in obsequium illustris minae acturus esset, qua ratione ad cum urbem, in qua ipsa erat, proficiscer posset, quibus verbis alloqueretur cam, quos jocos et sales adhiberet, quod specimen bellica exercitationis in ejus gratiam ederet. Ita autem vi hujus cogitationis ripabatur, ut id quidem videret, quantum res illa, quam consequer opletur, supra ipsius vires esset. For, as the Spanish original adds, non erat comitissa, nec ducissa, sed erat ejus aetatis sublimior, quam ullius earum. § 2. Aderat interim divina misericordia, quae lectione recenti ejus cogitationum alias subjicerebat. Cum enim vitam Christi mini nostri ac Sanctorum legeret, tum apud se cogitabat, secumque ita colligebat: id si ego hoc agerem, quod fecit b. Franciscus? Quid si hoc, quod b. Dominicus? quibus verbis alloqueretur cam, quos jocos et sales adhiberet, quod specimen bellica exercitationis in ejus gratiam ederet. Ita autem hujus cogitationum successio illum detinuit; ethae de Deo, illae de saeculo animae suis usque occupabat, donec ipsa prae lassitudine abjiceret, animamque ad a converteret. § 8. Sed in his cogitationibus hoc discriment erat, quod, cum secu brius intenderet, magna voluptate capiebat, ut ubi esseas est satis diu, nec cessaret. Hunc in modum cum spirituallitera exquisita ingressus, hinc primum illustri coepit ad intelligendum, quod de diversitatem sui docuit. Hinc in modum cum spiritus diversos, quibus habitabantur, Deli unum, alterum daemonis, paulatim agnovisset, nec modicum lumen
himself to Paris to obtain it.\footnote{Of the studies which he commenced in Barcelona, and then continued in Alcala, Salamanca, and at last in Paris, he himself reports, Acta Antiquissima, § 54: Barcinonem reversus coepit in litteras diligentius incumbere; sed ejus propositum multum illud obstabat, quod, cum lectiones memoriae mandare conaretur (id quod in grammaticis principiis necessarium est), novae illi intellectiones rerum spiritualium novique gustus infundebatur, atque hoc ita abunde, ut caperem memoria nihil posset, neque illud a se rejicere, tametsi plurimum reluctaretur. When he came to Paris in 1528, § 78: ad inferiora redit, cum perspexisset, plurimum se fundamentis destitui. Itaque una cum pueris studiabat Parisiensis more. But here, too, it was no better, § 82: quoties audiebat magistrum praedicatorum, tam multis inter turbabatur spirituales disserendas. Et quidem quecumque in predicandis erat, etiam in philosophandis in omnibus. Etiam in philosophandis, quandoque, neque in omnibus, nisi quandoque, neque in omnibus, nisi quandoque.}

Here, by his strict asceticism and contagious enthusiasm, he drew around him several young men of high talent,\footnote{vix. Peter Faber, from Savoy; Francis Xavier, a nobleman of Novarra; the Spaniard Jacob Lainez; Alphonse Salmeron, Nicolas Bobadilla, and the Portuguese nobleman Simon Rodriguez.} infused into them by his Exercitia Spiritualia (which appealed both to the senses and the imagination)\footnote{Exercitia Spiritualia S. P. Ignatii Loyolae, Antverp. 1638. Directorium in Exercit. Spirit. Antv. 1638. These Exercitia were drawn up at an early date by Ignatius. The Jesuits assert that he did this in a cave near Mauresa, in 1523 (see Acta Sanct. Jul. vii. 417). They are made for a period of six weeks, prescribing exactly all the outward acts and all the thoughts. They connect spiritual meditations with certain definite and fantastic images of Christian ideas, which must be produced in the candidate in one exactly prescribed order, e. g.: Secundum hebdomadis, quartum die. Fict meditatio de duobus vexillis, uno quidem Jesu Christi optimi nostri Imperatoris, altero vero Luciferi, hostis hominum capitalissima. Oratio praecursoria. Praeludium primum erit historiae quaedam consideratio Christi e sua parte, et ex altera Luciferi, quorum uterque omnes homines ad se vocat, sub vexillo suo congregandos. Secundum est ad constructionem loci, ut repraesentetur nobis campus amplissimus circa Hierosolymam, in quo Dominus J. Chr. tamquam honorem hominum omnium summus Dux assisset. Rursus alter campus in Babylonia, ubi se Lucifer malorum et adversariorum ducem exhibeat. Tertium ad gratiam petendam illud erit, ut poscamus exploratas habere fraudes mal duici, invoca simul divinae ope ad cas vitandas; veri autem optimique Imperatoris Christi agnoscere mores ingenios, ac per gratiam imitari posse. Punctum primum est, imaginari coram oculis meis apud} a kin-

spirituale ex illa plorum librorum lectione sibi comparasset; coept magis serio de vita ante s se acta cogitat, atque illud etiam perpendere, quantum poenitentiae indigeret, ut contracta per eam crimina expiaret. Qua quidem in cogitatione prius illius desideria de imitatibus sanctis viris seae sese offerebant, nulla majore ratio inclinatione, quam quod sibi divina adjuvante gratia promitteret, id quod illi fessisset se quoque facturum. Sed nihil amplius, statim ubi convalesisset, agere optabat, quam Hierosolymam proficisci, flagellationibusac jejuniis adhibitis, quam multa in tam magnae animo et Spiritu Dei accensae poenitentiae desiderium impararet. And so he made a pilgrimage, with strict penitentia exercises, in 1523, to the miracle-working image of the Virgin on Mount Montserrat, near Barcelona: § 17. Et cum mentem rebus is refertam haberet, quae ab Amadeo de Gaula (that is, in the knightly romance on Amadis of Gaul) conscriptae et ab ejus generis scriptoribus, nonnullae illis similles ei occurrit. Itaque statuit ad arma sua (ut inter milites dicitur) vigilias agere tota nocte una neque sedens neque jacent, sed vicissim stans et flexus genua ante altare Domine nostrae Montis serrati, ubi vestimenta sua deponebat statuerat, et Christi arma induere (a watch in armor, such as those were obliged to hold who were to receive knighthood).
dread zeal for spiritual chivalry in the service of Christ and of Mary, and bound himself with them by a common vow, taken in the church of Mary, at Montmartre, in 1584. In Venice they found themselves obliged to abandon the project of converting unbelievers in Palestine; but they were there directed by the Theatines to oppose other enemies of the Church, for which there was an urgent call, and also to work against the licentiousness, unbelief, and heresies prevailing in the Christian nations. Following their example, they now wandered through the cities of Italy, even to Rome, preaching repentance. There they laid before the Pope the project of their society, to defend the Church and oppose all its foes like brave warriors, with total submission and blind obedience to the Pope and his servant, the head of

ampum Babylonicum ducem impiorum in cathedra ignea et fumosa sedere, horribilem figuram etque terribilem. Secundum est, advertere, quomodo convocatos aemones innumeros per totum orbem spargit ad nocendum, nullis civitatis et societatis, nullis personarum generibus immunibus relictis. Tertium attendere, cujusmodi concionem habeat ad ministros suos, quos instigat, ut correptis injectis quibusque catenis homines primum trahant—ad cupiditatem divitiarum, unde postes facillius mundani honoris ambitu et superbiae deturbari et turbare ant. militari ex ostentato considerandus est summus optimusque noster Dux et Imperator Christi. Punctum primum erit, conspici Christum in amore et humilio quidem constitutum loco, sed valde speciosum forma, et adspectum amabilem. Secundum autem est, speculare quo pacto ipse mundi dominus versi electos Apostolos, discipulos et ministros alios per orbem mittat, qui omnium generi, statui, et conditioni doctrinam sacram ac salutiferam impertiant. Actum, auscultare concionem Christi exhortatoriam ad servos et amicos suos in opus talique destinatos, qua eis praecipit, ut juvare studente que minime, ac primo lucendum curent ad spiritualem affectum paupertatis, et insuper (si divini obsequii ratio et electio coelestis co fers) ad sectandam actu ipso veram paupertatem; unde ut ad opprobri, contemptuque desiderium allicient, unde humilitatis virtus ascendet. Et ita tres consurgunt perfectio totus, videlicet paupertas, abjicta et quae ex diametro divitiis, honoris et superbiae opponuntur, tuis omnem statum introducunt. Then follows a Colloquium ad b. Virginem, to labore help, ut recipi possim et manere sub vexillo Christi, concluding with an Ave Maria; also a Colloquium ad Christum hominem for the same object, and concluding with a prayer, Anima Christi; finally, a Colloquium ad Patrem, ut annuat petitioni, cum Pater noster. Transigetur hoc exercitium semel in media nocte, et altera vice sub auroram. Alterius vero duas circa matutini sacri, atque vesperarum tempus erunt faciendas. As the inclinations and the aversions of sense are enlisted for spiritual objects. That the effect was to struggle against individual sins rather than against the root of sin, see in the Directory, p. 24: In the morning, soon as he awoke from sleep, he was proponere diligentem sui custodiam circa pecatum aut vitium aliud particolare, a quo emendari cupit. Quoties id peccati genus hominum commiserat, manu peccati admodum deleat de lapso, quod fieri potest etiam assistentiibus nec adversentibus. In the evening he was to examine himself, and note every particular transgression with a point, and see to it that the series of these points came every day less. See H. v. Orelli, Wesen des Jesuitenordens, Lpzg. 1846, p. 16.
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...and so they received, Sept. 27, 1540, the first sanction for their society, Societas Jesu (in Spanish, Compañía de Jesús), the number of members being limited to sixty. In 1541 Ignatius was elected the first General of the Order.

12 The Deliberatio et Determinatio of the Society, which preceded, see in Act. 88. Jul. vii. 468. The Formula Vivendi, which was sanctioned by the Pope, is contained in the bull of confirmation Regimini, 5 Kal. Oct. 1540 (in the Literae Apostolicae, quibus Institutio, Confirmatio et varia Privilegia continentur Soc. Jesu, Antverp. 1636, p. 9): Quenca noue societate nostra, quam Jesu nomine insigniri cupimus, vult sub cruces vexillo Deo militare, et soli Domino, atque Romano Pontifici ejus in terris Vicario servire, post solemne perpetuae castitatis votum proponat sibi in animo, se partem esse Societatis ad hoc potissimum institutae, ut ad profectum animarum in vitam et doctrina Christiana, ad fidei propagationem per publicas praedicationes et verbi Dei ministerium, ad spiritualia exercitia et caritatis operam, et nominatim per puerorum ac rudium in Christianismo institutionem ac Christifidelium in confessionibus audiendi spiritalem consolationem praecipue intendat...
As early as 1540 two Jesuits, Simon Rodriguez and Francis Xavier, went to Portugal at the invitation of King John III. Xavier soon left there on a mission to the Portuguese East Indies; Rodriguez, a Portuguese noble, acquired unlimited influence over the weak King, founded the first Jesuit College at Coimbra, and brought the Society to the highest degree of prosperity in Portugal, although, by his reckless ambition, which he owed even face to face with the King, he made many enemies the new Order.

The Society directed its chief attention to battling with the reformation; and, like a well-ordered host, acting according to fixed plan, with strict obedience and entire devotion, it set itself at work to aid all the churches, in different countries, that were imperilled by the progress of the reform. And so the Jesuits went to France, the Netherlands, Spain, and Germany.
Very soon, in March, 1543, the Society acquired authority for an unlimited expansion; in June, 1545, it received permission to preach and hear confessions everywhere, with very large powers. In all its regulations, every thing was sacrificed to its main object: corporeal asceticism was restricted to the novitiate; the injunction of singing the service at certain fixed hours was abandoned. Like an army, the Society insured unity and order by gradations of office and authority: the *Professi*, the leaders, were few in number; the great crowd that streamed to them were, from 1546, made *Coadjutores*, to look after the service of the masses.

The failure of the Ratisbon Colloquy, 1541, led the Pope to decide against all concessions to Protestants; at the same time his courage was heightened by the host of Jesuits, ready for battle, who put themselves at his disposal. Paul III. now de-

---

17 In the bull *Cum inter Cunctas*, June 8d, 1545 (*Literae Apostol.* p. 24), they received permission, in quibusvis Ecclesiis, et locis ac plateis communibus seu publicis, et alias ubique locorum clero et populo verbum Dei praedicandi; further confessiones audiendi and ab omnibus et singulis peccatibus,—quantumcumque gravibus et enormibus,—etiam Sedli apostolicae reservatis, et a quibusvis ex ipsis casibus resulantibus sententias, censuris et poenis ecclesiasticis (exceptis contentis in bulla, quae in die Coenae Domini solita est legi) absolvendi, ac eis pro commissis poenitentiam salutarem injungendi; neconon vocta quaecunque per eos pro tempore emissa (ultramari(nis), visitationis liminum beatorum Petri et Paul Apostolorum de urbe, ac s. Jacobi in Compostella, neconon religiosis et castitatis votis duntaxat exceptis) in alla pietatis opera commutandi; et Christifidelibus ipsis Eucharistiae et alla ecclesiasticas sacramenta, sino aliquus praecedentio, ministrandi, dioecesarum loquor, reverentiam porochialium et aliarum Ecclesiarum, aut quorumvis aliorum licentia demergere minimum requisita.

18 Car. Lineck, *Imago absolutissima Virtutis Verbis et Exempla S. P. Ignatii expressa*, Prague, 1717, quotes from the *Diarium P. Consalvi* (see Note 7), quoties visisset quernam juvenum jucundo gustatuedulias adjunctum, visum gestire audio Ignatium. Such a one he encouraged, ut pergeret, secuturis quid divinis obsequis atque laboribus vires pareat. *Ribadenhra*, lib. v. c. 8: for the young people worn out by their studies, domum in remoto loco Romae exadieicandum curavit, in qua, qui litterarum studiis invigilaret, interdum laxaret in animum, et aliquid de summa illa studendi meditandique contentione remitteret.

19 In the bull *Reginini*, d. 5 Kal. Oct. 1540, confirming the *Formula Vivendi*, it is said: Socii omnes, quaecunque in sacris fuerint,—teneantur singuli privatim ae particulariter, et non communiter, ad dicendum officium secundum Ecclesiae ritum. Paul III. allowed Ignatius, by the bull *Erponi nobis*, June 5th, 1546: quod de cetero Sacerdotibus, qui vos in spiritualibus, et personis sacraelibus, quae vos in temporalibus et officii vestris domesticis coadjuvent, uti possisist; Ipsique Coadjutores, tam Sacerdotes, quam personae sacraelae,—vota paupertatis, et castitatis, ac etiam obedientiae, uta ad illa servanda pro eo tempore, quo tu, illi Praespositi, et qui pro tempore fuerint ejusdem Societatis Praespositi, in ministerio spirituali vel temporali utendum judicaveritis, et non ultra, adstringantur, nec propterea ad ali quam solemnem professionem emissam teneantur, neque ad eam ulteres admittantur, emissam. 
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cided upon a conflict with the advancing Reformation, regardless of consequences. In 1542 he decreed the appointment of a general Inquisition;21 and on May 22d, 1542, he summoned a General Council to meet at Trent,22 to give new props to the tottering Catholic Church.


SECOND CHAPTER.

PERIOD OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT, DEC. 13, 1545, TO DEC. 4, 1563.


Lettres et Mémoires de François de Vargas, de Pierre de Malvenda (both of the Imperial embassy in Trent) et de quelques Evêques d’Espagne, traduits de l’Espagnol, avec des remarques par M. Mich. le Vassor, à Amsterdam, 1699. Instructions et Lettres des Rois très-chrétiens et de leurs

21 On the influence of Ignatius upon the Pope in establishing it, see vol. iv. § 19, Note 26. 22 Note 254; Orlandinus, lib. iv. no. 18.

22 In this bull, which is prefixed to all the editions of the Canones et Decreta Conc. Trident., it is said in regard to the Ratibon Colloquy: Cum ex ejus conventus sententia peteretur a nobis, ut ab Ecclesia dissentium quodam articulos tolerandos seclararemus, quoad per oecumenicum Concilium illi exenterentur et deciderentur; Ique nobis, ut concederemus, neque Christiana et catholica veritas, neque nostra et eis apostolicae dignitatis permitteret; palam potius Concilium, ut quam primum eret, proponi mandavimus.

1 On these two editions, see J. G. Schelhorn’s Ergötzlichkeiten aus der Kirchenhistorie und Literatur, ill. 1088.

2 For a criticism of Sarpi and Pallavicini, see Ranke’s History of the Popes, in the appendiix. J. R. Brischar’s Beurtheilung der Controversen Sarpi’s u. Pallavicini’s Th. Tübingen, 1844. On Sarpi, see Köllner’s Symbolik, p. 48; on Pallavicino, p. 55.
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[The first Latin translation of Sarpi was in 1622, under the name Petri Suavis Poliani (Pauli Sarpi Veneti). It is inaccurate. The first two chapters were translated by Sir Adam Newton, the last two by William Bedell, afterward Bishop of Kilmore. Archbishop Abbot had the manuscript copy of Sarpi's work, procured through De Dominis. (See H. Newland's Life of De Dominis. Lond. 1859. Notes and Queries, iv. p. 275.) An English version of Sarpi, by Sir N. Brent, was published, fol. 1619, also in 1676. A. Bianchi Giovanni, Biografia di Frà Paolo Sarpi, Teologo e Consultore della repubblica Veneta. 2 vols. Zurigo, 1896; translated into French, 2 toms. Bruxelles, 1803. Heidegger, Tumulus Concil. Trid. (2.4to, Tiguri, 1890), contains a defense of Sarpi.—Pallavicini is defended in Reding, Occum. Concil. Trid. Veritas inextincta. 4. fol. See also the general historical works of Gulceiardinii, Seldan, and De Thou.]

PART III.—CHAP. II.—CATH. CHURCH. § 55. COUNCIL OF TRENT.


§ 55.

1545 TO 1551. FIRST PERIOD OF THE COUNCIL, DECEMBER 18, 1545, TO MARCH 11, 1547.


The Council was opened in Trent with so small a number of bishops¹ that the legates, the Cardinals Del Monte (afterwards Pope Julius III.), Marcellus Cervinus, and Reginald Pole, could easily carry out the Papal wishes² in respect to the important

1 Cardinal Joh. Bellajus gives an unfavorable judgment about them in an ode (appendend to Salmonii Macrini Odorurn libri, Paris, 1546, p. 154), e. g.:

Namque inter istos ut fatetar patres
Unum notari posse, vel alterum,
Quem conferas illis beati
Tempora quos alueres cli:
Totius at pars concilii quota est,
Quae recta spectet? . . .

² The Papal instructions to the legates ran thus (Raynald. 1545, no. 47): De capitis religionis, abscissis quocunque respectu, primum tractabitis, damnantes non personas, sed doctrinam, et non solum generales propositiones, sed et particulars, quae nunc vigent, et haeresum sunt fundamenta. De reformatione nec ante dogmata, nec simul cum illis omnino agent, cum hae secundaria et minor causa congruendae Concilii fuerit; sed tantummodo in hac re utantur, ut occasio illa non sit creandae, cum nos vel evitare, vel ad finem Concilii differre velic: quo declarant, quod, quando Concilium in re principali bene procedere coeperit, de illa, scitum convenit, pertractabiture. In rebus, quae ad Romanam Carissimam pertinent, de quibus quereas affertur, consilii Praesulatorum et Provincialium libenter aures porrigit, non quia Concilii sit illas emendare, sed quia Pontifex de illis optimi instructus remedia prorrigit opportuna. Literae et scripturae, quae nomine Concilii expedientes erunt, etiam nomine Legatorum, uti Praesidentium, et Pontificiis, uti ab illis repraesentanti, consignantur, ita ut non solum Pontifex Concilii convocandae auctor.
questions which at once presented themselves. The Emperor and many bishops wished that the questions about a reformation might be first introduced, so as to affect the Protestants favorably; but the Council began, according to the will of the Pope, with condemning the most important Protestant doctrines. Most of the bishops wished the forms of the Council of Basle to be observed, but the Papal legates carried the point that those of the last Lateran Council should be adopted. It soon became evident that every thing was to be ordered by the Papal

sed etiam summam in eo perducendo auctoritatem praeferre appareat, et tribus Legatorum sigillis, vel saltem primi, muniantur.—Facultatem Legatis damus aliquas indulgentias largiendi, sed animadvertant, ut concessae a Concilio non appareant, cui summum jus et auctoritas non competit.

* The question as to what should be first taken up was discussed in the Congregations on the 18th and 22d Jan., 1546, and at length settled by the determination to consider the articles of faith and the projects for reform both together. Rome was displeased at this, but yielded. The legates, however, brought it about that that determination was not included in the decrees of the Council, although they acted in accordance with it. (See the Acts in Raynald, 1546, Nos. 10, 11.) The chief object of Rome, to have the Protestants condemned at the outset, was in this way attained.

* Vide: 1. Several bishops demanded that the Synod should designate itself as universalem Ecclesiam repraesentans. The legates feared that then the conclusion would be drawn (as at the Council of Constance; see vol. iii. p. 228, § 131, Note 8), quae potestatem a Christo immediate habet, cui quilibet, cuiusque status vel dignitatis, etiamsi papalis, existat, obedire tenetur, and they insisted on the formula: Sacrosancta occumenca et generalis Tridentinasynodus, in Spiritu sancto legitime congregata, praesidentibus in ea tribus apostolicae Sedis Legatis. Comp. the discussions, Sess. II., 7 Jan., 1546, and the following days: Laur. Pratanus, in Le Plat, vii. ii. 8; Sarpi, ii. c. 34; Pallavicino, lib. 6, c. 5, 6; Salig, i. 366. 2. The demand that the votes should be taken by nations was not earnestly pressed; the legates proposed to adopt the method of the last Lateran Council; Sarpi, lib. ii. c. 32. 3. The legates at once laid claim to the exclusive right of initiating proposals, and wished to have this expressed by the formula praesidentibus Legatis. The Bishop of Fiesole opposed this (March, 1546); see Raynald, 1546, No. 36. Later, May 18, there was a violent dispute upon this point between the first legate and the Bishop of Astorga; see the Acts in Raynald, 1546, Nos. 67, 68. Among other things, it was said: Dico, inquit Asturicensis, posse singulos Episcopos proponere, nec aliter fieri posset; exempli causa ponamus, aliquem Episcopum velle aliquam materiam contra Legatos ipso vel Cardinales proponere: acue me cum legatis, et de non. Non, inquit Cardinalis Del Monte, vobis liedere arbitror, neque licebit unquam contra Legatos Sedis apostolicae, neque contra Cardinales aliquid propone: nec enim me prae sente tali alicui permittam impune facere, et miror vos addere tali dicere. The question remained unsettled. The legates were able to carry that formula through only once (Sess. XVII., 18 Jan., 1546); but they alone, in fact, exercised all along the right of initiating propositions. An unnamed person writes, from Trent, 3 Jan., 1546, to the assembled prelates (Fortgesetzte Sammlung von alten und neuen theol. Sachen, 1747, p. 337): Multi satis aperte quid sint dicturi ostendunt, non dico de fidei articulis cum Lutheranis consensuros, sed in renitendo pontificiae tyranni et imperio ipsos fortasse Lutheranos longe superare: desid ratur, qui glaciem rumpat, qui praesaltet. O quantum insaniant Lutherani, quod non huc occurrerunt! Ego multis utor hic familiariter, tum video, quid animo premant.
When the legates, Sess. II., were pressed on account of the formula universalem alesiam repraesentans (Laur. Pratanus, in Le Plat, vii. ii. 8), beatissimi Patris praesentantium, nec se posse, nisi lito mature consulto, hoc statueret. Quo dito dicil non potest, ut Patrum virtus immutatus sit: jam toluis Synodi aliam meres faciem: nam ex eo manifestum esse poterat, Legatos Praesidentes nil re a liberum Synodo permettere. Exsclamavere quidam, non expectandum esse in Pontifice deliberationem ad ea quae Concilii auctoritas statueret; alias libenter, quae Synodo debetur, esse nullam. At a later stage the legates came out still more decidedly. In the Congregation of July 30, 1546, the first legate, Del Monte,uld not follow the determination of the majority about the next session (Acts in Raynald, 1546, No. 128), first saying that the votes were equal, and then declaring that all questions about the order of the Council depended on the legates alone; he added: cum in rebus magna est controversia, parvaque est in numero Patrum erentia, Legatorum Sedis apostolicae sententia ita ponderanda est, ut culemque adhaeserit sicut. When, in the Congregation of Feb. 24, 1547, appeal was made to the example of the last Lateran Council, the same legate responded (Acts in Raynald, 1547, No. 32): Quod alias in Concilio Lateranensi factum fuerit, nihil ad positum factum, quia Papa in Concilio non tenebatur sequi sententias Patrum, si bat, et propter etiam major pars contradixisset, potuisset etiam ipsa solus suere. Bargas, who is praised for his learning and piety by Pallavicino (lit. xxi. No. 3), says in a Memoir addressed to the Emperor (Lettres et Mémoires, p. 35): 'a par expression assez forte, pour donner une justie idee du mal, que la manière d'agir le Concile a cause. Sous pretexte d'y établir l'ordre, les Légats du Pape regardent maitres de l'assemblée. Tout ce qui se propose, tout ce qui s'examine, ce qui se définit, c'est dans le temps et de la façon qu'il plaît à ces Messieurs. livrent les instructions qu'on leur a données à Rome, et qu'on leur envoie à tous ens. La liberté, c'est la chose dont ils parlent le plus; mais ils la détruisent d'office, par des actions, factis autem negant. Leur conduite n'est que déguisement et dissimulation. La liberté, qu'ils laissent, n'est qu'une chimière. Cela est si visible, que ces Prélats pensionnaires du Pape l'avouoient eux mêmes, et qu'ils en témoignent leur douleur aux gens de bien. L'injustice du siècle, et la situation présente des affaires ôtent à tous la liberté de parler. On se contente de gémir en P. 42, on the way in which the decrees were drawn up and concluded: Le devant la session ils (les Légats) assembleoient les Evêques en Congrégation générale. Là ces Messieurs lisoient les décrets, comme ils les avoient couchés par eux mesme, qu'ils les avoient seul plus de consulter. Ainsi tout passoit sans difficulté. ci n'entendoient pas ce dont il étoit question, et ceux-là n'osoient pas ouvrir dums. Enfin la pluspart étoient de ce qu'on les retenoit bien avant dans l'esprit. Voilà comment beaucoup de choses conclues à la haste et tumultuaires ont été publiées dès le lendemain. Si cette manière d'agir a fait du mal, ces euvres en jugeront eux mêmes: ipsi viderint. Nos certe qui en novimus, caecos observavimus, non possumus non dolere vicem nostram, Conciliorumque positionem jam diu tolerabant.

these discussions, Rachianti, Bishop of Chiozza, said (Episc. Clodiciensis; see in Raynald, 1546, No. 28): frustra nos modo querere traditiones per manus et observantium communis Ecclesiae ad nos perductas, cum habeamus Evangelium quo omnia, quae ad salutem et vitam Christianam necessaria sunt, scripta suntur. Then he said (Laur. Pratanus, in Le Plat, vii. ii. 18): Implletatem verbis

inesse, ubi de sacris litteris et traditionibus diecebat: pari pietatis affectu.

Lamen postea revocavit. The bishop soon left the Council (Sarpi, i. 283), and
all the books contained in the Vulgate were canonical, and that
the Vulgate edition was "authentic," at the same time ordering
its revision; and they likewise decreed that the interpretation
of the Holy Scripture should be conformed to the sense in which
the Church commonly received it. In the next following de-
crees about sin and justification, the Council had to wind about
among the points in controversy between the Dominicans and
Franciscans, so as not to offend either of these powerful orders.
The traces of this are found in its decrees about original sin

was then examined by the Inquisitors; but this had such an effect upon him that,
under Pius IV., he could be used by the legates in the most important business, and
he earned great praise for his piety and sagacity (Pallavicino, lib. vi. c. 14, No. 4).—
In the Decretum de Canonicis Scripturis it is said: (Synodus) perspiciens, hanc verita-
tem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis, et sine scripto traditionibus, quae
Ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptae, aut ab ipsis Apostolis, Spiritu sancto dic-
tante, quasi per manus traditae, ad nos usque pervenerunt; orthodoxorum Patrum
exempla secuta, omnes libros tam veteris quam Novi Testamenti,—neemon tradi-
tiones ipsas, tum ad fides, tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus a
Christo, vel a Spiritu sancto dictatas, et continua successione in Ecclesia cath.
servatas, pari pietatis affecto ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur.

7 Decr. de Editione et Usu Sacrorum Librorum: (Synodus) statuit et declarat, ut haec
ipsa vetus et vulgata editio, quae longo tot saeculorum usu in ipsa Ecclesia probata
est, in publicis lectionibus, disputacionibus, praedicationibus et expositionibus pro
authentica habeatur; et ut nemo illam rejicere quovis praetextu audeat vel preces-
mat. [On the controversy about the interpretation of this decree, see Köllner, Sym-
bolik, li. pp. 346-8.]

8 Ibid.: Ut posthaec sacra scriptura, potissimum vero haec ipsa vetus et vulgata
editio, quam emendatissimae imprimatur.

9 Ibid.: Ut nemo—sacram Scripturam ad suos sensus contorquens, contra cum
sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater Ecclesia, cuius est judicare de vero sensu
et interpretatione Scripturarum sanctarum, aut etiam contra unanimem consensum
Patrum, ipsam Scripturam sacaram interpretari audeat.

10 The most eminent divines who spoke upon this point were the two Dominicans,
the Italian Ambrosius Catharinus (who, however, deviated from Thomas Aquinas),
and the Spaniard Dominicus de Soto, a strict Thomist; also Hieronymus Seripandus,
General of the Augustines. See Sarpi, lib. ii. c. 63. Salig. i. 455, Decr. de peccato
originali: primum hominem Adam, cum mandatum Dei in Paradiso fuisset trans-
gressus, statim sanctitatem et justitiam, in qua constitutus fuerat, amississe, incurrise-
seque per offenses praevacrationis huysmodi Iram et indignationem Dei, atque
ideo mortem,—et cum morte captivitatem sub ejus potestate, qui mortis deinde
habuit imperium, h. e. diaboll, totumque Adam per illam praevacrationis offensam
secundum corpus et animum in deterius commutatum fuisse.—Hoc Adae peccatum
—propagatione, non imitatione transfusum omnibus, inest unicurque proprium.—
Nihil est damnationis sis, qui vere consecutus sunt cum Christo per baptismam in
mortem: qui non secundum carmem ambulant, sed veterem hominem exuentes, et
novum, qui secundum Deum creatum est, induentes, innocentes, immaculati, puri,
innoxii, ac Deo dilecti effecti sunt.—Manere autem in baptizatis concupiscientiam
vel fomiem, haec s. Synodus fatetur et sentit: quae cum ad agenem relicta sit, no-
cere non consentientibus, sed virilliter per Christi Jesu gratiam repugnantibus non
valet.—Hanc concupiscientiam, quam aliquando Apostolus peccatum appellat, s.
Synodus declarat Ecclesiam catholicam nunquam intellexisse peccatum appellari,
and the immaculate conception of Mary (Sess. V., June 17, 1546). The doctrine of Justification, upon which several of the fathers of the Council came very near to the views of Luther, was at last defined in the sharpest antagonism to the latter (Sess. VI., January 13, 1547), although many points in respect to it
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were left unheeded; in particular, it was left ambiguous whether any one could be sure of his justification. Then they began upon the doctrine of the Sacraments (Sess. VII., March 3, 1547), not deciding the contested point, how the sacraments worked, but affirming the necessity of the "intention" on the part of the administrator.

In the debates upon the practical reformation of the Church, the demands of the Spanish bishops came into especial and sharp conflict with the claims of Rome. The Pope implied that he would meet the general expectations by a Bull, but the Papal legates did not lay it before the Council. On the other hand,

16 Ibid. Cap. 9: Quamvis necessarium sit credere, neque remitti, neque remissa unquam fuisse peccata, nisi gratis divina misericordia propter Christum; nemini tamen fiduciari et certitudinem remissionis peccatorum suorum jactanti, et in ea sola quiescenti, peccata dimitti vel dimissa esse dicendum est. Cap. 12: Nemo, quamdiu in hac mortalitate vivitur, de arcano divinae praedestinationis mysterio usque adeo praesumere debet, ut certo statuat, se omnino esse in numero praedestinatarum: quasi verum esset, quod justificatus aut amplius peccare non possit, aut si peccaverit, certam sibi resipiscientiam promittore debet. Nam, nisi ex speciali revelatione, aciri non potest, quos Deus sibi elegerit. Thereupon Dominicus Soto wrote a work to prove that man can not be sure that he has grace; Catharinus, in reply, said that the Council did not intend to condemn the opposite opinion; Pallavicino, lib. viii. c. 12, § 9.

17 De Sacramentis in genere, 13 canones; De baptismo, 14 canones; De confirmatione, 3 canones.

18 In particular, whether a virtus instrumentalis et effectiva was put into the sacraments once for all by God, in order to produce the sacramental efficacy, as the Dominicans maintained; or whether God works at each time directly through the sacraments, according to the doctrine of the Franciscans. On the violent strife of the two parties, see Sarpi, lib. ii. c. 96; Salig, i. 567.

19 De Sacramentis in genere, can. 11: Si quis dixerit, in ministris, dum sacramenta conficiunt et conferunt, non requiri intentionem saltem faciendo quod facit Ecclesia, anathema sit. Besides this, in can. 6, the anathema was declared against the assertion, sacramenta novae legi non continere gratiam, quam significant, aut gratiam ipsum non ponentibus obiciem non conferre, quasi signa tantum externa sint acceptae per fidem gratiae vel justitiae, et notae quaedam Christianae professionis, quibus apud homines discernuntur fideles ab infidelibus (Zwingli; see § 35, note 13); can. 9, against such as hold in tribus sacramentis, baptismo scilicet, confirmatione, et ordine, non imprimi characterem in anima; can. 10, against those who say Christianos omnes in verbo, et omnibus sacramentis administrandis habere potestatem.

Bulla Reformationis Pauli P. III. ad Historiam Conc. Trident. pertinens concepta non vulgata, ed. D. H. N. Clausen, Havn. 1880, 4to. It is dated anno incarnationis dominicae, 1546, XI. Kal. Jan.; that is, 23d Dec., 1546. Pallavicino, lib. ix. c. 10, § 3, puts it in the beginning of 1546; he probably read, XI. Kal. Jan. In Trent they began to speak of it in January, 1547; Laur. Pratanus, in Le Plat, vii. ii. 28. The first legate said: Se collegisse quaedam honorum morum impedimenta, a patribus superioribus sensibus in controversiam quasi vocata, quae si ex ordine exenterentur, fore ut inter patres conveniret. Facile erant illa patribus accepta, et bona reformations speculosa non paucis tamen suspecio erat, illa jam pridem per diploma praeidentibus a beatissimo Patre ordinata, quae velintes lili paulo aliter extorquere, diploma
several bishops asked in vain for reforms which affected the Papal authority. The legates maintained that the Council could only make reforms in those matters which were referred to it by the Pope, and in these only by the reservation of the supreme Papal power. In vain did some bishops endeavor to insist upon the episcopal rights. The legates were able to null unquam ostenderunt; omne enim in Pontificis summi potestate liberrime postulatum semper volueri, cautelionibus tam crebris decrcto additis, ut quod agerent ipsos olle arbitrarianis.

The Bishop of Fiesole, Brachius Martellus Episc. Fesularum, 15th April, 1546, made an energetic speech against exemptions, especially against the right of monks to preach without the permission of the bishop (in Le Plat, iii. 405): e. g.: Mihi minimo non placet quidam de sanctissimorum Episcoporum meritis dispensato. Is prius ipsi Episcopi fuerint in suis Episcopatibus libere atque integre restituti. 

Von puto horum privilegii nobis adiisse divinum, jus quae situm, jus Episcopi, quod adimi nequit. Aut omnia sunt Episcopii nobis nostra jurisrestituta, ut nulla omnia sunt nobis Episcopis nova onera imponenda. On account of this speech the legates wrote to Rome, and then administered a severe reproof to the bishop; Pallavicino, lib. vii. c. 4, § 13 ss. Wigerius, Bishop of Senigaglia (d. June 9, 1546), now demanded that it should first of all be decided that bishops held their residence jure divino (Pallavicino, lib. vii. c. 6, § 3). The Episcopal party united in urging this claim; for, they said, there must be jure divino rights where there are jure divino duties, and all these Papal dispensations must be stopped which allowed the holding of several bishoprics at once, and the non-residence of the cardinals. This was stubbornly opposed by the legates, and remained as an apple of discord all through the Council. The Cardinalis Giennensis made a long address, Dec. 30 (see Raynald, 1546, No. 135), in which he argued, especially from Cajetan, "residentiam sedis jure divino," and violent debates followed (Le Plat, iii. 478). The Spanish bishops handed in eleven articles, Feb. 8 (Sarpi, lib. ii. c. 89), in which they insisted that the residence of bishops is jure divino; that no one, not even cardinals, could have more than one bishopric; that, in general, all pluralities of benefices should be abolished; and that the holding of ecclesiastical positions must be made to depend upon previous examination.

* * *

**Compare the proceedings in the Congregation, February 24, 1547, according to the Acts in Raynald, 1547, No. 82. Certain rights, as delegates of the Pope, were to...**
conduct the decrees about reforms in respect to the residence of bishops, dispensations, and privileges in such a way that the Papal power was not at all diminished.22

The question about the removal of the Council had been previously raised.23 By the threats of the Emperor this was hindered, until his campaign in Saxony removed him from the scene. On March 11, 1547, it was decided upon.24 The Emperor and the Pope now negotiated in an irritated tone upon having the Council brought back to Trent;25 and meanwhile the former, to the great displeasure of the Pope, took into his own hands the ecclesiastical arrangements which seemed to him to be required in Germany, by prescribing, in May, 1548, the Interim Augusta to the Protestants, and, in June, 1548, the Formula Reformationis to the Catholics.26 Thereupon provincial and diocesan councils were at once summoned,27 in order to introduce the re-

be made over to the bishops in their dioceses. Fesulanus ex scripto recitavit, se valde condolere, Episcopos in propriis dioecesis auctoritate aliena agere, hoc nequaquam ferendum esse, ut Episcopi apostolicae, i.e. alienam auctoritatem in gregem sibi commissum animadvertant. Quod, inquit, quam iniquum sit, non melius verbis, sed verbis Clementis Papae I. Pontificis attendite. Tunc alta voce clamavit Episcopus Alifanus, consentiebat ad Legatos, dixit, non esse ferendum Fesulanum in tanto consensu adversus primam Sedem loquentem, petiitque dari sibi liberum, quem habebat Fesulanus in manibus, quoniam convincere voleret, vera afin heretics esse.—Adversum quem Calagurritium et Giennensis dixerunt, inconveniens esse in Synodo libertatem impedire, neque esse Alifani, aut alterius cujusque Praesat, dicentem impedire, vel de haeresi argueres, sed solum Rev. Praesidentium. Albiginenses, non, Patres, amplius Fesulanus, inquit, audientius, quia relapsus est, sed scriber coerendus. Castellamarus, nulla est, inquit, concilii amplius libertas.—Hispaniensis omnis Fesulanum tuebantur, et cum eis Senogallenses; contra Albigenenses et Alifanum clamabant, adeo ut prae clamore non facile dicentes audirentur. Isti, non esse quemquam adversus primam Sedem loquentem audientes: alii libertatem Concilii laesam clamabant. The legates restored with difficulty the old arrangement. The first legate reproved both parties, but Albigenenses et Alifanum leniter corrumpit, admonuitque, ut deinceps munus hoc redarguendi Praesatos non sibi assumerent; on the other hand, Fesulanum admonuit, ne toles repetitas cantilenas cum offensione auriun omnium honorum repeteret.

22 The weighty decrees about reform, in the seventh session, which aimed at an efficient possession and administration of ecclesiastical offices, and abolished plural benefices, was from the first restricted by the formula, Salva semper in omnibus Sedis apostolicae auctoritate.

23 In August, 1546, it was prevented only by the earnest threats of the Emperor. See the Diarium Concil., in Raynald. 1546, No. 127; Laur. Pratanus, in Le Plat, vil. lii. 23 sq.


25 Ranke's Fürsten und Völker, etc., ii. 255 (in his History of Popes, Book ili. p. 88, Philad. ed.).

26 See above, Division I. § 9.

27 Division I. § 9, Note 9. Much that was good was determined in them. Comp.
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rums prescribed in the above Formula. The Pope looked upon
all this as an intrusion upon his own rights, but he was obliged
bear it. The King of France was indeed for the Pope
against the Emperor; but even he demanded reformati;
ch greatly limited Papal encroachments, and he hinted at
elping himself by provincial councils.

§ 56.

SECOND PERIOD OF THE COUNCIL—MAY 1, 1551, TO APRIL 28, 1552.

Julius III. (1550—1555) at last yielded to the desire of the
peror, and again transferred the Council to Trent, although
ance, in conflict with the Pope about Parma, did not recognize
. Moguntina, ann. 1549; Capitula ad fidem pertinentia, cap. 43 (Hartz-
, vi. 574): Nos praeva superstitioni viam praecedere volentes, omnibus locorum
illius injungimus, ut si forte in territoriis suis ad imaginem aliiquam concursus
i, et homines ad ipsius imaginis figuram respectum habeare, et quasi quandam di-
litatis opinionem illi tribuere animadvertirt, ipsam imaginem—aut tollant, aut
sent, et aliam a prima, notabili quantitate differentem, reponant.

* Division I. § 9, Note 6.

See the instructions of the King to his embassadors in Bologna, Aug. 13, 1547,
Le Plat, iii. 647. He demanded, 1, the abolition of the annates (first-fruits); 2, of
occupation of livings by anticipation; 3, of several other abuses, e. g. the mensae
ales, the carrying of litigation to Rome, the union of benefices; 4, of dispensa-
ns for gold; 5, and of the exemption of ecclesiastical property from taxation.

French bishops, in an epistle of September 29, 1548 (in Le Plat, iv. 138), declined
invitation to send some of their number to Rome to take part in the negotia-
tions about reform (p. 138): Quamquam non negamus in restituendis moribus et
olendas disciplinas Christianae vitae operam optime poni universae Ecclesiae; hoc
en et pars est altera eorum, quae proponebantur indicendo Concilio, et, si dif-
di non possit, a singulis Metropolitanis ad veterem canonum severitatem commo-
exigetur, et committendum nobis non videtur, ut superioribus malefacientes
ngatur haud parvum malum, ut in sermones hominum malorum incurrant, nos nihil minus velle, quam corruptorum principiorum Ecclesiae administrans
nis medicinam, quam improbitatem nostram retractare et corrige, quod solum
num concilium et suscipere et perficere quest, proinde subterfugere nos, nec
 remedii generi aquiescere.

Before his election the cardinals, and he among them, had imposed a whole
es of obligations on the one who should be chosen Pope; see in Massarelli
pendix to Salig, iii.), p. 188; e. g. 1. Quod sacrosanctum Concilium universale
haeresibus extirpandis et pro universalis Ecclesiae reformatione omni studio
ligentia prosequetur. 2. Quod omnem reformationem, quam per dictum Con-
um juxta canonicas sanctiones et ss. Patrum decreta fieri contigerit, omnino
m et gramin habebit. 3. Quod, quantum in ipsa eurit, interim curabit, idque ad
em sacri Romanorum S. R. E. Cardinalium collegii, vel ab eis ad id deputata-
qui ex nunc nominetur requisitionem, ut Curia Romana reformatur. The
were chiefly for the advantage of the cardinals; and the above were doubtless
 designed to make the Pope more dependent on the cardinals.
this transfer, and threatened to call a national council. The Papal party in the Council adhered to the plan of allowing only matters of faith to be decided, and of keeping in the background all reforms touching upon the Papal authority. Crescetius, Cardinal S. Marcelli, who now presided, and who enjoyed the closest confidence of the Pope, roughly and defiantly opposed all the demands for reform. As to the determination of dogmas,

---

3 Jac. Amyot appeared as the French ambassador at Trent, and there had to protest (Acta in Raynald. 1552, No. 32; Le Plat, iv. 241), ne Regi gravissima bellorum motuum difficultatibus implicato necesse esset Tridentum ad Concilium mittere suae ditionis Episcopos, quippe quibus nec liber nec tutus co patet accessus, neve id ipsum Concilium, a quo excluderetur invitissimus, generale totius Ecclesiae catholicae aut haberetur aut appellaretur;—denique neque Concilii hujusmodi—decretis aut ipsae, aut populus Gallicus, aut uli Gallice Ecclesiae Praelatet ministri in posterius teneantur: imo vero se testari palam ac docentiae, academ se remedii ac praesidia descensurum, si necesse videretur, quibus maiores sui Francorum Reges in re consimili causaque uti consuevisserent; nec sibi quidquam antiquissum fore, se- cundum fidel ac religious integritatem, libertate et incolumitate Ecclesiae Gallice. Switzerland also, at the instigation of France, refused to send representatives to the Council; see Chr. W. Glück's Gesch. Darstellung der Kirchl. Verhälttnisse d. Kathol. Schweiz bis zur Helvetik, Mannheim, 1850, p. 330.

---

4 When the imperial envoy, Don Franc. de Toledo, pressed the precedence of reforms, the legates showed him, with the greatest secrecy, a letter of the Emperor to the Pope (see Vargas' Letter to Granvilla, Vargas Lettres et Mémoires, p. 63): Si la lettre est véritable, sa Majesté a promis, qu'on ne procédera à la réformation, qu'au- tant que le Pape le trouvera bon, et qu'elle fera en sorte que les Evêques ne s'opposeront point à sa Sainteté, et qu'ils laisseront passer tout ce qu'elle voudra. The epistle was undoubtedly genuine, written by the Emperor to induce the Pope to call the council, and to keep him aloof from France. Vargas writes, October 12, 1551, p. 147: Le Légat est absolument le maitre du Concile. Il empêche même que certaines choses ne passent, quoique le Pape veuille bien nous accorder. The Bishop of Orense, on the same day, p. 158: Les Présidents du Concile ne font paroître ni zèle, ni empressement pour la réformation du Clergé. Ils déclarent sans façon que nous devons nous contenter de ce qu'on voudra bien nous accorder, sans qu'il nous soit permis d'ouvrir la bouche, pour demander quelque chose de plus. Vargas, November 12, 1551, p. 188: Le Légat va toujours son chemin. Il se met au large et se tire d'embarass en consumant le temps à faire disputer les théologiens, et à tenir des congrégations sur ce qui regarde les dogmes. On s'attend bien, qu'à la dernière heure, avant la Session, il viendra vite et d'un air empressé proposer quelque chose de spécieux pour la réformation, et de bien concerté en apparence. On n'aura pas le temps de le lire, ni de le bien comprendre. Tout cela ne servira qu'à donner encore de la confusion au Concile et de nouveaux sujets de rai- lerie. Les paroles et les remonstrances sont fort inutiles ici. Je crois, qu'elles ne le sont pas moins à Rome. Ce sont des avenges. Ils ont pris une ferme ré- solution de ne penser qu'aux intérêts de la chair et du monde. Que tout périsse, ils ne s'en embarrassent nullement. P. 191: Le Concile ne peut rien faire par lui meme. On l'a dépouillé de son autorité. Il n'y a point de liberté. Le Légat est le maître, il tient tout dans sa main. Après cela on ne doit plus s'étonner de rien. Vargas, November 26, 1551, p. 209, says that the reigning Pope, Julius III., when he was cardinal-legate at a previous council of bishops, had proposed, de leur cédant à deux conditions le droit de pourvoir seuls à tous les bénéfices à charge d'âmes.
he allowed them to go on with the doctrine of the Sacraments; but even here there was no lack either of arbitrariness on the part of the legate or of controversies among the divines. So that, when the delegates from Württemberg and Saxon (January

La première, que toutes les expéditions s'en feroient en cour de Rome, c'est-à-dire, que l'argent nécessaire pour être pourvû de ces bénéfices seroit porté à Rome: ces Messieurs pensent toujours à cela. L'autre condition, c'est-à-dire que le droit de pourvoir à tous les autres bénéfices, sans charge d'âmes, demeureroit uniquement au Pape. This the present legate wished to bring about, but desired that the bishops should ask him for it. In respect to the benefices in commendam, the legate proposed (p. 253), qu'on ne pourra pas donner un Evêché en commande à ceux, qui n'auront pas attesté l'âge compétent. The benefices in commendam of the cardinals would in this way be specially insured. Many of the prelates opposed this (Vargas à Granvella, November 26, 1551, p. 233): L'Evêque de Verdun, homme pieux et sinère, dit entre les autres, qu'une pareille réformation ne feroit aucun fruit, qu'elle estoit indigne du Concile, et qu'elle ne convenloit point au temps présent. Il ajoute, que les commendes sont un gouffre qui engloutit les biens de l'église; mais comme il lui arriva de dire, que la réformation proposée m'étoit qu'une pretended réforma 'on, un des jours suivans le Légat de dessein prémédité s'emporta si fort contre Evêque de Verdun, qu'il lui dit des choses tout à fait desobligeantes, injurieuses, et contraires au respect dû à l'assemblée, et à la liberté qu'on devroit avoir dans le concile, si Dieu l'eust bien voulu permettre. Ce Prélat fut traité d'outardé, de sort, *jeune homme. On lui dit encore je ne sais quelles autres injures, on ne lui permit pas de répondre, enfin on le menaça, qu'on sauroit bien le punir. Vargas, January 1, 1552, p. 425, reports how the legate, in his doctrinal definitions respecting the sacramentum Ordinis, tried to foist in the most sweeping usurpations of the Papacy, especially the propositions (p. 432): Ut illa (coelestis Hierusalem) sub uno supremo aectore varios et diversos ministrantium continet ordines, ita visibilis Christi Ecclesia sumnum ipsum Vicarium pro unico et supremo capite in terris habet. Cujus spensatione sic reliquis omnibus membris officiadistribuuntur, ut suis quaque in dinibus et stationibus collocata, munera sua in totius Ecclesiae utilitatem cum ulima pace et unione exequantur. Besidesthis, the legate wished to introduce an article (p. 428), qui décide la question de la superriorité du Pape au-dessus du concile. Some members of the Commission endeavored to ward this off by all sorts of representations: L'Evêque d'Orense aiant dit seulement, qu'il doutoit de la vérité cet article, et qu'il vouloit examiner, le Légat lui a repondu d'une manière inso-...
24, 1552) demanded a council free from Papal influence, many of the bishops were rejoiced, because in this way subjects which they were not now allowed to handle might yet come to speech. The legate, on the contrary, thought of having the supreme power of the Papacy decreed, in opposition to those demands. But the progress of the army of the Elector Maurice...
again occasioned another prorogation of the Council (April 28, 1552).

The apostolical Marcellus II., and the hopes of reform which centred in him, passed away in a few days; and then Paul IV. became Pope (1555–1559)—the severely monastic founder of the Order of the Theatines, the ruthless inquisitor—who now undertook, with headstrong and passionate willfulness, to fight against the demands of the age, and to reinstate the old glory of the Papacy; but he was condemned to bitter experience of the vanity of such an attempt. He protested against the Augsburg Religious Peace, and the transferring of the imperial crown from Charles to Ferdinand; but was obliged in turn to hear from Germany unwelcome truths about the limits of the Papal power. With the help of the French he tried to expel the Spaniards from Italy; and it was only owing to the Spanish reverence for the Roman See that he, shut up in Rome by the Duke of Alba, received mild terms of peace. On the other hand, by his haughty repulse of the advances made by Elizabeth, England’s new queen, he separated that land forever from the Roman Church. He had to abandon his purpose of calling Lateran Synod instead of that at Trent. He wished to effect formation without a council, and began the work from his standpoint of monastic narrowness and Papal omnipotence: he harped the Inquisition, ordained stricter Church discipline

---

1 Ranke’s Fürsten u. Völker von Südeuropa, ii. 279; History of Popes, Philad. ed. 5–103.
2 Division I. § 11, Note 1 sq. (vol. iv. above, p. 218).
3 Ranke, as above, p. 100.
4 See above, § 28, Note 10.
5 Sarpi, lib. v. c. 23; Pallavic. lib. xiii. c. 17.
6 Sarpi, lib. v. c. 22. With this in view, he called together a numerous Commis-
7 sion, and when they pointed out to him the necessity of leaving the reforms to the Council, he replied with violence, qu’il n’avait point besoin de Concile, et qu’il était essus de tous;—que c’était une chose fort inutile d’envoyer dans les montagnes soixantaine d’Evêques des moins habiles, et une quarantaine de Docteurs des plus éclairés, comme on avait fait déjà deux fois, et de croire que ces gens-là fussent plus propres pour reformer le monde, que le Vicaire de Jésus-Christ assisté de tous les Cardinaux qui sont les colonnes de toute la Chrétienté et l’élite de les nations Chrétiennes, et des conseils des Préfets et des Docteurs qui sont à eie, et qui sont les plus savans qui soient au monde, et en beaucoup plus grand bre qu’on ne pouvoit jamais en envoyer à Trente.
8 The Bull Cum ex Apostolatus Officio, March 1, 1559, in the Bullarium, and in Ray-
9 1559, No. 14, renews and confirms all previous punishments upon traitors, and determines against all spiritual and secular magnates (Duces, Reges, et Impera-
10 included) who had fallen into schism or heresy that they have forfeited their
also against the clergy, and published an *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*, 1557 (new edition, 1559): but these ordinances had no effect outside of Italy. The temporal sovereigns were the rather thereby induced themselves to help the churches of their own lands. Julius III. had before this felt aggrieved that King Ferdinand had had a Catechism prepared by the Jesuit Canisius, and had ordered his people to be taught in it (1554). Paul IV. had greater occasion of complaint when the same King and the Duke of Bavaria (1556) allowed their subjects to receive the communion in both forms (wine as well as bread). Poland thought about like concessions and of a national Council.

Paul IV. aroused so much opposition by his course that Pius IV. (1559–1565), influenced by his nephew, the pious and zealous Charles Borromeo, cardinal and Archbishop of Milan (d. 1584), thought only about smoothing over the difficulties when approached by France and Germany with the proposal to call a wholly new Council independent of Trent; for France threatened at the same time a national Council, and the Emperor possessions and rights, ad lila de caetero inhabiles et inacapes, habeanturque pro relapsis,—perinde ac s1 prius haeretici hujusmodi in judicio publice abjurassent; nec ullo unquam temporae ad eorum primum statum—rehabilitari possint, quinimo sacularis rellinquantur arbitrio potestatis, animadversione debita punitiendi, nisi apparentibus in eis verae poenitentialae indicibus—ex ipsius Sedis benignitate et clementia in aliquo Monasterio—ad peragendam perpetuam in pane doloris et aqua moestitiae poenitentiam retrudendi fuerit. Even when dying—(Cardinalibus) sanctissimum Inquisitionis officium, quo maxime religio asseveratur, opprimunturque haereticorum impium consatus ac insidia, enixe commendavit (Raynald. 1559, No. 35).

---

18 Ranke’s History of the Popes, p. 103, Am. ed.
19 The first Index was published by the Papal legate in Venice, Joh. della Casa, 1549; see Schelhorn’s *Ergötzlichkeiten*, ii. 3. On the Index of Paul IV., see Schelhorn, i. 4; comp. Division I., § 19, Note 35.
20 Ferdinand’s order, Aug. 12, 1554, in Goldast. Const. Imp. iii. 566. Philip II., in 1557, also introduced it into the Netherlands; see the edict in Le Plat, iv. 606. The Dukes of Bavaria had postils prepared, and directed the clergy to make use of them, Winter’s *Gesch. der evangel. Lehre in Baiern*, ii. 38.
21 Division I. § 11, Note 6 (above, iv. p. 220).
23 J. P. Glussianus, *De Vita et Rebus gestis s. Car. Borromaei*, Mediol. 1751. [Canonized by Paul V. 1610. Godou, Vie de C. Borromeo, Paris, 1748, 2. 12mo; also by Touron, 1761; Giussano’s life, transl. into German, August, 1836, 3 vols.; Salier, Der heil. K. Borromeo, August, 1833; also a German life by Dieringer, Cologne, 1846.]
24 On this proposed new general Council, see the letter of the King to his ambassador before the Emperor, June 24, 1560, in Le Plat, iv. 626. In the Assembly of Notables, in Fontainebleau, 1560, two bishops urged that France, through its bishops, should reform its own Church, because nothing could be hoped for from
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Ferdinand asked that the cup might be given to the laity, and that the marriage of priests might be allowed.²⁸ Pius IV., to Rome (Division I., § 23, Notes 3 and 4). The King then issued letters for a general assembly of the bishops for January, 1561 (Le Plat, iv. 650), pour conferer, consulter, et adviser ce qu'ils connoistronteigne d'estre propose audit concile general, si tant est qu'il se tienne bientost, et neantmoins cependant resoudre ensemble tout ce qui pourra toucher pour nostre regard la reformation d'icelles eglises. It was often afterwards repeated that, if a free general council could not be convened, France must help itself with a national council; letter of the King, Charles IX. (i.e. of his mother, Catharine de Medici), to the French ambassador near the Emperor, December 24, 1560 (Le Plat, iv. 669); to the ambassador at Rome (Le Plat, iv. 672), December 31, 1560.

In the last letter, p. 671, it is said: Pour mon regard j'ail le dit lieu de Trente bien agreable, et n'aye pas grande occasion de m'arrester, si l'ouverture du dit Concile se fait par continuation ou nouvelle indiction, vù memeant que saitie Saintete est en volonté, ainsi qu'elle m'a fait dire, d'accorder que les determinations ja faites audit premier Concile de Trente se puissent de nouveau discuter et debattre.

²² The former especially, on account of his son Maximilian, see letter to the Pope, March 6, 1560 (Leterae Secretiores Ferd. I. Imp. pro obtinenda Eucharistia sub utraque, Museo J. A. Schmidii. Helmst. 1719, 4. p. 8): Non possumus—Sanctitatem Vestram—celare,nos comperisse,quod eidem Serenisima illo nostro Regi Bohemiae maximum scrupulum injecerit communio sacrosanctae Eucharistiae sub una specie, adeoque Dilectione ejus valde inclinare ad communionem sub utraque specie, quam nimium institutioni Christi consentaneam et in primitiva Ecclesia non insitutam prius intendat.—Unde postea eventit,—quod Dilectio ejus triummem fere a communione sacrosanctae Eucharistiae prorsus abstinuerit, donec tandem nos in praesentiam officiolum rogaverit,—vellemus illi apud Sanctitatem Vestram benignam dispensationem impetrare, qua el sub utraque specie communicare liceat.—Si quis nodus aut ratio inveni potest, qua huic negotio quest consulit et caveri, ne idem illius noster, desperato Sanctitatis Vestrae—auxilio et solatio, sese dogmatique et sectisque, um catholicae et orthodoxae religionis nostrae pugnanteis, totum adjungat atque adict, magnopere equidem—Sanctitatem Vestram rogatum volumus, ut hujus rei dignatum rationem ducere—dignetur. Comp. Division I. § 11, Note 11.—The Discursus Caesareae Majestatis in Negotio Concilii praesentatus domino Nuntio apostolico, une 20, 1560, from which Pallavicino, lib.xiv.c.18,No. 9 ss.,and Raynald.1560,No. 5, merely give extracts, complete in Planckii Anecdota ad Hist. Conc. Trid. fasc. vii.—xx. Among others, xviii. 6: Sexto cum videatur Sanctitas ejus eo animo esse, et velit, sublata suspensione Concilii Tridentini in duos annos facta, id ipsum Conclium prosequi, Cae.s Majestati in hoc quoque articulo magnae difficultates occurrunt, non quidem suae ipsae causae, quae pro sua parte hoc non cogitab impugnare sed labefactare illius Concilii decreta, sed propter quod Majestas suam non intelligit quomodo es continuato suo executo ferei quest. Nam obstatre videtur prium impedimento loci ad celebrationem Concilii incommodissimi. Deinde, quod aetate Principes et Ordines Augustanae Confessionis dicuntur nonuisse sufficienter additi, quos certe audiri oportet, si quis fructus Concilii externe debeat. Fraternitas su ætate Majestas sua Caesarea, quod idem adversarii unumque receptu vel adiurari sunt acta et decreta in lilo Concilii edita, si Ita simpliciter eis obrudandarum, servata omni potestate et facultate opponendi, quae contra illa opponere praeterent. Ad hæc—cavenda erit disputatio et contentio cum Principibus quibusdam catholics (France, see above, Note 2), qui protestatione interposita eam Synodum biferunt pro Concilio agnoscere, sed eam duntaxat pro conventu particulari haberunt, in quo et plerique Principes prosurus non comparerunt, cum fortasse non sub delegatus, qui velit pretender lae, paucorum illorum qui adhibuerunt praesentiam Universitati praefundatur non potuisse. Then follows the proposal to take in hand
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avert impending dangers, made haste to summon the Council again to Trent, Nov. 29, 1560.25

Meanwhile the Society of the Jesuits was widely diffused, and had grown to be the most important prop of the Papacy. The strict military rule which Ignatius intended to give it could be only gradually enforced, especially in distant parts. Rodriguez, who had made the Order numerous and powerful in Portugal, acted there so independently that he had to be recalled in 1552.27

the reformation, especially of the clergy, without waiting for the Council, fasc. xix. 5: Sunt denique, qui in tanta rerum perturbatione et tam celebrandi quam exequendi Concilii difficultate et incertitudine—pro conservandas simul atque instaurandas religionem catholicae nonnullis de severitate canonicam remittendum, adeoque non tam populo, quam etiam Clero propter cordis eorum duritiem in nonnullis gratificandum esse putant.—Cujusmodi inter alios sunt praecepta duo articuli, de communiuo sub utraque laicis, et de conjugio Clericorum permittingo.—Prioria autem articuli de communiuo status non ex eo pendet, an non liceat communicare sub alteram tantum; vel etiam, an non sub qualibet specie conlineatur et sumatur totus et integer Christus:—sed an Ecclesia tanquam benignissima mater tum ad consolandas multorum infirmas conscientias, tum etiam ad convincendas multorum superstitions vel etiam malitiosam curiositatem pro praetentis temporis iniquitate non seque justas habeat causas relaxandae Constantini prohibitionis (Gieseler, vol. iii. p. 382, Note 6, § 145) et restituenda calicis, ac olim adimendi habuerit; et an non magis ex re-publicae et religionis dignitate sit, cuique Christiano libertatem permitti usque ad decenionem Concilii hoc vel illo modo—sumendi et hac ratione Ecclesiae communione arceri, cedendumque hac occasione ad enormissimas quasque sectas prolabendi frenas laxare. Posterioris vero articuli de conjugio Clericorum difficilior appareat resolutio.—Verum cum natura imitatrix sit vitiorum,—paucis sine carnis delicto perderivat;—Sanctissimo Domino nostro deliberandum erit, an expediat, istam clericalis continentiae legem pro praetentis temporis conditione usque ad Concilii definitionem paterna dispensatione seu dissimulatione relaxare, quam eadem mordicus retenta sacerdotum ordini laqueum, nefandasque scortationes contra divinum praeceptum fenestram perire. Quo magis enim ecclesiasticis bonis abundant temporalibus, hoc minus videntur gravandi esse castitatis votum vel legem, aut certe eorum statum ad panpateratem Ecclesiae primitiae redigendum esse. The Pope, in his reply, August 30 (Raynald. 1560, No. 56), insisted upon continuing the Council of Trent, and referred the Emperor with his two propositions to it.


27 Orlandinus, lib. xii. No. 54 ss. Rodriguez admitted great numbers to the Society, but the discipline was neglected. After his recall he withdrew to the college in Coimbra, and there sprung up a formal revolt against the new Order. Against Ignatius himself calumnious accusations were stealthily made to the King and to the men of highest rank (No. 60): eum ambitione ductum neptem sanam in matrimonio collocandum Joanni Borgiae curasse, quem Societatis edidisse jam vota Gomius affirmabat. Pecunias et Lusitanae provinciae, ut aliae provinciae susciteret, avertisse: qua in re cum gravem adversarium Simonem (Rodericiam) haberet, eum a provinciis gubernaculis dejeceisse, etc. Ignatius, however, was able to keep the
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After the death of Loyola, July 31, 1556, the crafty Lainez became General of the Order, and caused the Constitution bequeathed by Loyola to be deliberately adopted as the fundamental law of the Society, 1558; so that it received a fixed and uniform shape. The rupture of all other ties was the condition of admission, so that its members might belong wholly to the Society. Unconditional obedience to the superiors, so

confidence of the King, and the Jesuits of Coimbra did penance voluntarily, going through the city flagellating themselves (No. 63). Ignatius wrote at that time the Epistolae de Veritate Obedientiae ad Fratres in Lusitania, 7 Kal. Apr. 1553, which is appended to the Reguli Soc. J.

These were for a long time kept secret, even from Jesuits of the lower degree. Declarationes in examen generale, c. 1: Non oportebit Constitutiones universas ab eis, qui novi accedunt, legi, sed compendium quoddam earum, ubi quisque, quid sibi observandum sit, intelligat. Hence the Regulae were prepared as extracts from the constitutions, partly Regulae communes, partly as Regulae for the single offices and classes, which together form the Regulæ Soc. Jesu. Reg. comm. 58: Nemo quae Domini vel agenda sunt, externis referat, nisi Superioris id probari intelligat. Constitutione vero aliisque hujusmodi libris ant scripta, quibus Societas institutum vel privilegia continentur, non sis ex superioris expresso consensu lis communicet. Leschacherium, August 14, 1612, in Le Bret's Magazin f. Staaten-u. Kirchen, iv. 580: Jesuitae, ut audi vel, Societatis constitutiones et privilegia non impri-
mant, nisi in Romano Collegio, neque exemplaria permittat nisi probatis ex soci-
te. Impressionem anni 1606 nunquam videvo poti, licet omnia susque deperier, ut exemplar nancisci posse. Joh. de Palafox ad Innocent. P. X. in miseris Papis Tuba altera majorem Clangens Sonum (Argent. 1715, 12mo), p. 441: omnes alla religiosa opus, constitutiones habet, privilegia reclusa, constitutiones velates, et omnia, quae ad eorum pertinent directionem, laqueo mysterio quo obvoluta abscondit?—In Jesuitica Societate plures sunt, etiam professi, qui horant constitutiones proprias, privilegia et institutiones, quibus nomen deservit. To the Constitution and Rules were then added the Decreta Congregationum generalium, the Ordinationes Praeceptorum Generalium, and the Ratio Studiorum. As well as the Literae Apostolicae, quibus institutio, confirmatio, et varia Præfatio continentur Soc. J., and the Exercitia Spiritualia Ignatii, were for a long time rarely printed, but at length brought together as the Corpus Institutorum Soc. Jesu, Antverp. 1702, 2 vols. 4to, and Institutum Soc. Jesu, Pragae, 1752, 2 vols. fol. The Constitutiones Soc. Jesu, 1558, were reprinted in London, 1848, with additions. In Examen Generale, c. 4, No. 7 (before the Constitutiones): Unusquisque eorum, qui dictatem ingrediantur, consilium illud Christi sequi: Qui dimiserit patrem, existimabit, sibipatrem, matrem, fratres, et sorores, et quidquid in mundo habeat, relinquendum: quod sibi dictum existimet verbum illud: Qui non odit patrem et rem, non potest meus esse discipulus. Et ita curandum erat ut omne carnis in corporum effectum erga sanguine junctos exstat, ac illum in spiritualem vertat, eoque diligat eo solum amore, quem ordinata caritas exigit. Then the Clarabor: Ut loquenti modus sentiat dignum juve, sanctum est consilium, ut honestum non dicere, quod parentes vel fratres habent, sed quod habebant, etc.

Constitutionum P.VI. c. 1: Versari debet ob oculos Deus creator ac Dominus lte, propter quem homini obedientia praestatur,—ita ut—exactissime omnes viribus nostrarum ad hanc virtutem obedientiae in prims Summo Pontifici, unde Superiores Societatis exhibendam intendamus: ita ut omnibus in rebus, ad eam potestum caritate se obedientia extendere (therto the Clarabor: huicmodi illae omnes, in quibus nullum manifestum est peccatum), ad eum vocem, per-
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that complete unity in action and doctrine might be attained, was the first duty of the Jesuits.

The minutest prescriptions were given for all relations. The Jesuits found their most im-

inde ac si a Christo Domino egredeterent (quandoquidem Ipatus loco, se pro ipsius amore et reverentia obedientiam praestamus), quam promissimis simus, re quavis atque adeo littera a nobis inchoata necum perfecta relieta; ad eum scopum viros omnes ac intentionem in Domino convertendo, ut sancta obedientia tarn in executione, tum in voluntate, tum in intellectu sit in nobis semper omni ex parte perfecta; cum magna celeritate, spirituali gaudio et perseverantia quidquid nobis injunctum fuerit obemendo; omnia justa esse nobis persuadendo, omnem sententiam ac judicium nostrum contrarium cacea quadam obedientia abnegando, et id quidem in omnibus, quae a Superiore disponuntur, ubi definiri non possit (quemadmodum dictum est) aliquod peccati genus intercedere. Et sibi quisque persuadat, quod qui sub obedientia vivunt, se forci ac regi a divina providentia per Superiores suos sinere debent, (perinde ac si cadaver essent, quod quovunque fuerit, et quovunque ratione tradacto se simul: vel similiter atque semis baculis, qui, ubicunque et quovunque in se velit ut eum manu tenet, et inservit.)—Omnibus ilidem maxime commendantur sit, ut multum reverentia (et praeclaque in interiori homine) sui Superiores exhibeat, Jesum Christum in eisdem considerent ac reverentur, eosdem saepe et essentiae, ac sic in spiritu caritatis in omnibus procedant, ut nihil ex externis vel internis eos cecint. Cap. 5: Cum exoptet Societas,—suos omnes securos esse, vel certe adjuvaris, ne in laqueum ullius peccati, quod ex vi Constitutionum hujusmodi aut ordinationum proveniat, incidant; visum est nobis in Domino, excepto expresso voto, quo Societas Summo Pontifici pro tempore existenti tenetur, et tribus aliis essentialibus paupertatis, castitatis et obedientiae, nullas constituciones, declamationes, vel ordinem ullam vivendi posse obligationem ad peccatum mortale vel veniale inducere, nisi Superior ex nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, vel in virtute obedientiae jubet. This passage is frequently misunderstood. In monastic Latin, Obligatio ad peccatum is not obligation to sin, but obligation by or with sin, Obligatio sub poena peccati, i.e. such that its non-observance is reckoned as sin. So in P. VI. c. 3, § 8, qui ad peccatum obligare potest est the superior. Comp. S. Francisci Regula Tertiariorum, c. 20 (Holsten. iii. 42): Caeterum in praemissis omnibus—nullum ad mortalem culpam volumus obligare. Constitt. Praedicatorum, c. 5 (Holsten. iv. 13): Praecepta obligationis ad mortale peccatum. [On the formula Obligare ad peccatum, see Steitz, in Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie, 1864.]


32 Regulae S. Jesu. In these, after a Summarium Constitutionum, follow, first, Regulae Commones; then the rules for special relations, Regulae Provincialis, R. Praepositi, etc. Characteristic are the Regulae modestiae. For general intercourse is prescribed modestia et humilitas conjuncta cum religiosis maturitate; then follow these special injunctions: 2. Caput hac illuc leviter non moverat, sed cum gravitate, ubi opus erit: et si opus non sit, tenetast rectum cum moderata inflexione in partem anteriorem, ad neutrum iatrus defectentem. 3. Oculos demisinos, ut plurimum, teneant; nec immoderat eos elevando, nec in hanc aut illam partem circumfectando. 4. Inter Ioquendum, cum hominibus praesertim alicujus auctor-
PORTANT SPHERE OF OPERATION IN THE HIGHER INSTRUCTION OF YOUTH. Their colleges were for the most part devoted to higher culture in general, but they always had a strict Catholic basis of doctrine and order. The Collegium Romanum, founded in 1551, took the first rank among them. Alongside of this, at the instigation of Ignatius, Pope Julius III. founded, in 1552, the Collegium Germanicum in Rome, as a theological training-school, to prepare Germans for the defense of Roman Catholicism in Germany, and committed it to the charge of the Jesuits; and this became the pattern of a new kind of theological institutions called seminaries. The new Protestant universities and schools having brought to light the defects in the education of youth, these Jesuit colleges attained great renown among the Catholics, and were largely frequented. Thus the Jesuits were enabled to win over the best talents, and to implant in the young a fanatical devotion to the Church and to their Society. Their Order had

5. Rugae in  

6. Labia nec nimis compressa, nec nimium diducta.  

7. Tota hilaritat in potius praestare, quam tristitiam, aut aliud minus moderatum.

* Ribadeneira in Vita Ignatii, lib. iv. c. 3. (Acta SS. Julii, viii. 735.)  

* The plan is developed by Ignatius in his letter to a brother of the Order, Le Jay, July 30, 1552, in Friedländer’s Beiträge zur Reformationsgesch. (Berlin, 1837), p. 275. the bull of foundation, August 31, 1552, the Germans are required to be educated, magistri et praeceptoribus eis per litteras humaniores trium linguarum, latinae, graecae et raecae, ac logicae, physicae et alias liberalibus disciplinis, et deum sacram theologiae, et Dei publice legant et doceant, and to be specially prepared for clerical work, ut tandem—, tanquam fideiathletae, in suas regiones, ad aliose exempla vitae suae Christum trahendos, et qui id talentum accipserint, ad verbum Dei praedicandum et eccendum,—necum haeresum latens venenum comprehendendum, et errores perforvienceendum et essecumundum—remitti et destinari possint. Comp. Ribadeneira, v. c. 6; Jul. Cordarae Collegii Germanici et Hungarici Historia, lib. iv. (Romae, fol.); Das deutsche Collegium in Rom (Leipzig, 1843).

See below, § 57, Note 33.

This was effected chiefly by the Exercitia Spiritualia. The parents were also light upon through their children. The Jesuits especially favored a public show by the revival of ancient superstitious usages, and by inventing new ones. Their scholars at Ingolstadt, where the reformation then had many adherents, a pilgrimage to Eichstädt to receive confirmation, 1560 (Orlandinus, ii. 133): sum s. Eucharistiam pie suscepsisset, et rorem, qui e s. Walpurgae sepulcro, recepto patriotic et alius religioso haussisset, biniimum templum admirante populo simulque Deo et deo coeleste precante hari modestia processere. The bishop allowed them to remove at once the laid on the spots anointed with the holy chrism), so as not to stir the derision unbelieving; but they wore it for three days. Where they could lay hands retetical books, they burned them. In Vienna, at the close of a great feast (Jan-
different degrees—the Scholasticici, the Coadjutores, and the Professi quatuor Votorum;\(^\text{37}\) to which were also added the mysterious Professi trium Votorum.\(^\text{38}\) A strict examination preceded

uary 1, 1561; see Orlandinus, ii. 201), the Rector started a game, in which from one dish was drawn the name of one of the company, from another a saint for him, and from a third a good work he was to do. On Sunday, before the fast, in the eating-hall where the scholars were assembled for their mid-day meal, the fathers suddenly marched through, preceded by a crucifix and death's-head, singing and scourging themselves. On the next day the pupils did the same. Fasts were at that time often not observed in Vienna; but a Jesuit pupil preferred to be expelled from his father's house rather than to break the fasts. This new fanaticism was not, however, always satisfied with harmless exercises and pious pranks; in Poland the disciples of the Jesuits began, after 1606, to rage against the Evangelicals with burnings and murder. See Gieseler, iv. p. 257; Ranke's History of the Popes, p. 267.

\(^\text{37}\) The Scholasticici nostri s. approbati (in relation to the Scholasticis externis) were those who, after the completion of two years of probation, had adopted the tria vota simplicia paupertatis, castitatis et obedientiae cum promissione ingrediendi societatem (Examen generale, c. 1); and this, sicut Deo et non homini: ita nemo id admittit. Propter ea in nullius manibus fieri dicitur (Declar. ad Constitut. P. V. c. 4, § 3). They had continued their studies, Constitt. P. IV. c. 8 ss., comp. c. 8, § 8: in universum loquendo, edoceri eos convenit, quem modum tenere oporteat huus Societatis operarios, qui in tam varia mundi regionibus, cumque tam diversa hominum generibus versari debent, antevertendo incommode quas possunt accedere, et emolumenta quae ad majus Del servitium conferunt captando, omnibus rationibus adhibitis quae possunt adhiberi. Et quamvis hoc sola unctio S. Spiritus, et ea prudentia, quam communicare solet Dominus illis, qui in divina sua Majestate confidunt, docere possit; via saltem aliquo modo quaeruntur documenta, quae juvent, et ad effectum divinæ gratiæ disponunt, aperiri potest. After ending their studies, the Scholasticici could be employed in instructing (P. IV. c. 6, § 18). The Coadjutores formati had likewise to take only the simplicia vota et non solemnia; but in manibus ejus, qui admisserunt sit, P. V. c. 4, § 1; to this was added the Declaratio: in manibus fieri vota dicuntur, quando emittuntur coram aliquo, qui, cum ad id habebat potestatem, ea admissit. They praised God, et tibi R. Patri Praeposito Generalli Societatis Jesu, locum Dei tenenti—paupertatem, castitatem et obedientiam: the Coadjutores formati spirituales had besides, peculiarem curam circa puerorum eruditionem juxta modum in litteris apostolicis et constitutionibus dictae Societatis expressum. The Colleges were for the most part manned with these Coadjutors, and they usually held the office of Rector in them (P. IV. c. 10, § 3); only as an exception was a Professus made Rector (P. VI. c. 2, § 3). The Coadjutores temporales were limited to manual labor, Regulae communes, No. 14: Nemo eorum, qui ad domestica ministeria adimituntur, aut legere disceat aut scribere, aut si aliquid sciat, plus litterarum addiscat, nec quisquam cum doceat sine Praepositi Generalis facultate: sed satis ei erit sancta cum simplicitate et humiliitate Christo Domino nostro servire. The Professi quatuor Votorum were obliged to take solemn vows, namely, paupertatem, castitatem et obedientiam, et secundum eam, and to promise peculiarum curam circa puerorum eruditionem; and besides this, as votum quartum, specularem obedientiam summum Pontificel circa missiones (P. V. c. 3). Of these Professi there was only a small number (P. VIII. c. 1, § 2: juverit, magnam turbam ad professionem non admittit). The Societas professa, always ready to be sent in the service of the Pope (P. IV. c. 2, § 4), lived in the Domus professa, which had no revenue, and were maintained by alms (Pt. VI. c. 2). The Professi formed the first class: supremam curam vel superintendentiam collegiorum professa Societas habebit (P. IV. c. 10).

\(^\text{38}\) This class was authorized by Julius III. in the Bull Exposit, Debitum, 1550.
PART III.—CHAP. II.—CATH. CHURCH. § 56. THE JESUITS.

Exact and mutual watchfulness, with reports to the superiors, kept the latter accurately informed about everything, and enabled them to assign to each one the sphere for which he was fitted. Since all Jesuits could be dismissed, the Society kept out useless and harmful members. And so it was conducted into one whole, many members closely knit together. Thus the most manifold talents, knowledge, and aptitudes, firmly aimed to the Church and the Society within, and without equal bound by strict oversight and discipline, in many and diverse spheres of labor, at the beck of the General of the Order, were made to work for the same ends. Spread abroad through many
lands, this Society, by its united action, propped up the Church where it was tottering, and gave it new foundations in the regions from which it had been driven out, as well as among the unbelieving nations.

§ 57.

THIRD PERIOD OF THE COUNCIL—JAN. 18, 1562, TO DEC. 4, 1563.


The Council did not venture at first to call itself a continuation of the previous one,¹ although it kept on with its interrupted acts. The legates,² as a rule, were now obliged to proceed more circumspectly than before, because the demand for actual reforms resounded more importunately from all sides, even from the bishops.³ The Emperor Ferdinand handed in proposals which

¹ See § 56, Note 26. The Spanish embassadors demanded at once the open declaration, esse hanc veteris Concilii continuationem, non novi indictionem (Paleotto, p. 21); the imperial embassadors (Raynald. 1562, No. 15), in hac præxima sessione omnino continuationis facienda significationem praecavendam esse. The French embassadors, at their first appearance, insisted on the declaration, May 26, 1562 (Le Plat, v. 181), hanc synodum non eam esse, quae primum a Paulo III. Pont. Max. indicata et incita fuit, tum postea a Julio III. turbulentissimis temporibus medias inter Gallorum et Hispanorum acies continuata, nullo præclaro faciendo dissiluit: hanc esse novam, nunc vero primum indicatam; but received to this demand, which was renewed in writing, the following answer from the legates (p. 185): Novam Concilii indictionem declarare in nostra non est potestate, sed tantum ejus celebrationi praecess.

² The Cardinals Hercules Gonzaga (Card. Mantuanus, President, followed at his decease, March, 1563, by the Cardinal Joh. Morone, Bishop of Prenesta, the same who, on a charge of heresy, was imprisoned under Paul IV.; see Div. I. § 19, Note 34), Seripandus (Episc. Salernitanus, who also died, March, 1563, and was succeeded by Card. Bernh. Navagerius), Stanisl. Hosius (Episc. Warmiensis), and Simonetta (Episc. Pisauriensis). The Cardinal Marcus Sitticus von Hohenems (Altaempe), a son of the Pope's sister, an ignorant monk, was a mere figurant.

³ Sarpi, lib. vi. § 55. Pallavicino, lib. xviii. c. 7, § 1, and c. 11, § 11.
enetrated deeply. Bavaria acceded to them; but France, which at first seemed to follow their example, seemed to vacillate; and the Emperor Ferdinand, after long conference with the skilful Cardinal Morone in Innspruck (April, 1563), became more yielding. He allowed himself to be convinced that his wishes for reform by the Council could not be fulfilled on account of the opposition of the Spaniards, but that the Pope would by and by concede them to him. So he left Innspruck (June 25, 1563), and pressed for a conclusion of the Council. As the doctrinal

These were prepared for by a memorial of Staphylus (Scheilhorn, Amoen. Eccles. 1560), and another from a commission (ibid. l. 490). These were handed to the Pope January 7, 1562, and are found in various collections, which vary from one another, Raynald, 1563, No. 58, and in Bartholomae a Martyribus Opp. (Romae, 1735) 54, both in Le Plat, v. 264. The Syllabus, in Scheilhorn, i. 587, is only a sketch of the papers of Staphylus. The Emperor here demands reformation of the Curia, abolition of scandalous dispensations, of exemptions, of pluralities simony; demands the residence of bishops, a more edifying cultus, the instruction of the people by preaching and in schools, higher culture and morals of the clergy, etc. Notice in Raynald.: 13. Fortasse permittendum, ut lecate alicubi latinitas vernacula fideltas versus intermiscere. 15. Considerandum sacro Concilio, quo res ipsa efflaget, aliquam juris positivi relaxari. Et circa communicationem traque specie consulti desidero externarum nationum. 16. De es carnium et aliquliquid de pristin origine remittendum, super quo tamen prudenter delibere. 17. Conjugium item clericorum aliquid nationibus concedendum.

Address of the Bavarian ambassador, Augustinus Baumgartner, June 27, 1563, in Le Plat, v. 335.

Letter of the French ambassador to the Council, July 4, 1563, in Raynald. 1563, p. 335. The M.S. Relatione Sommaria del Card. Morone sopra la Legatione sua is by Ranke in his History of the Popes. Morone himself gives as the result of negotiations that the Council had begun to change its attitude, and could be more easily handled. See Ranke, Hist. in Appendix.

Caesaris ep. ad Card. Moronis, 31. Jul. 1563, in Raynal. 1563, No. 139: Nos, dissimulamus nepos noester, Rex catholica, hoc est animo, ut Concilium in longum et tempus, ut diecitur, non possumus conjectura assequi, quibus rationibus indutum, sicut Concilium tamdiu extrahil, neque tamen quidquid in lls quae sunt juris remitti (marriage of priests, cup to the laity, fasts). Nobis quidem tanta cunctatio minime probatur, qua nimirum animadvertimus univrsum chris-

 orbem maximopere offendit.—Quod autem pacem interjectis diebus a proxima secessione instituenda sit reformatio, sed tamali, ut ea tantum continent, quae generatim sine ullo discrimine ad omnes provincias pertinent; in quo nonam nuper ex sermonibus cum Paternitate vestra reverendissima Oen-

habitos firmam spem concepimus, quidquid hactenus ad hoc reformationis vel in hoc ipso, vel in proximo praecedenti Concilio Tridentino determinet fuet, id a sanctissimo Domino nostro eo directum iri, ut quam clitisses metitur, nunc equidem plane confidimus, Sanctitatem suam in hoc ipsum invi-

rum quan diligenter. Et sunt profecto ea, quae hactenus pro parte nostra fuerunt, ejus omnino genera, ut non tam sacrum Imperium, regnaque et

nas nostras haereditarias, quam potius majorem orbis christiani partem con-

idecantur.
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decrees against Protestants approached their end, it seemed inevitable that the Council must enter upon the reforms (so long demanded and always postponed) of the grosser ecclesiastical abuses, especially those which had their roots in the exorbitant demands of the Papal power. The legates then craftily began with the proposals in reference to the limitation of the secular authority in matters ecclesiastical. Most of the bishops were very ready to agree to them. Vain were the protests of the embassadors of the states; the worldly rulers became anxious, and


10 These Capita de Immunitate Clericorum et Reformatione Principum, communicated to the embassadors of the secular rulers the beginning of August (Pallavicino, lib. xxii. c. 3, reprinted in Le Plat, vi. 227), demanded complete exemption of the clergy from the state courts and from taxes they had not themselves authorized, and the abandonment of the Placet of temporal rulers as to all bulls and ecclesiastical edicts. When they had attained their end these were withdrawn; see Paleotti Acta Conc. Trid., ed. J. Mendham, p. 634: Hi omnes (that is, the embassadors of the temporal rulers) apud Sanctissimum egerunt, ut caput id vel omitteretur vel resecaretur. Sanctissimus, ut eos quoque forte promitiores ad finendum Concilium haberet, facile eas assensit, ac per literas id Legatis mandavit, et admoniti ex Urbe fuerunt, ne Legatorum propositioni contradicerent. Quare fuit id caput in generalem quandam formulam, et fere inanem verborum sonum, redactum, propterea quod, ab omnibus fere probatum. So originated Sess. XXV. Decretum de Reform. c. 20: Quae sunt Juris Ecclesiastici Principibum saecularibus commendatur.

11 The French embassador Ferrier did so in a very rough way, September 22, 1563, and the embassy took its departure. The address is in Martene, Vcrt. Monum. vili. 1599; Le Plat, vi. 233. It was here pointed out how the French kings had been always pressing for a reformation. At, inquit, abunde nobis satisfactum est qua tuor sessionibus cum tot canonibus, decretis et anathematibus: certe, P. S., si alid pro aliquo solvere invito creditores, etiam, si minus, adhuc creditores sumus, quos nunquam anathemata, aut dogmatum aut doctrinae catholicae definitionem postulasse scitis. On all the proposals for reform now pending: Rex rescripsit, paucus in eo (libello) esse, quae cum antiqua patrum disciplina conveniant, multa vero quae ei adversentur.—Delinde totum illud caput, quod de Regum et Principum reformatione loquitur, nihil tam spectare, quam ut antiquissima Ecclesia; siac Gallicanae libertae tollatur, et Regum christianissimorum majestas et auctoritas minatur et laedatur. Reges enim christianissimos—multa de rebus saeculo exemplo Constantini—et aliorum christianorum Imperatorum edixisse, plures leges ecclesiasticas tulisse, casque antiquus Pontificibus maxims non solum non displicuisse, sed etiam nonnullas inter sua decreta retulisse, et praeclauos illarum auctores Carolum M. et Ludovicum IX.—divorum nomine dignos censuisses.—Legibus regni ant Ecclesiae Gallicanae nihil omnino contineri, quod repugnet dogmatibus Ecclesiae catholicae antiquesque Pontificum decretes et Ecclesiae universales Concilios. Non prohiber Eplecos etiam totum annum, si voluerint, residere in dioecesi, singulisque diebus verbum Domini anuntiare, sedem octo, aut novem mensas, diebus festis, quadragesima aut adventu, quemadmodum vos in ultima sessione constituiatis: non
Themselves soon desired the end of the Council. And so the remaining decrees for reform, as proposed by the legates, were adopted in great haste in two sessions. To the Pope was committed the revision and drawing up of the ecclesiastical writings that had been adopted, and the fathers even consented to ask for a Papal confirmation of the Council. It must, however, be remembered that two thirds of the bishops were Italians, and at many of them drew a monthly stipend from the Pope.


Ibid. Placet nevobis, ut—omnium et singulorum, quae tam sub fel. rec. Paulo et Julio III., quam sub sanctissimo Domine nostro Pio IV., Romanis Pontificibus, in ea (Synodo) decretae et definita sunt, confirmationem in nomine sancta ejusdem et Papae Romano Pontifice petant? Responderunt: Placet. The Archbishop of Granada agreed: Placet quod petatur, sed non petionem confirmationem (Raynald. 1563, No. 215): according to Nicol. Maenas, Le Plat, vii. ii. 185, there were three bishops, qui noluerunt aliam confirmationem.

Sarpi, lib. vi. § 23, says that over forty bishops received every month 30 to 60 thalers from the Pope. Ferdin. Imp. ad Papam VIII. Id. Mart. 1563 (Schehorn, Amoen.): Ecce jam coepto Concilio rumor tam a catholicis quam ab aliis hinc inde itur, Concilium in omnibus ad nutum Romanae Curiae diriget moderare, Romanorumque voce nullam innovi aut disermi, sed quoque legis et libertatis Romanorum pontificum possit esse. Sed etiam, que non sunt ad securitatem belli, sed etiam ad salutem pacis et concordiae.

The Archbishops of Granada and Seville agreed: Placet quod petatur, sed non petionem confirmationem (Raynald. 1563, No. 215): according to Nicol. Maenas, Le Plat, vii. ii. 185, there were three bishops, qui noluerunt aliam confirmationem.

It must, however, be remembered that two thirds of the bishops were Italians, and at many of them drew a monthly stipend from the Pope.
In a general review of the proceedings at Trent in respect to reform, it is at once strikingly apparent that there runs through the whole Council a more or less hidden struggle between the defenders of the unlimited power of the Papacy and the adherents of the Council of Basle. It appeared at the beginning in the question whether the obligation of the residence of bishops (in their sees) was of divine right; and behind this there lurked the other question about the divine institution of the episcopal authority. 

15 This question was at last mooted on the doctrine De Sacramento Ordinis, decided in Sess. XXIII., July 15, 1563. The debates began September 18, 1562 (Paleotti Acta Conc. Trid. ed. Mendham, p. 279). The Commission appointed on this matter, in the first draft of the Doctrina et Canones, reported October 9, 1562 (p. 339), tried to avoid the controverted point, and merely said, Episcopos Presbyterissuperiores esse, and in Apostolorum locum successisse. But many bishops, especially the Spanish, insisted on the formula—Episcopos jure divinoassest institutos, while the General of the Jesuits, Lainez, denied outright this jus divinum (p. 300). His speech, in which he maintained that the Pope is the only source of spiritual power, is given in extracts in Sarpi, lib. vii. No. 20. The legates at first wavered, but afterwards, October 30, 1562, brought forward an altered proposal (Paleotto, p. 321), in which, in place of the present De Sacr. Ordinis, can. 7 and 8, it read: Si quis dixerit, non fuisse in Christo Domino institutum, ut essent in Ecclesia catholica Episcopi, ac eos, cum in partem sollicitudinis a Pontifice Romano, ejus in terris Vicario, assumuntur, non esse veros et legitimos Episcopos, Presbyterissuperiores, et adaequata dignitate, endemque potestatem non potiri, quam ad haec usque temporae obtinuerunt, anathema sit. The Archbishop of Granada opposed this most strongly (p. 339); tria praecipue confutandae putavit: primum illud, quod dicatur, sub uno Christi Vicario, etc., quoniam Episcopis sunt successores Apostolorum, et consequenter Vicarii Christi, agnoscentes fames superiores et sibi ipsi vicarium, qui potest alias Vicarios mutare, evertere et abrogare.—Secundum est illud, vocatos in partem sollicitudinis: nam dicil oportet, vocatos a Deo, ut semper loquentur Scripturae. tertium est, ut in ultimo Canone dicatur, Episcopos jure divino institutos et superiores Presbyteris, cum id fuerit jam excussum, nec colari potuit, et adhuc sexagens et amplius Patres hic praesentes idem petant, allique sint petituri, si in Synodo palam proponatur. The Papalists conceded, indeed, that potestatem ordinis a Deo derivari, but maintained jurisdictionem totam oriri a Papa. After this new project had fallen through, the Cardinal of Lothringia interfered, and the affair became more entangled by many new proposals. In an assembly of June 12, 1563, the Cardinal Morone gave this as the state of the case (p. 383): Agi nunc de ineunda concordia cum Gallis et Hispanis: noille Gallos, ut eorum opinio, quia asserunt Concilium esse supra Papam, ululatus lacrator; Hispanos item nolle, ut eorum opinio de jurisdictione Episcoporum, quod immediate a Christo profisciscaetur, improbatur; allioquin utramque nationem utique petere, ut si quid de his stauendum sit, prius inter Patres disputetur. Legatis alicium videri, hoc tempore tam vastas disputations ingredi, quas multas mensibus non absolverentur; sed satius esset iles doctrinam verbis com-
It also came up in the question upon the right of initiating the ponte, quibus neutra opinio damnetur, nec tamen inde quidquid de dignitate Sanctitatis suae detrabatur. At that time Lainez, General of the Jesuits, spoke very strongly for the absolute power of the Pope, and got applause from the Ultramontanes in proportion as he enraged the Gallicans (Sarpi, lib. viii. No. 15; Pallavicini, lib. xxii. c. 6, No. 9; Salig, iii. 38). Thereupon the legates drafted a new proposition, in which the Papal power was raised very high (Paleotto, p. 388), and sent it to Rome for approval (June 19). But this project was generally opposed by the fathers at Trent: by the Italians, because it gave the Pope too little; by the Spaniards and French, because it gave too much. The legates then came to an agreement with the latter (p. 391), ut doctrina et canones pure de Sacramento Ordinis, et nihil de jurisdictione loquentes conficiantur, ut ipsa disputationes omnes praecludantur. And the general weariness procured for that proposal a very general acquiescence. So we have it now, in Sess. XXIII., July 15, 1563, De Sacramento Ordinis, cap. 4: Prolinse sacrosancta Synodus declarat, praeter caeteras ecclesiasticas gradus episcopos, qui in Apostolorum locum successerunt, ad hunc hierarchicum ordinem praecipe pertinere, et posito, sicut idem Apostolus ait, a Spiritu S., regere Ecclesiam Dei; eosque Presbyteris superiores esse; ac Sacramentum Confirmationis conferre, ministros Ecclesiae ordinare, atque alla plerique persagere ipsos posse, quorum actionem potestatem reliquis inferioribus ordinibus nullam habent. Can. 6 at first read (Paleotto, p. 390): Si quis dixerit, in Ecclesia catholica non esse hierarchiam, quae stat ex Episcopis, Presbyteris, et aliis ministris, anathema sit. The Cardinal of Thriugia and the Spaniards wished the following clause inserted (p. 394), hierarchiam esse Christo institutam; but the Papal party feared, his verbis contineri jurisdictionem, hincque sequi, Episcopos immediate institutos a Christo, et ab ilmis illis collatam jurisdictionem, quod pati nolebat. So they united on the formula as it now stands in the canon—hierarchiam divina ordinatam institutam. Further, at the request of the Spaniards (p. 398), "alios" was left out before "ministros." The last specially disputed canon was divided into two. Can. 7: Si quis erit, Episcopos non esse Presbyteris superiores, vel non habere potentatem coniandi et ordinandi; vel eam, quam habent, illius esse cum Presbyteris communem; Ordines ab ipsis collatos sine populi vel potestatis secularis consensu aut vocae irretos esse; at eos, qui nec ab ecclesiastica et canonica potestate ritu ordinati missi sunt, sed allunde veniunt, legitimos esse verbi et Sacramentorum ministros esse; anathema sit. Can. 8: Si quis dixerit, Episcopos, qui auctoritate Romani Pontificis assumuntur, non esse legitimos et veros Episcopos, sed figmentos esse; anathema sit. The last specially disputed canon was divided into two. Can. 7: Si quis erit, Episcopos non esse Presbyteris superiores, vel non habere potentatem coniandi et ordinandi; vel eam, quam habent, illius esse cum Presbyteris communem; Ordines ab ipsis collatos sine populi vel potestatis secularis consensu aut vocae irretos esse; at eos, qui nec ab ecclesiastica et canonica potestate ritu ordinati missi sunt, sed allunde veniunt, legitimos esse verbi et Sacramentorum ministros esse; anathema sit. Can. 8: Si quis dixerit, Episcopos, qui auctoritate Romani Pontificis assumuntur, non esse legitimos et veros Episcopos, sed figmentos esse; anathema sit. The last specially disputed canon was divided into two. Can. 7: Si quis erit, Episcopos non esse Presbyteris superiores, vel non habere potentatem coniandi et ordinandi; vel eam, quam habent, illius esse cum Presbyteris communem; Ordines ab ipsis collatos sine populi vel potestatis secularis consensu aut vocae irretos esse; at eos, qui nec ab ecclesiastica et canonica potestate ritu ordinati missi sunt, sed allunde veniunt, legitimos esse verbi et Sacramentorum ministros esse; anathema sit. Can. 8: Si quis dixerit, Episcopos, qui auctoritate Romani Pontificis assumuntur, non esse legitimos et veros Episcopos, sed figmentos esse; anathema sit. The last specially disputed canon was divided into two. Can. 7: Si quis erit, Episcopos non esse Presbyteris superiores, vel non habere potentatem coniandi et ordinandi; vel eam, quam habent, illius esse cum Presbyteris communem; Ordines ab ipsis collatos sine populi vel potestatis secularis consensu aut vocae irretos esse; at eos, qui nec ab ecclesiastica et canonica potestate ritu ordinati missi sunt, sed allunde veniunt, legitimos esse verbi et Sacramentorum ministros esse; anathema sit. Can. 8: Si quis dixerit, Episcopos, qui auctoritate Romani Pontificis assumuntur, non esse legitimos et veros Episcopos, sed figmentos esse; anathema sit. The last specially disputed canon was divided into two. Can. 7: Si quis erit, Episcopos non esse Presbyteris superiores, vel non habere potentatem coniandi et ordinandi; vel eam, quam habent, illius esse cum Presbyteris communem; Ordines ab ipsis collatos sine populi vel potestatis secularis consensu aut vocae irretos esse; at eos, qui nec ab ecclesiastica et canonica potestate ritu ordinati missi sunt, sed allunde veniunt, legitimos esse verbi et Sacramentorum ministros esse; anathema sit. Can. 8: Si quis dixerit, Episcopos, qui auctoritate Romani Pontificis assumuntur, non esse legitimos et veros Episcopos, sed figmentos esse; anathema sit. The last specially disputed canon was divided into two. Can. 7: Si quis erit, Episcopos non esse Presbyteris superiores, vel non habere potentatem coniandi et ordinandi; vel eam, quam habent, illius esse cum Presbyteris communem; Ordines ab ipsis collatos sine populi vel potestatis secularis consensu aut vocae irretos esse; at eos, qui nec ab ecclesiastica et canonica potestate ritu ordinati missi sunt, sed allunde veniunt, legitimos esse verbi et Sacramentorum ministros esse; anathema sit. Can. 8: Si quis dixerit, Episcopos, qui auctoritate Romani Pontificis assumuntur, non esse legitimos et veros Episcopos, sed figmentos esse; anathema sit. The last specially disputed canon was divided into two. Can. 7: Si quis erit, Episcopos non esse Presbyteris superiores, vel non habere potentatem coniandi et ordinandi; vel eam, quam habent, illius esse cum Presbyteris communem; Ordines ab ipsis collatos sine populi vel potestatis secularis consensu aut vocae irretos esse; at eos, qui nec ab ecclesiastica et canonica potestate ritu ordinati missi sunt, sed allunde veniunt, legitimos esse verbi et Sacramentorum ministros esse; anathema sit. Can. 8: Si quis dixerit, Episcopos, qui auctoritate Romani Pontificis assumuntur, non esse legitimos et veros Episcopos, sed figmentos esse; anathema sit. The last specially disputed canon was divided into two. Can. 7: Si quis erit, Episcopos non esse Presbyteris superiores, vel non habere potentatem coniandi et ordinandi; vel eam, quam habent, illius esse cum Presbyteris communem; Ordines ab ipsis collatos sine populi vel potestatis secularis consensu aut vocae irretos esse; at eos, qui nec ab ecclesiastica et canonica potestate ritu ordinati missi sunt, sed allunde veniunt, legitimos esse verbi et Sacramentorum ministros esse; anathema sit. Can. 8: Si quis dixerit, Episcopos, qui auctoritate Romani Pontificis assumuntur, non esse legitimos et veros Episcopos, sed figmentos esse; anathema sit. The last specially disputed canon was divided into two. Can. 7: Si quis erit, Episcopos non esse Presbyteris superiores, vel non habere potentatem coniandi et ordinandi; vel eam, quam habent, illius esse cum Presbyteris communem; Ordines ab ipsis collatos sine populi vel potestatis secularis consensu aut vocae irretos esse; at eos, qui nec ab ecclesiastica et canonica potestate ritu ordinati missi sunt, sed allunde veniunt, legitimos esse verbi et Sacramentorum ministros esse; anathema sit. Can. 8: Si quis dixerit, Episcopos, qui auctoritate Romani Pontificis assumuntur, non esse legitimos et veros Episcopos, sed figmentos esse; anathema sit. The last specially disputed canon was divided into two. Can. 7: Si quis erit, Episcopos non esse Presbyteris superiores, vel non habere potentatem coniandi et ordinandi; vel eam, quam habent, illius esse cum Presbyteris communem; Ordines ab ipsis collatos sine populi vel potestatis secularis consensu aut vocae irretos esse; at eos, qui nec ab ecclesiastica et canonica potestate ritu ordinati missi sunt, sed allunde veniunt, legitimos esse verbi et Sacramentorum ministros esse; anathema sit. Can. 8: Si quis dixerit, Episcopos, qui auctoritate Romani Pontificis assumuntur, non esse legitimos et veros Episcopos, sed figmentos esse; anathema sit.
decrees, which the legates alone exercised. These points of controversy sprung up again and again during the whole continuance of the Council; and yet they were at last settled, not by a decision, but by avoidance. Other decrees could be passed only on condition that this contested basis of principles was ignored.

The aim of the Tridentine Reform was to improve ecclesiastical order, so far as this was thought necessary, so as not to concede ground or right to the demands of the Protestants, and particularly to strengthen Church power so that it might withstand all attacks.

The Papal authority was not touched by this reform, but rather kept in view in all the ordinances. The title Episcopus Universalis Ecclesiae was not indeed recognized, nor was the Plenitudo Potestatis expressly granted; but yet to the Pope, as God's Vicar on earth, the highest power in the whole Church was conceded, and the Council was put beneath him, since his con-
firmation of it was asked for; and several other weighty points, on which no determinations were expected from the Council, were submitted to the Papal decision. The abuses profitable to Rome were only lightly touched. The decrees against the plurality of benefices, and against benefices in commendam, were inadequate; annats (first-fruits) were retained according to a Papal bull; only the reversion of benefices was definitely prohibited; appeals to Rome and dispensations were limited.

20 See Note 17.
21 See Note 12.

Sess. VII. March 8, 1547, De Reform. cap. 2, orders that no one shall hold several benefices: Qui autem plures Ecclesias—nunc detinent, una quam maluerint retenta reliquis—dimittere teneantur. In cap. 5 dispensations are allowed for the possession of several beneficia curata. To grant abbeys in commendam is not forbidden, and Pallavicino (lib. xil. c. 13, No. 14) defends this as necessary.

22 Paulus IV., in a bull, April 17, 1559 (in the Bullarium), declares that he can not give them up. Pius IV. also rejected the demand to abolish them made by France (Le Plat, v. 592, 648, 662), and afterwards by the German Princes (Raynald. 1568, No. 44).

Sess. XXIV. Nov. 11, 1563, De Reform. cap. 19: Decernit s. Synodus, mandata de providendo, et gratias, quae expectatiae dicuntur, nemini amplius—concedi, nec pactenus concessis cilquam utl ilicere.

Sess. XIII. Oct. 11, 1551, De Reform. cap. 1: In causis visitationis, et correctionis, ex iis habilitatis et inhabilitatis, necnon criminalibus ab Episcopo—ante definitivum sententiam ab interlocutoria, vel ali quocunque gravamine non appelletur. Cap. 2: A sententia Episcopi—in criminalibus appellationis causa, si apostolica auctoritate in partibus eam committi contigerit, Metropolitano, aut—uni ex vicinioribus Episcopis—committatur. Sess. XXIV. Nov. 11, 1563, De Reform. cap. 10: Episcopi—in omnibus is, quae ad visitationem ac morum correctionem subditorum suorum spectant, us et potestatem habeant, etiam tarnquam apostolicae Sedis delegati, ea ordinandi, noderandi, puniendi, et exequendi, juxta canonum sanctiones, suae illis ex prudence su a pro subditorum emendatione ac dieoecesis suae utilitatem necessario videbuntur. Nec in his, ubi de visitatione aut morum correctione agitur, exmto, aut uila inhibitio, appellantio, seu querela, etiam ad Sedem apostolicam interposito, executione eorum, quae ad his mandata, decreta aut judicata fuerint, quoque modo impleat, seu suspenderat. Cap. 20: Causeres omnes, ad forum ecclesiasticum quomodolibet certentias, etiam si beneficiae sint, in prima instantia coram Ordinariis locorum nunxare cognoscantur.—Ab his exspicientur causa, quae juxta canonicas sanctiones pond Sedem apostolicam sunt tractanda; vel quas ex urgenti ratione libili causa judicaverit Summus Romanus Pontifex per speciale rescriptum signaturae Sanctitatis Suae, manu proprio subscribendum, committere aut avocare.—Legati quoque, etiam de latere, nonnulli, gubernatores ecclesiastici, aut illis quoruncunque facultatum, non solum Episcopos in praedictis causis impediunt, aut tumabuntur non praeemptum; sed nec etiam contra clericos, aliave personas ecclesiasticas, nisi Episcopo pruo requisiit, ecque negligente, procedant: alias eorum processus, ordinaciones nullas momenti sint; atque si damni satisfactionem partibus illati teneantur. Upon Dispensations, Sess. XXII. Oct. 17, 1562, De Reform. cap. 5: Dispensations, quacunque auctoritate concedendas, extra Romanam Curiam committendas erunt, committantur Ordinariis iliorum, qui ipsa impetraverint; eae vero, quae gratioso concedentur, suum non sortiantur effectum, nisi pruo ab Editum, in quibus delegatis Apostolis, summarie tamquam et extrajudicialiter cognoscatur, expressae preces surreptionis vel obreptionis vito non obijacere.
That cardinals should be chosen from all Christian nations, and should have the qualifications demanded of bishops, were points so defined that their fulfillment was constantly dependent on the will of the Pope.

The divine institution of the episcopal power was not distinctly recognized, although bishops (in accordance with Acts xx. 28) were designated as successors of the apostles appointed by the Holy Ghost. The rights of the Popes over them remained unchanged; the co-operation of the people and of the temporal power in their election was declared to be unnecessary.

The bishops received certain rights over exempted monks, but only as delegates of the Pope. Several decrees were passed to insure the observance of the rules of the Orders.

major quandoque utilitas postulaverit, cum aliquibus dispensandum esse; id causa cognita, ac summa maturitate, atque gratis a quibusque, ad quos dispensatio pertinebit, erit praestandum: aliterque facta dispensatio subreptitia censetur.

Sess. XXIV. Nov. 11, 1563, De Reform. cap. 1: Quos (Cardinales) Sanctissimus Romanus Pontifex ex omnibus Christianitatis nationibus, quantum commode fieri poterit, pront idones repererit, assumet.


See above, Note 15, and there Sess. XXIII. De Sacr. Ordinis, cap. 4.

Sess. XXIII. De Sacr. Ordinis, cap. 8, above, Note 15. The Norma procedendi ad Creationem Episcoporum et Cardinalium is prescribed Sess. XXIV. Nov. 11, 1563, cap. 1. Omnes, qui ad promotionem praeficiendorum quodcumque jus, quacunque ratione, a Sede apostolica habent, aut aliquin operam suam praestant, are to retain their rights. What is to be kept in view in the elections: The provincial synods are to prescribe, with the assent of the Pope—examinis, seu inquisitionis, aut instructionis faciendae formam. This instruction is to be sent to the Pope with every election, ut ipse Summus Pontifex plena totius negotii habita—Ecclesiis possit utilius providere, after a report has been made upon it by a cardinal, with the advice of three others in a Consistorium. Cap. 5: Causae criminales gravioribus contra Episcopos, etiam haeresibus, quod absit, quae depositione aut privatione dignae sunt, ab ipso tantum summum Pontifice cognoscantur et terminentur. Minora vero criminales causae Episcoporum in Concilio tantum provinciali cognoscantur et terminentur, vel a deputatis per Concilium provinciale.

Sess. XXIII. De Sacr. Ordinis, cap. 4: Docet insuper sacrosancta Synodus, in ordinatione Episcoporum, sacerdotum et cæterorum Ordinum nec populi, nec cujusvis saecularis potestatis et magistratus consensum, sive vocationem, sive auctoritatem, ita requiri, ut sine ea irrita sit ordinatio. (On Cyprian, see Gieseler, vol. i. p. 242, Note 9; on Leo, vol. i. p. 387, Note 23.)

Sess. VI. Jan. 13, 1547, De Reform. cap. 3: Nemo saecularis clericus cujusvis personalis (privilegii praetextu), vel regularis extra monasterium degens etiam sui ordinis privilegi praetexta tutus censetur, quo minus, si deliquerit, ab Ordinario loci, tanquam super hoc a Sede apostolica delegato, secundum canonicas sancciones visitari, puniri, et corrigi valeat. Sess. XXI. July 16, 1563, cap. 8: Commendata monasteria,—in quibus non viget regularis observantia, necnon beneficia tam curata, quam non curata, saecularia et regularia, qualitercumque commendata, etiam exempta, ab Episcopis, etiam tanquam apostoliceae Sedis delegatis, annis singulis visitentur; cu-
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Worthy of note are the decrees which defined the necessary qualifications for spiritual offices,32 laid the basis for the suitable education of the clergy,34 ordered frequent sermons,35 and ordained that the bishops should visit all other cloisters, and reform them after these rules, if their superiors, after due notice, did not visit them within six months. Sess. XXIV. Nov. 11, 1563, De Reform. cap. 4: Nullus aequalis, sive regularis, etiam in Ecclesias suororum Ordinum, contradicte Episcopo, praedicare praesumat.

Sess. XXV. Dec. 4, 1563, De Regularibus et Monialibus, cap. 22. Here it is determined, cap. 16: Flineto tempore novitiatius Superiores novitios, quos habiles inveniunt, ad profutendum admitant, aut e monasterio eos eliciant. But since only a small part of the Jesuits were admitted to profession (§ 56, Note 37), on the motion of their General it was added: Per haec tamen s. Synodus non intendit aliquid inuovare; aut prohibere, quin religio clericorum Societatis Jesu juxta plam eorum institutum in S. Sede apostolica approbatum Domino et ejus Ecclesiae inservire possit. The Jesuits afterwards referred this sentence, especially because it reads per haec, and not per hoc, to all the preceding decrees of this section, and maintained that they were excepted from them; Sarpi, lib. viii. § 72.

Sess. XXII. Sept. 17, 1562, De Reform. cap. 1: In the churches where there is a draebenda, aut praestimonium pro lectoribussacraetheologiae, the incumbents shall be compelled by the bishop ad ipsius sacrae Scripturae expositionem et interpretationem per se ipsos, si idoneifuerint, alioquin per idoneum substitutum. In the cathedral churches, and in the collegiate churches of large places, the first vacant oraebenda is to be consecrated to the same end, ut ipsa sacrae Scripturae lectio habeatur, ita tamen, ut quaecunque aliae lectiones, vel consuetudinem vel quavis alia ratione institutae, propter id minime praetermittantur. Poor and small churches must have at least one magistrum, qui clericos alloque scholares pauperes graamaticam gratis doceat, ut deinceps ad ipsa sacrae Scripturae studia transire possint. In the cloisters and gymnasia those readings of the sacred Scriptures are to be held. The insufficiency of this arrangement was especially evident after the German College in Rome, 1552, gave the model of a new kind of institution for the training of the clergy (see § 56, Note 34). Cardinal Reginald Pole, in his Articles of Reforma- tion for the English Church, 1556 (§ 27, Note 16), had ordered seminaries in every diocese after that pattern (Reg. Poli Decretum XI., in Le Plat, iv. 592); and this ordinance was made the basis of that framed in Trent, and in part verbally copied. Sess. XIII. July 15, 1568, De Reform. cap. 15: Ut singulae cathedrales—ecclesiae pro modo cuitatam et dioecesis amplitudine certum puerorum—numerum incolae—religioseeducare et ecclesiasticis disciplinis instructuresantur. In hoc vero collegio recipiuntur, qui ad minimum duodecim annos et ex legitimo matrimonio sint, ac legere et scribere competenter noverint. Hos pueros Episcopus in toto seges, quod ei videbitur, divisos juxta eorum numerum, aetatem, ac in disciplina ecclesiastica progressum, partim cum eo opportunum videbitur, Ecclesiarem ministro adiectum, partim in collegio erudendos retinat: aliosque in locum educorum postet, ita ut hoc collegium Dei ministerum perpetuum seminarium sit. See K. Thelner's Gesch. d. geistl. Bildungsanstalten, Mainz, 1885, p. 102 (the Decr. Poll, 463; the Decr. Trid. p. 466).

Sess. V. June 17, 1546, Decr. de Reform. cap. 2: Decrevit s. Synodus, omnes Epis- cos, Archiepiscopos, Primates, et omnes alios Ecclesiaraum Praealatos teneri per se, si legitime impediti non fuerint, ad praedicandum sanctum J. Chr. evangelium. vero contigerit, Episcopos et alios praedictos legitime detineri impedimento: uta formam generalis Concilii viros idoneos assumere teneantur ad hujusmodi
dained regular provincial and diocesan synods and church visits.

But these arrangements were not so strongly secured that they could be brought into effect unimpaired; only the episcopal punitive power was more firmly established, so as to secure more fully the disciplinary prescriptions often vainly renewed.

The request as to the marriage of priests was absolutely rejected; the granting of the cup to the laity reserved for the Pope; 

The bishops are to hold even exempts to the strict observance of this decree. Sess. XXIV. Nov. 11, 1568, De Reform. cap. 4, these injunctions are repeated and supplemented: there is to be preaching tempore jejuniorum quadragesimae, et adventus Domini quotidie, vel saltem tribus in hebdomada diebus.—Moneat Episcopus populum diligenter, teneri unumquemque parochiae suae interesse, ubi commodo id fieri potest, ad audiendum verbum Dei.—Iidem etiam saltem dominicia et allis festivis diebus pueros in singulis parochiis fidei rudimenta, et obedienciam Deum et parentes diligenter ab iis, ad quos spectabit, doceri curabunt.

Provincialia Concilia, sicubum missa sunt, pro moderandis moribus, corrigendis excessibus, controversiis componendis, aliisque ex sacriss canonibus renovandis. Quare Metropolitani—intra annum ad minus a fine praesentis Concilii, et deinde quolibet saltem trienni post octavam Paschae—seu aliocommodiori tempore pro more provincia non praetermittat synodum in provincia sua cogere.—Synodi quoque dioecesanae quotannis celebrentur: ad quas exempti etiam omnes—accedere teneantur. On the annual, or at least biennial, church visitations, see cap. 3.

The Emperor Ferdinand especially urged, through his Hungarian ambassador, George Draschovitius, Bishop of Fünfkirchen, that the cup should be allowed to those of his people who wished it, under the same conditions as were conceded to the Hussites by the Council of Basle (Paleottus, p. 214). The grounds pro and con, as given in the voting, see p. 229 sq., 240 sq. For it, e.g. p. 241: Exemplum Graecorum, qui habent usum calicis, et tamen ab Ecclesia non sunt separat. —Nec apud eos auditorium periculum effusionis, prout attestantur Praetati, qui hic ascultat, et habent Ecclesias suas in his locis (see the votum of the Bishop of Calamon, p. 235); and p. 242: Controversum adhuc est apud theologos, an plus gratiae acquiratur ex sumptione utrisque speciei quam usus tantum. Ideo qui petit utramque eligat tuiorem partem, et injuria el fit, si prohibeat (ou Alex. Halesius, see Gieseler, vol. ii. p. 438, Note 11). Against the concession were 88; for it unconditionally, 30; others proposed conditions; 18 would allow the cup only to Bohemians and Hungarians; others wanted to postpone the decision; others to leave it to the Pope (p. 247). After long strife, the legates carried through the last proposal; and so there followed at the close of Sess. XXI., Sept. 17, 1562, the Decretum super Petitione Concessiones Calicis: Sacrosancta Synodus—decrevit integrum negotium ad Sanctis-
the use of the Latin language in the mass was confirmed; the worship of saints, images, and relics was protected; indulgences in general were justified, without further fixing their wavering definition; but the traffic in indulgences was forbidden.

The use of the Latin language in the mass was confirmed; the worship of saints, images, and relics was protected; indulgences in general were justified, without further fixing their wavering definition; but the traffic in indulgences was forbidden.
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*° Sess. XXII. Sept. 17, 1562, De Sacrificio Missae, cap. 8: Etsi Missa magnum conlectat populi eruditionem, non tamen expedire visum est Patribus, ut vulgari passim lingua celebretur. Quamobrem, utbeque ubique cujusque Ecclesiae antiquum, et a s. Romana Ecclesia, omnium Ecclesiæ matre et magistra, probato ritu, uti opere Christi suscrant, neve parvull panem petant, et non sit qui frangat eis, manutent s. Synodus Pastoribus, et singulis curam animarum gerentibus, ut frequenter unter Missarum celebrationem vel per se, vel per alios, ex ilis, quae in Missa leguntur, hujus sacrificiï mysterium aliquid decretum. diebus praesertim dominicæ et festis.

** Already, Sess. XXI. July 16, 1562, De Reforma, cap. 9, it was decreed that elecemo-
FOURTH PERIOD.—DIV. I.—A.D. 1517—1648.

These decrees of Trent were so favorable to Rome that Pius IV., despite the ignorant scruples of some curialists, did not hesitate about confirming them, lauding the moderation of the Council. But although he immediately enjoined upon all the

syntarum Quaestorum nomen atque usus should be wholly abolished, indulgentias vero aut aletas spirituales gratias per Ordinarios locorum, adhibitis duobus de Capitulor, debitis temporibus populo publicandas esse. The Decretum de Indulgentiis was drawn the night before the close of the Council, since the legate Morone did not wish to have any (Paleottus, p. 644), Contin. Sess. XXV. Dec. 4, 1563: Cum potestas conferendi indulgentias a Christo Ecclesiae concessa sit, atque hujusmodi potestate, divinitus sibi tradita, antiquissimis etiam temporibus illa usus fuerit: sacrosancta Synodus indulgentiarum usum, christiano populo maxime salutarem, et sacrarum Conciliorum auctoritate probatum, in Ecclesia retinendum esse docet, et preceptit; eosque anathematem damnat, qui aut inutilis esse asserunt, vel eas concedendi in Ecclesia potestatem esse negant. In his tamen concedendis moderationem, juxta veterem et probatam in Ecclesia consuetudinem, adhiberi cupit, ne nimals facilite ecclesiastica disciplina enveretur. Absus vero, qui in his irrepserunt, et quorum occasione insigne hoc indulgentiarum nomen ab haereticis blasphematum, emendatos et correctos cupiunt, praesenti decreto generaliter statuit, pravos quaestus omnes pro his consequendis, unde plurima in christiano populo abusum causa fluxit, omnino abolendos esse. Caeteros vero, qui ex superstitione, ignorantia, irreverentia, aut alio qu庭 omnes esse asserunt, caeterosque anathematem damnat, qui inutilis esse asserunt, vel eas concedendi in Ecclesia potestatem esse negant. In his tamen concedendis moderationem, juxta veterem et probatam in Ecclesia consuetudinem, adhiberi cupit, ne nimals facilite ecclesiastica disciplina enveretur. Absus vero, qui in his irrepserunt, et quorum occasione insigne hoc indulgentiarum nomen ab haereticis blasphematum, emendatos et correctos cupiunt, praesenti decreto generaliter statuit, pravos quaestus omnes pro his consequendis, unde plurima in christiano populo abusum causa fluxit, omnino abolendos esse. Caeteros vero, qui ex superstitione, ignorantia, irreverentia, aut alio qu庭 omnes esse asserunt, caeterosque anathematem damnat, qui inutilis esse asserunt, vel eas concedendi in Ecclesia potestatem esse negant.

43 Sarpi, lib. viii. § 82. Pallavicini, lib. xxiv. c. 9, § 4.
44 Pii IV. Oratio habita in Consistorio d. Dec. 30, 1563, in Le Plat, vi. 806. After praise to the temporal rulers, the cardinals, and the fathers of the Council: Quibus quidem patribus magnam quoque nostro nomine gratiam habemus, quod in moribus emendandia corrigenda vitaeae deo se praebuerunt moderatos in nos et indulgentias certae taxarentur summae, were left out at the instance of the Spanish ambassador, Count de Luno, quod videbantur haec de industria ita expressa ad notandum cruciatam Hispanam (Paleottus, p. 645). Thus the Cruciatam, with its complete indulgence, was still sold for the advantage of the Spanish throne, in spite of the fact that the p ratio quae non est, forbidden by the decree, were there carried to their highest pitch.
faithful an unconditional acceptance of the Council, this did not by any means universally follow. In France especially the decrees of reform encountered decided opposition, and the Council was never published there. In Switzerland, too, and in Hungary, they were not accepted, although the unobjectionable disciplinary decrees were there enforced by synods. In Germany the Tridentine decrees could not be published as laws of the Empire, but the Catholic rulers adopted them, 1566, at the Augsburg Diet.

The Council of Trent did not indeed meet the wishes of the rulers corroborations are executionis aut executionis, aliove quaesito colore statuere.—Nos enim difficultates et controversias, si quae ex eis decrets ortae fuerint, nobis declarandas decidendas, quemadmodum ipsa s. Synodus decrevit (see Note 17), reser-

annual. * In the Bull of Confirmation (Note 44): Decreta omnia et singula auctoritate postolicae hodie confirmavimus, et ab omnibus Christifidelibus suscipienda ac ser-

unda esse decrevimus. The observance and introduction of the same is enjoined, with penalties, on ecclesiastics of all degrees; but Imperatorem electum, caeteros Reges, Respublicas ac Principes christianos monemus, et per viscera misericor-

di Domini nostri J. Chr. obtestamur, ut—ad ejusdem Concilii exequanda et obser-

venda decreta Praelatis, cum opus fuerit, auxilio et favores suo adsint, neque adver-

tes sanae ac salutari Concilii doctrinae opiniones a populis quacunque a se acceptas, sed eas penitus interdicant. In the Bull Sicut ad Sacrorum, xv. Kal.

* The bishops and the Guises pressed for the acceptance. The State Council and Parliament were hostile, because the rights and liberties of the Gallican Church are molested by many of the Tridentine decrees. When the League, during its struggle with Henry IV., convened an Assemblée Générale at Paris, 1563, the bishops proposed the acceptance, with seemingly the best hopes of success; but the president of the Parliament, Le Maistre, intrusted with drawing up the report, in a moire, April 9, 1563 (in Le Plat, v. 267; Thuanus, lib. 105, No. 21), brought to the objectionable decrees, and showed how they injured, partly the rights, as well as those of the King, by increasing the Papal power. The matter then dropped; but in a tumultuous assembly, August 6, 1568, the acceptance of Council was put through (Thuanus, lib. 107, No. 10). This decision was regarded invalid, after order had been restored. All subsequent attempts, among which that of the clergy in the États Généraux, 1614 and 1615, as very pressing (the Acta Le Plat, v. 284), were unsuccessful. See Cournier, Discours Historique sur la reception du Concile de Trente, particulièrement en France, appended to his trans-

sion of Sarpi, iii. 224.


Ranke's History of the Popes, p. 175, Am. ed.

Thus the Cardinal of Lothingia solemnly declared, Sess. XXIV., November 11,
liberal Catholics; in particular, the reputable possession and administration of the bishoprics was by no means insured. But yet it can not be denied that it put an end to the hesitating condition of the Catholic Church, restored unity and order, and especially did an important work as to the education and honor of the clergy.

1563 (Le Plat, vi. 290): Cum nudius tertius meam de reformationis articulis dicerem sententiam, praefatus sum etiam, me valde cupere, ut prius illa ecclesiastica resitutu curaretur disciplina; sed cum his corruptissimis temporibus et molibus intelligam non posse ea, quibus maxime opus est, protinus adhiberi remedii, interim assentiri et probare ea quae nunc sunt decreta: non quod ea judicem satia esse ad integram aegrotantis repubricae christiane cura tionem, sed quod sperem, his prius lenioribus fomentis adhibitis, cum gravioribus medicamenta pati potuerit Ecclesia, Pontifices maximos, et maxime Sanctissimum D. N. Pium pro sua insigni praeclarae restitutu sanitati, sed quod sperem, his prius lenioribus fomentis adhibitis, cum gravioribus medicamenta pati potuerit Ecclesia, Pontifices maximos, et maxime Sanctissimum D. N. Pium pro sua insigni praeclarae restitutu sanitati. Hanc autem meam sententiam tum meo, tum omni Galliae Episcoporum nomine inacta referri volo, et ut id fiat a notaria peto et postulo.

See the Memoriale Card. Bellarmini a Clementem VIII. (1592-1605), on the necessary reforms, with the rejoinders of the Pope, in Ch. G. Hoffmanni Nova Scriptt. et Monumentorum Collectio, i. 623. Bellarmine gives the following as the abuses requiring correction: 1. Diurna vacatio Ecclesiarum; 2. promotio minus utilium Praetorii; 3. absentia Pastoris ab Ecclesiis; 4. polygamy spiritualis, velicet cum uni Episcopo multa Ecclesiae communicantur; 5. facilis translatio Episcoporum de una Ecclesia ad alteram; 6. Episcoporum resignatio sine legitima causa. The Pope confesses the justice of the complaints, but excuses the evils for the most part on account of the great difficulties in the way of doing right.

Naturally this could only be brought about by degrees. Laurentius Surius, a Carthusian at Cologne, 1568, in his Comm. Rerum suo Tempore in Orbe Gestarum, p. 76, complains of the bad morals of the clergy, and then adds: Atque haec una fere et praecipua ratio est, car Lutheri et ejus discipulorum nefanda dogmata et impii conatus usque adeo felices habuerint progressus multis annis, quod nulla apud Catholicos, etiam in ipso Clero, secuta est vitae in melius commutatur; ut jam merito pudere nos debeat sociordia et impudentia nostrae, qui videmus nos unique Dei justo judicio propter peccata nostra tot malis obrui, nec tamen operam damus, ut moribus rectius componentis et corrigendis iram praepotentis Dei a nostris cervicibus avertamus. See below, § 60, Note 28.
PART III.—CHAP. III.—CATH. CHURCH. § 58. THE PAPACY.

THIRD CHAPTER.

FROM THE END OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT TO THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA. 1563–1648.

The Popes began at once—on the basis newly won by the Council of Trent, and supported by the Jesuits—to work with zealous in resisting the Reformation and re-establishing their dominion. Success, however, everywhere depended upon temporal powers. The Popes were allowed their old pretensions only where the secular authority was weakened by religious divisions. In other cases, only as much was conceded as the rulers thought best.

Inasmuch as the Council had committed to the Popes the publication of the authorized (normal) ecclesiastical works, the latter were able to complete in their own sense the newly established establishment of all ecclesiastical relations. Pius IV. himself began with the publication of the Index Librorum Prohibitorum (March 24, 1564) and the Professio Fidei (November 1564). See § 57, Note 13. The new Index, often wrongly cited as Index Tridentinus, which was published by the Bull Dominici Gregis Custodiae, is a recasting of the one issued by Paul IV. (§ 56, Note 19), especially enlarged by ten Rules prefixed (which also given in many editions of the Canones et Decreta Conc. Trident.). To be included are, Reg. III.: Versiones scriptorum etiam ecclesiasticorum, quae hactenus sunt a damnatis auctoribus, modo nihil contra sanam doctrinan continent, adduntur. Librorum aut veteris Testamenti versiones viris tantum doctis judiciicio Episcopi concedi poterunt: modo hujusmodi versionibus sanam rationem et ad intelligendum sacram Scripturam, non autem ab eis utantur. Versiones vero novi Testamenti, auctoribus pri-classibus hujus indicii factae, nemini conceduntur: quia utilissimis parum, percuti plurimum lectoribus ex eorum lectione manare solet. Reg. IV.: Cum experto manifestum sit, si sacra Biblia vulgari lingua passim sine discrimine permittatur, plus inde ob hominum temeritatem detrimenti, quam utilitatis oriri; hac in
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§ 58.

HISTORY OF THE PAPACY.
13, 1564). He was, however, obliged by his promise, privately given to the Emperor, to empower the German bishops to grant the cup to those that desired it (April 16, 1564). The worldly

parte judicio Episcopi aut Inquisitoris stetur, ut cum consilio Parochi vel Confessaril Bibliorum a catholics auctoribus versorum lectionem in vulgata lingua eis concedere possint, quos intellegerint ex hujusmodi lectione non damnum, sed fidei atque pietatis augmentum capere posse: quam facultatem in scriptis habeant. Qui antem absque tali facultate ea legere seu habere praesumperit, nis prius Bibilis Ordinario redditis, peccatorum absolventem perciperi non possit. Bibilopolae vero, qui praedictam facultatem non habenti Biblia idiomate vulgare conopint, vel alio quovis modo conceiserint, librorum pretium, in usus pios ab Episcopo convertendum, amittant, allisque poenis pro delicti qualitate ejusdem Episcopi arbitrio subjacent. By the Papal bull it was "published" for the whole of Christendom; but it has never been accepted in France, Germany, and the Netherlands.

To set forth the Romish doctrine in opposition to the Reformation, the Papal nuncio, Aloysius Lippomannus, had already prepared a Confession of Faith for Poland at the provincial synod in Lowicz, 1556 (in Streitwolf et Klener, Libri Symb. Eccl. Cath. ii. 301), then Pius IV., 1560, Decreta et Articulz Fidei jurandos per Episcopos et alios Praesidios in Susceptione Muneris Consecratioz (in Raynald. 1560, No. 64; Streitwolf et Klener, ii. 306). Thereupon the legates in Trent brought forward, April, 1563, seventeen Canones super Abusibus sanctissimi Sacramenti Ordinis, and in the seventeenth a Summarz Fidei Formula (Le Plat, vi. 82; Streitwolf et Klener, ii. 830), which last was to be solemnly adopted, not only by all ecclesiastics, but also by all secular officers before induction into their offices. This declaration, and the threats about the right of patronage, led to decided opposition on the part of the ambassadors of the temporal rulers. Instead of these canons, we have the essentially altered Decretum de Reformatione, in Sess. XXIII., July 15, 1563, in which that Fidei Formula is lacking. In place of this, the Council ordained, Sess. XXIV., November 11, 1563, De Reform. cap. 12: Provisi de beneficis superbus sanctissimis Sacramenti Ordinis, and in Romanz Ecclzsiae oedgentia se permansuros in usum pios spondeant ac jurent. This Professio Fidei was prescribed by Pius IV. in the Bull Injunctum Nobis, November 18, 1564, and by the Bull In Sacrosancta, of the same day, made binding by oath upon all teachers in universities and schools, and all those who sought any academic promotion. The use of the Professio for converts is not prescribed in any bull, but it became customary afterwards. And then, too, the conclusion of this bull is particularly suspicious: Hanc vero catholicam fideem, extra quam nemo salus esse potest, quam in praesenti sponte profiteor, et versus te, meam integram et inviolatam usque ad extremum vitae spiritum constantissime, Deo adjuvante, retineo et confiteri, atque ad meus subditos, vel illis, quorum cura ad me in munere meo spectabit, teneri, et docteri, et praelocari, quantum in me erit, curaturum. Ego idem N. spondeo, voveo ac juro. Sic me Deus adjuvet et haec sancta Dei Evangelia. It is often called Professor Fidel Tridentine, or Professor Fidel Tridentina. The latter is plainly incorrect. G. Chr. F. Mohniko's Urkundl. Gesch. der sogen. Prof. Fidei Trid. und einiger andern römisch-kath. Glaubensbekennnisse, Greifswalde, 1822.

After his return to Innspruck (§ 57, Note 8), the Emperor, through his and the Bavarian Commissioners, laid before the envoys of the German Archbishops, in
Pius IV. was followed by the Dominican, Pius V. (1566–1572), in whom seemed to be incorporate the strict ascetic piety, the spiritual arrogance, and the truculency of his Order. He tried to restore order at his court and in the Church with inexorable severity. In Italy the Inquisition began its bloody work with new zeal; in Spain it exterminated all the remnant of Protestantism. In France, the Netherlands, and England, the exhortations of the Pope fostered civil war. To enforce the Papal dominion over the secular power, Pius V. tried to have the Bull in Coena Domini proclaimed and observed (1567), but was refused even in Naples by the otherwise so devoted Philip II. But yet his elevation (1569) of the Duke of Florence to the archduchy of Tuscany was accepted; and when the Turks began to settle in Cyprus he succeeded in uniting Spain and Venice in a league with himself, which led to the glorious victory of Lepanto (October 7, 1571). Of the normal ecclesiastical works,

**Notes:**

1. Venice, July, 1563, the necessity of allowing the cup and the marriage of priests. Only Treves and Salzburg favored the cup—all were against the marriage of priests. At the judgments of the Bishops Michael Helding of Merseburg, Julius Pflug of Naumburg, Friedrich Nausea of Vienna, and Christoph of Wienerisch Neustadt, were in favor of both. See Schmidt's Neuere Gesch. d. Deutschen, Bd. 4, Buch 2, p. 17; Bucholtz, Gesch. Ferdinand's VIII., 660. The Pope allowed only the cup. He has only his letter to Bishop Julius Pflug, April 16, 1564 (in Literae Secretio. Ferd. I. Imp. pro obtinenda Eucharistia sub Utraque in Gratiam Maxim. II. Boh. s. Augis, ann. 1560, missae ad Pium IV., cum aliis huc spectantibus in Museo J. A..imidii, Helmst. 1719, 4, p. 81, and extracts in Le Plat, vi. 321). From the Acta. Instist., Raynald. 1564, No. 35, it appears that this was conceded to several (quibus m) bishops. Namely (according to the Pope's letter), facultas eligendi et depudicandarum sacerdotum sectis, qui in provincia tua, decenti ordine servato, et omnibus vestite vita, quo oriri possit inter communicantes sub utraque, et sub una. tum specie, ministrare possint iliam ex devotionis fervore petentibus, dummodo quire iliam petierint, cum s. Romana Ecclesiam hanc communicem habeant, et cum caesareis in rebus fidem ejus doctrinae sequantur, tum hoc quoque confiteantur,—sancissimo Eucharistiæ Sacramento tam sub una, quam sub utraque specie communicat. (See Gieseler, iii. p. 442, Note). The imperial edict carrying out this concession, June 14, 1564 (in Literae Secret. p. 35), and the legislation by the Bishop of Gurk, in St. Stephen's Church, Vienna, ibid. p. 47. The Duke Albrecht, of Bavaria, meanwhile involved in conflict with his Protestant nobility (A. Buchner's Gesch. von Baiern, vi. 231)—did not publish that Papal edict at all, and in 1569 forbade the cup entirely (p. 246).

2. Ranke's History of the Popes, p. 115–172.


5. Thuanus, lib. 46.

6. Thuanus, lib. 49 and 50. [R. St. Hilaire, Bataille de Lepante, in Revue Chrétienne, v. 1864; also, in his Hist. of Spain.]
there were published, under Pius V., the Catechismus Romanus (1566), containing the strict Dominican theology; and, revised with anxious reference to the Papal claims, the liturgical works, the Breviarium Romanum (1568), and the Missale Romanum (1570). Gregory XIII. (1572–1585) began to labor with great

9 In 1564, under Pius IV., and under the superintendence of Cardinal Carlo Borromeo, drawn up by three Dominicans (Leonardus Merinus, Archiep. Lancianensis; Aegidius Foscararius, Ep. Mutinensis; Franc. Forerius of Lisbon), and Mutius Calmius, Archiep. Jadrensis, aided by several humanists for the style. Under Pius V., 1566, it was revised by a new commission of theologians and Latinists, and published in Latin and Italian; in Latin with the title Catechismus ex Decreto Concilii Tridentini ad Parochos, Pii V. P.M. jussu editus. Rome apud Paulum Manutium, 1566, fol. It was at once generally adopted, and published countless times: e.g. in Streitwolf et Klener, Libri Symb. Eccl. Cath. i. 101. The title of Catechismus Tridentinus, often given, is erroneous. In the later controversy on grace between the Jesuits and the Dominicans, the former depreciated the Catechism as the work of Dominicans, and denied that it was binding on all the Church, and opposed to it the Catechism of Canisius and others. After that it sank in repute and general use. See Marheinecke's Christl. Symbolik, ii. 116; Streitwolf et Klener, T. I. Proleg. p. lli.; Köllner's Symbolik der kath.-römischen Kirche, p. 106.

10 The former by the Bull Quod a nobis, vii. Id. Julii, 1568; the latter by the Bull Quo primum tempore, prid. Id. Julii, 1570, prescribed to all churches which could not show that they had used their Breviaries and Missals with the assent of the Roman See more than two hundred years. The Breviary was revised anew under Clement VIII., 1602, and Urban VIII., 1613; the Missal, under Clement VIII., 1604, and Urban VIII., 1684. Some characteristic alterations: In the older Breviaries and Missals, in the collect for the day of Peter's Chair, Feb. 22, it reads: Deus, qui b. Petro Apostolo tuo collatis clavibus regni coelestis ligandi atque solvendi animas Pontificium tradidisti. The revision struck out animas: the Pope is not to be restricted to loosing and binding souls alone. In the older Missal the Gospel for Tuesday of the third week in Lent began: In illo tempore resplicens Jesus in discipulos, dixit Simoni Petro: si peccaverit in te frater tuus, etc.—si te non audierit, dico Ecclesiae. Here Simoni Petro was struck out; for Peter must not be represented as appealing to the Church as a higher power. Perelma, Abhandl. v. d. Macht der Bischöfe, übersetzt, Frankf. u. Leipzig, 1778, p. 211. In the Octave of the Feast of Saints Peter and Paul there was in the Breviary a paragraph of a sermon of St. Augustine, in which Matth. xvi. 18 was interpreted thus: Tu es ergo Petrus, et super hanc petram, quam confessus es, super hanc petram, quam agnovisti, dicens: tu es Christus filius Del vivi, aedificabo Ecclesiam meam; super me aedificabo, non me super te. This section was struck out: see E. Richerii Defensel Libelli de Ecclesiastica et Politica Potestate (Colon. 1701, 4), l. 135. How carefully the revisers did their work on other points, see Guil. Lindani, Bishop of Ruremonde, Ortatio Synodica, 1570 (in Schelhorn's Ergötzlichkeiten, l. 341): Prodit hoc anno novum Rom. Breviarium, nobis ad unum omnibus posthac ex Concilii Prov. Mechliniensis decreto—legendum: quot Psalmos habet, Deus bone, quam mendis plurimis contaminatos! quam foediscor ruptelis depravatos! quam denique averalectionedis crepantes et aberrantes!—Certe si quis S. D. N. Pium V. hoc de re fidelter monulisset, procul dubio eandem Verbo Del, scribarum oscitantia et typographorum ignavia deformato, nec paculis locis deformato, adhibulisset operam, quam suo D. Thomae Aquinati alliave castigatissime in lucem edendis admovisse dicitur.—In hac novi Breviarii Rom. castigatione si S. Patri tam fuiscent diligentes ac fidiles referendaril,—quam solent esse Romae occulti in Bullis accuratissime concipendi, et affabre omnium ingeniorum calliditate fingendis, immortalem ipsi quidem peperissent gloriam.
zeal in the establishment of theological institutions. He erected several of them in Rome, and in other cities, for countries separated from the Roman Church, and urged upon the bishops the founding of seminaries according to the Tridentine decrees. His reformation of the Calendar, was accepted only in the Roman Church. Sixtus V. (1585–1590) was an energetic character. He extirpated banditti, promoted agriculture and manufactures, and erected costly buildings at Rome, though in doing this he destroyed many monuments of antiquity. So, too, he restored the Papal finances, and collected a state treasury, but not the means by the sale of offices and by loans. He arranged the Papal administrative affairs by adding to the seven existing congregations eight new ones, chiefly for the government of the states of the Church. He kept up the conflict with Elizabeth of England and the Huguenots of France; and had the satisfaction of seeing even the Sorbonne, ruled by the League, draw up tramontane decrees. Yet he was wise enough to let Venice

---

2 In Milan for Swiss, in Brunsenb, Brügg, Fulda, Ypern, Madrid, Mantua, Mons, Riga, and Wilna, all under the direction of Jesuits; Theiner, p. 137.
3 Theiner, p. 148 sq.

By the Bull Inter Gravissimas, Febr. 24, 1582, enjoined on rulers: Mandamus, nostro huc Calendarium et ipsi suscipiat, et a cunctis sibi subjectis populis, religiosae suspiciendum, inviolate aue observandum curent. Ten days fell out; the 5th Oct. 5 was to be Oct. 15. Bower's Gesch. d. röm. Päpste, x. i. 241; Ranke's Hist. of the Popes, p. 136. [Adopted by Lutherans and in Holland, 1700; in Great Britain, 1752.]


By the Bull Immensa, xi. Kal. Febr. 1587. There were, 1. Congregatio pro s. Invtione (sancti Officii); 2. pro signatura gratiae; 3. pro errectione Ecclesiarum et divisionibus consistorialibus; 4. pro ubertate annuae Status ecclesiasticorum; 5. pro ritibus et ceremoniis; 6. pro classe parada et servanda ad Status ecclesiasticorum omnem; 7. pro indice librorum prohibitorum; 8. pro executione et interpretatione Conc. Tridentini; 9. pro Status ecclesiasticorum gravaminibus subieciandis; 10. Universitatem Studii Romani; 11. pro consultationibus Regularium; 12. pro consultationibus Episcoporum et aliorum Praeulatorum; 13. pro vils, pontibus et aquas; 14. pro typographia Vaticana; 15. pro consultationibus negotiorum Status ecclesiasticorum.

The Sorbonne, on application of the sixteen presidents of districts in Paris, decided, January 7, 1589, populam Galliae jurejurando fidel Henrico III. præstito se, et contra Regem pro defensione religionis arma capi posse. At the same time decided, ut decreturn ad Pontificem mitteretur, isque rogaretur collegi no-
FOURTH PERIOD.—DIV. I.—A.D. 1517-1648.

persuade him to be more mild towards Henry IV., against the violent opposition of Spain and the League. To carry out in an enlarged and grand style one edict of Trent not yet discharged, he founded the Vatican Typography, and there published the Septuagint (1587), and then the long-expected normal edition of the Vulgate (1590); the last, however, as was soon detected, in so imperfect a form, so little in harmony with its pretensions, that Clement VIII. (1592-1605), to the general scandal, had to prepare a new edition. After Henry IV. had at-
tained supremacy in France and become a Catholic, and when
the Gallican principles, admirably defended by Petrus Pithou

Biblia a Sixto V. editis, in quibus erant permulta perperam mutata, non decrunt
viri graves, qui censerent ea Biblia esse publice prohibienda: sed N. (Bellarminus)
coram Pontifice demonstravit, Biblia ilia non esse prohibenda, sed esse ita corrigenda,
da ut salvo honore Sixti V. Pontificis Bibliæ ilia emendata proderentur, quod fieret,
qui sum cum celerrime tollerentur, qua male mutata erant, et Biblia recurretur sub
nominé ejusdem Sixti, et addita praefatione, qua significaretur, in prima editione
Sixti praefationis irrepsisse aliquo errata vel typographorum, vel alterorum inegi-
This course was adopted, and the Sixtine Vulgate recalled, so that it is now one
of the rarest of books, and the new Clementine edition was published as the Sixtine,
when it deviated from it in more than two thousand passages. The title of this
new normal edition is: Biblia Sacra Vulgate Editionis, Sixti V. P. M. jussu recogni-
taque edita, ex typogr. Apost. Vat., 1592, fol. But Bellarmine had to write the Pref-
ce, and bring out in it the above lie; and this was afterwards discussed circum-
tantially when his beatification was considered. In the bull prefixed Clement VIII.
mandated, with the same threats as Sixtus V., that the Vulgate should in future
be printed after this edition; but he did not enjoin the change of the Bible passages
in the books of ritual, nor forbid all marginalia; cf. Thomae James Bellum Papale,
Bibliorum emendationem aggressus est; nec satis scio, an gravissum unquam periculum
occurret. Bellarmine relates in his genuine autobiography (in the Voti degli Card.
Van Ess, p. 120), Anno 1591: Cum Gregorius XIV. cogitaret, quid agendum esset de
Biblis a Sixto V. editis, in quibus erant permulta perperam mutata, non decrant

**Les Libertez de l'Eglise Gallicaine par M. Pierre Pithou, Avocat, 1594, in 83 Arti-
ues. The most important are: Art. 4: La première (maxime) est, que les Papes ne
puissent rien commander ny ordonner, soit en general ou en particulier de ce qui con-
serve les choses temporelles és pays et terres de l'obeissamce et souveraineté du Roi
et du Christ: et s'ils y commandent ou statuent quelque chose, les sujets du Roi, en-
tre qu'ils fussent Clercs, ne sont tenus leur obeir pour ce regard. Art. 5 and 6: La se-
conde, qu'encore que le Pape soit reconnu pour suzerain ès choses spirituelles: toutes
en France la puissance absolue et infinie n'a point lieu, mais est retenue et bornée
r les canons et regles des anciens Conciles de l'Eglise receus en ce Royaume. Et in
e maxime consistit libertas Ecclesiae Gallicanae. Art. 40: De la seconde maxime
pend ce que l'Eglise Gallicaine a toujours tenu; que, comme qu'elle est souveraine,
ou (comme dit s. Cyrille écrivant au Pape Celestin) par l'ancienne coutume
cour de toutes les Eglises, les Conciles generaux ne se doivent assembler ni tenir
en ce Pape clave non errante, reconnu pour chef et premier de toute l'Eglise mili-
t, et père commun de tous Chretiens, et qu'il ne s'y doive rien conclure ni arres-
sans lui et sans son autorité, toutesfois il n'est estimé estre plus puissant le Concile
versel, mais tenu aux decrets et arrests d'icelui, comme aux commandemens de
glise, espouse de nostre Seigneur J.Chr., laquelle est principalement représentée
telle assemblée. Art. 41: Aussi l'Eglise Gallicaine n'a pas receu indifferemment
es canons et epistres decretales, se tenant principalement a ce qui est contain en
cienne collection appellée Corpus Canonum (Gieseler, II. 48, Note 21), mesmo
Jo regard des epistres decretales jusques au Pape Gregoire II. Art. 44: Bull
elettes apostoliques de citation executoriales, fulminatoires ou autres, se exe-
ten en France sans Pareats du Roi ou de ses officiers: et l'exection, qui s'en
fet faire par le lai après la permission, se fait par juge royal ordinaire de l'autorité
Roi, et non autoritate apostolica. Art. 75: Or pour la conservation de ces libertez
privileges (que nos Rois tres-Chrestiens, qui portent la couronne de franchise sur
autres, jurent solennellement à leur sacré et couronnement de garder et faire
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(Advocate of Parliament, then General Procurator, †1596), were again enforced against the League,²³ Clement VIII. saw occasion to release the king from the ban, although he was a relapseus (1595).²⁴ Henry IV. helped to bring the Pope into condition to appropriate Ferrara as a fief in reversion (1598);²⁵ but the latter was obliged in return to endure the unwelcome Edict of Nantes, and to declare the king's marriage void (1599).²⁶ Paul V. (1605 to 1621), a stiff canonist, had a mind to put an end to the interference of the temporal power in Church matters, according to the strict law of the decretales; although Gregory XIII., as long before as 1572, was obliged to submit to a decisive repulse from Switzerland, where he tried to contest the criminal jurisdiction of the civil authorities over the clergy.²⁷ Most of the Italian states

garder inviolables) se peuvent remarquer plusieurs et divers moyens sagement pratiquez par nos anciens, selon les occurrences et les temps. Art. 76: Premièrement par conferences amiables savecles saint Pere. Art. 77: Secondement, observant soigneusement, que toutes bulles et expeditions venant de cour de Rome fussent visitées, pour eavoir si en icelles y avoir aucune chose, qui portast prejudice, en quelque manière que ce fut, aux droits et libertez de l'Eglise Gallicane, et à l'autorité du Roi. Art. 78: Terciement, par appellations interjettées au futur Concile. Art. 79: Quartement, par appellations précises comme d'abus, que nos pères ont dit estré quand il y a entreprise de jurisdiccion, ou attentat contre les saluts decretal et canonc reccus en ce Royaume, droits, franchises, libertez et privilèges de l'Eglise Gallicane, concordats, edits et ordonnances du Roi, arrestes de son Parlement: bref, contre ce qui est non seulement de droit commun, divin ou naturel, mais aussi des prerogatives de ce Royaume, et de l'Eglise d'icelui. Art. 80: Lequel remède est reciproquement commun aux Ecclesiastiques pour la conservation de leur autorité et jurisdiction: si que le Promoteur, ou autre ayant interest, peut aussi appeller comme d'abus de l'entreprise ou attentat fait par le Juge lai, sur ce qui lui appartient. Art. 81: Et est encore tres-remarquable la singulierr prudence de nos majeurs, en ce que telles appellations se jugent non par personnes pures lai seulement, mais par la grande chambre du Parlement, qui est le lect et siege de justice du Royaume, composée de nombre egal de personnes tant ecclesiastiques que non ecclesiastiques, mesmes pour les personnes des Pairs de la couronne.

²³ When the University of Paris made oath to Henry IV., April 23, 1594, it declared (Du Plessis d'Argentré, ii. 506), quod dictus Henricus est legittimus et verus Rex, Dominus naturalis et haeres dictorum regnorum Franciae et Navarreæ secundum leges fundamentales ipsorum, et de obedientia ab omnibus subditis dictorum regnorum et incolis praestanda est sponte et libere prout a Deo imperatum est, etiamsi hostes regni et factiosi homines usque bodie obstiterint eum admissi a sanctissima sede et aegnosiæ tanquam filium bene merito et primogenitum a. matris nostræ catholicae quamvis per eum non steterit, neque stet, ut notorietate facti permanentis palam sit omnibus: et cum nulla, ut Inquit D. Paulus, potestas sit, nisi a Deo, idcirco qui potestati ejus resistunt, Del ordinationi resistunt, et sibi damnationem acquirunt.

²⁴ Ranké, p. 231.

²⁵ Ranké, p. 241.

²⁶ Thuanus, lib. 125.

²⁷ The Pope had put the ban upon Lucerne, but afterwards denied it: Helvetia,
avoided the strife by yielding. But Venice, stirred up by divers encroachments and pretensions, made decisive opposition when the Pope tried to wrest away its criminal law, and to procure the abolition of the laws against the increase of the real estate of the Church. A strife sprung up, in which, on the one side, the whole mediaeval idea of the Church and the Papacy was insisted upon, especially by the Jesuits, Robert Bellarmine at the head of them; and, on the other side, the modern state and its rights were chiefly defended by the great advocate of the Republic, Paul Sarpi. The Pope proceeded to ban and interdict (April, 1606), but the Venetian clergy paid no heed to it; the Jesuits,
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the Theatines, and the Capuchins, who advocated it, had to leave the territory of the Republic. By the mediation of the French government, the conflict was so far ended (1607) that Venice made some advances to the Pope, although it decidedly reserved its own rights. The Republic would not at first at all accept an absolution from the Papal censure, in themselves nugatory, and at last allowed it only in an ambiguous form. In this whole struggle it became plain that it was impossible to renew the old Papal pretensions. The Papacy, in relation to the secular powers, must henceforth be content to keep up appearances and external honor; it must try to retain the governments on its side, but avoid all conflict with them. In France, after the death of Henry IV. (1610), the regency of the Queen-mother, Mary de Medici, showed itself very indulgent to the Papal claims, and put itself on the ultramontane side against Edmund Richer,

The French negotiator, Card. de Joyeuse, appeared in the Senate with the Papal legate, and said (P. Sarpi Interdicti Veneti Hist. p. 219): Gaudeo venisse hunc felicissimum diem, mihique imprimis exoptatum, in quo Serenitatis vestrae dieo, censuras omnes sublatae esse, alicu re ipsa et effectu sublatae sunt. P. 220: Post prandium illius diesi sparsus est rumor, mane in Collegio datam a Cardinale absolutionem. Id publici honoris zelo ductis admodum displicuit.—Verum cito deposita est omnis sollicitudo: nam perquirendo repertum est, fannam illam a Gallis sparsam, qui dicerent, cum omnes Collegii Senatores in suis locis consistere, extendentes, ut fieri solet, donec Ducis resideret prior, ut et ipsi postea considerent, Cardinalem sub epomide signum crucis fecisse. Id ubi intellectum fuit, sollicitudo illa in hilaritudinem potius vertit.—Satis est, interdictum ne tantillum quidem observatum fuisse, et Senatum nedum absolutionem, sed et quamcumque caeremoniam, quae illius speciem praec se ferret, recusatse.

Thus the Court, on the representation of the nuncio, put a check upon the proceedings of the Parliament against Bellarmine Tract. de Potestate Summi Pontificis, 1610 (D'Argentré, ii. i. 19, 35), and against Franc. Suarez Defensio Fidei Catholicae, 1614 (l. c. p. 86). Many of the bishops were exasperated against Parliament by the Appellations comme d'abus frequent under Henry IV., and hoped to rid themselves of secular tyranny by attaching themselves to the Papal party. [Ranke, p. 291.]

A friend of Sarpi's, who in the Venetian controversy had answered Bellarmine's attack on Gerson, in his Apologia pro Jo. Gersonis (afterwards recast, Ludg. Bat. 1676, 4to), and who had been syndic of the Sorbonne since 1608; he withstood at every point the renewed ingress of the Jesuits. When the Dominicans, at their General Chapter in Paris, 1611, among other points, presented the following theses for disputation: 1. Romanum Pontificem in fide et moribus errare non posse; 2. In nullo casu Concilium esse supra Papam; 3. Ad Papam pertinere dubia decidienda Concilio proponere, declara confirma vel infirmae, partibus silentium perpetuum imponere, Richer, as syndic, forbade these disputations. The Dominicans declared, se istas conclusiones non tanquam de fide, sed velut problematicas proposuisse. The Gallican theologians, indeed, maintained, Ecclesiam Gallicanum a temporibus Constantiensis Synodi contrarium sentirem velut de fide semper propugnasse.
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the zealous defender of the Gallican Church liberties; but Gallicanism was still firmly held by the Parliament and a great part

However, the nuncio then at Paris allowed the disputation (see the Protocol on the Proceedings, in D’Argentré, ii. ii. 45). Thereupon Richer wrote his Libellus de Ecclesiastica et Politica Potestate, 1611 (often printed, e. g. Colon. 1660, 4), in which the following positions are set forth and carried out: Cap. 1: Jurisdiction ecclesiasticae primariae ac essentialiter Ecclesiæ; Romano autem Pontifici atque aliis Episcopis ministeriali sunt, sicut facultas videndi oculo convenit. Cap. 2: Christus immediate et per se claves sive jurisdictionem ordinii hierarchico contulit per immediate et realim missionem omnium Apostolorum atque disciplinarum. Cap. 3: Ecclesia est polita monarchica, ad finem supernaturaliter spiritualiter instituta, regimine aristocratico, quod omnium optimum et naturae convenientissimum est, tempus a summo animarum pastor Domino nostro, qui Rex est, Monarcha, Dominus absolutus,—et caput essentiale Ecclesiae. Cap. 4: D. Petrus est solummodo dispensator et caput ministeriale. Cap. 5: In Ecclesia status a regimine distinguuntur: nam status monarchicus est ad unitatem atque ordinem vindicandum, necnon ad efficacem executionem canonum: regimen vero aristocraticum propter salutare consilium, infallibilem providentiam, et constitutiones canonum: Ecclesia enim non absolu potestate regitur. Cap. 6: Infallibilis potestas decernendi aut constituendi canones toti Ecclesiae, quae est columna et firmamentum veritatis, non uni et soli Petro competit: idque praxi Ecclesiae comprobatur. Cap. 11: Cum Ecclesia neque territorium, neque juxdiabit habet a Christo, et ad finem supernaturaliter tantum institutus sit de medis necessarilis ad beatitudinem, susvisum tantum et directive, non coercitiva potestas temporales irrogando, judicat. Cap. 13: Princeps politicus, ut Dominus reipublicae ac territorii, vindex est atque protector legis divinae, naturalis et canonicae: quare in eum finem leges figere, et gladium dirigere potest. Cap. 18: Princeps politicus, ut Ecclesia protector, et vindex omnium, judex est legitimus appellantium, quas ab abusus vocant: et hinc Ecclesiae Gallicanae libertates originem sumpsit. Cap. 15: In Concilio generali congregato Papa habetur caput quoad veri divini praelectionem, administrationem sacramentorum, et executionem canonum: minime vero quoad directionem, et potestatem coercitivam totum Concilium. These were certainly the principles of the Gallican Church. Rome had been forced to suffer them in the usage of this Church. But Richer maintained that they should be made the principles of the whole Church constitution, binding de jure, so that he opposite ultramontane positions would be heretical. At the head of the opposing party was Cardinal du Perou, Archbishop of Sens. The provincial synods of Sens and Alise, 1612, condemned the book (L. Odespun, Concilia Novissima Galliae, Paris, 1646, fol. p. 623). Richer was forced by this party to resign his syndicate, 1612 (D’Argentré, ii. ii. 59). He remained steadfast, and wrote his Defensio Libelli de Eccles. et Polit. Potestate (reprint. vol. i. Colon. 1721; vol. ii. Paris, 1721, 4to); but his foes stamped Richerius et Richerisae as heretical names. La Vie d’Edmond Richer, Docteur de Sorbonne, par feu Adrien Baillet, à Liège, 1714. In the Assemblée Générale des trois états, 1614, the Tiers-État tried to have it established as fundamental law of the State (Des États Généraux et autres Assemblées Nationales, t. xvi., à La Haye, 1789, p. 285), que comme le roi est reconnu souverain en son état, ne tenant sa couronne de Dieu seul, il n’y a puissance en terre, quelle qu’elle soit, spirituelle ou temporelle, qui ait aucun droit sur son royaume, pour en priver les personnes sacrées ou nos rois, ni dispenser ou absoudre leurs sujets de la fidélité et obéissance qu’ils doivent, pour quelque cause ou prétexte que ce soit. All spiritual and temporal powers should be bound to this by oath. On the other hand, l’opinion contraire, que le roi soit libéral de tuor ou déposer nos rois, s’élever et rebeller contre eux, would be declared to be high-treason and damnable, and when uttered by a cleric, the members of his order were held bound to contradiction sur peine d’être punis.
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of the clergy. Gregory XV. (1621–1623) gave to the Conclave its present form, and established the Congregatio de Fide Ca-

de même peine que dessus, comme fauteurs des ennemis de cet état. Cardinal Du Perron, at the head of the clergy, opposed this project in two long speeches, l. c. xvi. 11. 91 and 112; see p. 125: Quant à la déposition des rois,—je dirai ce qui est de la croyance de l'église, que ce point est problématique et l'a toujours été en théologie, qui ne peut être comprise sous les loix politiques.—Qu'en la France cette question a été toujours tenue problématique et appelant questions problématiques, contre lesquelles de part et d'autre il n'y a décision de l'écriture, de l'église, ni aucun anathème, comme en philosophie nous disons une opinion et question probable, pour laquelle il n'y a démonstration nécessaire.—Si en France la négative est tenue, l'affirmative se tient par les quatre parts de la chrétienté (vix. p. 94, in Spain, Italy, Germany, Poland, and Sweden); pour cela ni les uns ni les autres ne sont excommuniés et privés de la communion de l'église, n'étant jusqu'ici intervenu sur telle question aucun concile universel. Thereby he proves at length (p. 95, 128) that the affirmative has the most for itself, and in old times was also accepted in France. P. 129: Je ne tiens néanmoins cette question ni affirmativement ni négativement, je la propose comme problématique et tiens la négative politique.—Je soutiens, qu'il n'est raisonnable en ce siècle de traiter la question et de faire un point de foi sur cet article, pour amener des guerres civiles et mettre un schisme en l'église. As to the position about regicide, a temporal law, he says, can not protect the King, but only an ecclesiastical. P. 128: mais ces loix, qui vont au spirituel et aux consciences, ne se peuvent faire que par ceux, qui en ont le pouvoir en un concile général, et l'autorité de l'église gallicane ne peut décider ces choses. With the new publication of the decree of Constance (vol. iii. Div. IV. § 118, Note 8, p. 152), the matter had been settled. The Parliament indeed declared (p. 108) that three maximes were in no wise problematical, and aduced several of the arrêts issued by it in evidence (p. 110). Miron, President of the Tiers-État, also replied to the Cardinal in a vigorous speech (p. 146). The provisional regency, however, ended the matter by a royal edict, January 6, 1615, prohibiting the continuance of this discussion (p. 175). The Pope (Jan. 31, 1615) praised the clergy for its resistance to the excessus ad daeae, qua nonnulli publico conventu istic IV. Non. Jan. habito violare sacrosan tam auctoritatem apostolicae Sedis conati sunt (xvii. 37). During this period there was much discussion among the clergy as to the acceptance of the Council of Trent (Le Plat, Monum. ad Hist. Conc. Trident. vii. i. 284), and the Pope encouraged them (Jan. 31, 1615) to press for it (p. 298). But as the Tiers-État opposed (p. 296), no general conclusion could be reached by the Estates. The clergy then determined (p. 301), May 19 and July 17, to have the Council accepted by provisional and diocesan synods; but this was not agreed to by the King (p. 314). An example of the extent to which the French clergy of that time were inclined to an excessive estimate of the Papal powers is found in the Epist. Cleri Gallicani Lutetiae congregati ad Urbanum VIII. P. M. dd. Id. Oct. 1625 (Odespun, Conc. Novissima Galliae, p. 715): Is nempe es, ex cujus ore mortallibus divinae voluntatis decreta pronunciantur; cujus dignitas tantae sollicitatis est, ut nec periculum verei debet, nec incrementum sperare possit. Quidquid enim magnitudinis vastitas Orbis ampietit, quidquid potestatis coeli favor imperitri potuit, id in unius societatem commendii sacrosancta Pontificem majestas inclusit. Nutu suo coelum reserat, Taenarum jussu recludit, universitatem religionem complictit, et ubique, quo nihil majus melius terris datum est, Del praepotentia vices gerit. Magna quidem sunt haec, et ob hoc unum circumscripta, quod ulterius proterti non possit. However, the French clergy did not venture, as is commonly alleged, to maintain downright the right of the Pope to depose kings, or the Papal infallibility.

**By the Bull Aeterni Patris Filius, Nov. 15, 1621: Statulmus,—In posterum elec-
tholica Propaganda, to which Urban VIII. (1623-1644) added important auxiliaries in the Collegium de Propaganda Fide, or Collegium Urbani (1627). Urban's pontificate is notable for the last recension of the Bull *In Coena Domini* (1627), and for...
the recantation of Galileo (1633). And yet this Pope was so far influenced by political considerations that he joined with France against the states which defended the Catholic cause—Spain and Austria. For this Richelieu sacrificed to him the hated Richer (1631), and allowed the suppression (1639) of the writings of another eminent defender of the Gallican Liberties, Peter Dupuy (Puteanus).

But yet in his administration he en-

---


* Ranke's Fürsten u. Völker, iii. 542, 562 [History of the Popes, pp. 318, 326].

* Richer was obliged, December 7, 1629, in the Cardinal's chamber, to subscribe a declaration drawn up by the Cardinal (d'Argentré, ii. 203): Je proteste et déclare, que j'ai toujours voulu, et veux encore présentement me soumettre avec le livre susdit, ses propositions, leur interpretation, et toute ma doctrine au jugement de l'Eglise catholique et Romaine, et du saint Siège Apostolique, que je reconnois pour la mère et la maîtresse de toutes les Eglises, et pour le juge infaillible de la vérité. He then condemns these positions, which might seem to lower the power of the Pope and prelates,—quoique ce n'ait jamais été mon intention. When Richer afterwards, in his Testamentum, December 24, 1629, affirmed his principles, and this was made known, he was forced by Richelieu's intimate counsellor, the Capuchin P. Joseph, to recant under threat of death. Richer died Nov. 28, 1631. See Baillet, above, Note 33.

* On February 9, 1639, the bishops then in Paris issued a letter to all the French bishops (L. Odespun, Concilia novissima Gallicae, Paris, 1646, fol., p. 727), in which they announced that they had condemned the two works: Traictez des Droits et Libertez de l'Eglise Gallicane, 1636, and Preuves des Libertez de l'Eglise Gallicane, 1639, and invited them to stand by this judgment: Nusquam enim fideli christianae, Ecclesiae catholicae, ecclesiasticae disciplinae, Regis ac regni salutis necentioribus dogmatibus quasquam adversatus est, quam luis quae ipsis voluminibus sub tam leni titulo recluduntur. Equidem, sicut haereticorum et schismaticorum mos est, compilator ille multus pessimis, quae profinabat, bona quaedam immiscuit, et inter falsas
forced those liberties so far as to insure the royal authority every where, even in the ecclesiastical sphere. Innocent X. (1644–1655) lost all honor by his dependence on his sister-in-law, Olympia Maldachini; so that his protest against the Peace of Westphalia had all the less effect.

The increased power obtained by the bishops at Trent was imparted to them in the form of rights delegated by the Pope. They were sufficiently bound by the oath which they took to him. But still the standing nuncios, first appointed for enforce-
ing the introduction of the Tridentine decrees, and supported by
the Pope at the principal courts, were also designed to guard
the Papal interests as against the bishops, and to insure the plen-
ary authority of the Papacy. France was able at once to se-
cure the rights of the Gallican Church against them. But the
Papal nuncio planted in Lucerne since 1579, with the help of
the Jesuits, interfered all the more boldly with the Swiss polity,
so as to abridge the rights of the bishops, and to embitter the
Catholic cantons against the Protestant. So, too, the nuncio

**In Florence, Naples, Turin, Venice, Vienna, Brussels, Warsaw, Paris, Madrid, Lisbon.**

Cardinal Morosini, as legate, 1576, had to take the following oath (Les Loix Ecclési-
astiques de France, nouv. édit. par L. de Héricourt, à Paris, 1756, fol., p. 54): S. Roma-
nae Ecclesiae Presbyter, Cardinalis Maurocenus, nuncupatus ad Henricum Franco-
rum Regem, et universum illius regnum—s. Sedis apostolicae de latere Legatus, juro
et promitto in verba Cardinalis, per sacros ordines meos, manibus ad pectus positis,
Christianissimo Regi, me Legati munere non functurum, nec faculatibus mihi a s.
Sede concessus usurum, nisi quando in regno ero, et suae Majestati Christianissimae
placuerit; adeo ut certior factus de illius voluntate, illi convenienter Legati nomen
cum sit continuo suo depositurus, simulque omnium quae gerentur a me, legatione
finita, codicillos relentarum in manibus ejus, quem voletur sua Christianissima Ma-
jestas; item leges et statuta et consuetudines regni servaturum; nec ullo modo
auctoritati et jurisdictioni regiae, juribus, libertatibus et privilegiis Ecclesiae Galli-
canae et Universitatum derogaturum. In quorum testimonium has praeventis manu
mea subscripsi, ac praetera sigillo meo muniendas curavi. So, too, the later legates.

**The first nuncio in Lucerne was Joh. Franz Buonomi, Bishop of Vercelli (see
Gesch. d. Einführung der Nuntiatur in der Schweiz, herausgeg. v. D. L. Snell, Baden,
1847, p. xiv.), who, however, hated for his arrogance, was removed 1581. He was fol-
lowed, 1584, by Felician Ninguarda, Bishop of Scala; 1586, Joh. Bapt. Sanatorio,
Bishop of Scala, who tried to separate the Catholic cantons from the Reformed, so
settled down since 1595 at Cologne, during the minority of an archbishop, the Bavarian Prince Ferdinand, gave occasion to incessant complaints by his inroads upon the episcopal jurisdiction. During the troubles of the Thirty-Years' War, while the


As early as 1584 Joh. Franz Buonomi, as nuncio, cum potestate Legati de Latere, as sent to Cologne to complete the deposing of the Elector Gebhard. He had great powers assigned him, covering the whole province (see in Hartzheim, Concil. erman. viii. 498), which, however, were much abridged by Sixtus V. (ibid. p. 508). As he had successors, he was regarded in Rome as the first stationary nuncio in Cologne (Pii P. VI. Responsio ad Metropolitanos Mogunt. Trevir. Colon. et Salis. super Nunciaturis Apostolicis, Leodi, 1790, p. 409); in fact he was legate extraordinary, see (Ch. Fr. Weidenfeld's) Gründliche Entwickelung der Dispens- und Nuntiaturstreitigkeiten (Bonn), 1786, 4, p. 382; Begründete Gegenbemerkungen über die betrachtungen wider das Kölnische Promemoria, 1789, p. 83. But when the seven-years-old Ferdinand was elected coadjutor on the Pope's recommendation, the papal legate had to conclude a compact with the Cathedral Chapter, in which it is declared (Tractatus de Coadjutoria Archiepiscopi Ferdinandi, de anno 1595, annexed to the work, Caloporia, or materials for answering the writing: Véritable État, c., 1787, p. 53): Quod ad spirituale attinet, (S. Sanctitas) confidit de Coadjutore Capitulo, quod pro zelo christianæ religionis et pietate decorem domus Del primis cordi habebant: attamen, siquidem Capituloitavidebitur, pro majori auctore et securitate rerum tam temporalium, quam spiritualium offert Sua Sanctitas bere in hac provincia, salva tamen semper ordinaria jurisdictione, virum gravem ac cum cum titulo et dignitate Nuntii apostolici, cum facultatibus opportunis pro salute Ecclesiae, et cum expressomandato s. Sedis apostolicae, ut ea, quae unioni triae juratae, quae juratis capitulationibus, quae etiam Ecclesiae consuetudinis obgynant, per omnia tolli, et quae eas conveniant, observari procerct. Thus the nunciature at Cologne had a transient occasion, but it became permanent; see Entwickelung, p. 340; Gegenbemerkungen, p. 92.

The nuncios at first, in cases of appeal, nominated judices in partibus; then they named for this one of their own clergy as auditor; next they took appeals, singing over the metropolitan; and, in fine, took up cases in the first instance; see Entwickelung (above), p. 346. As in the chapters of Cologne, Münster, Liège, and Lembern the episcopal officials had concurrent jurisdiction with the secular lices, the nuncios also took appeals from them in secular cases; and against this Imperial Chamber had long to struggle; see Pragmat. u. actenmässige Gesch. zu München neu errichteten Nuntiatur, Frankf. u. Leipz. 1877, p. 109. There (in appendix, p. 50) are extracts giving the powers (facultates) which Benedict XIV., in middle of the eighteenth century, conferred on the Cologne nuncio. Amongers: 1. Visitandi et reformandi patriarchales et alias Ecclesias, nec non materia. 2. Constitutiones, consuetudines et mores mutandi, vel constitutiones de novo edendi. 5. Cognoscendi et terminandi causas criminales, et matrimoniales, quasunque alias ecclesiasticas, profanas, civiles, criminales, et mixtas, ad forum lesiasticum quomodolibet pertinentes (non tamen beneficiaria), praeterquam in nau instanza. 7. Conferendi beneficia ecclesiasticæ simplicia intra limites suas ationem, dummodo ratione mensium apostolicorum reservata non fuerint, quorum titus viginti quator Ducatos surri de Camera non excedunt, etc. The Protestants he Diet of Ratisbon, 1594, made special complaint that the Papal legates endeav-
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general ecclesiastical order of Germany was broken up, and the bishops troubled themselves less about the Pope, the Archbishop Ferdinand of Cologne, in 1645, became more dependent on the Pope, by obtaining, through Papal indulgences, the right of dispensation as to marriages—facultates quinquennales. By degrees such concessions were interpolated into these indulgences that the dignity of the episcopal office was greatly lowered.

§ 59.

HISTORY OF THE JESUITS.

The Jesuits were the most important prop of the Popes, and gave them the most powerful aid. They were soon spread abroad, every where enlarging the Papal sway by confirming the wavering, quickening the indifferent, restoring the lapsed, and converting the unbelieving. They were as active as the mendicant friars had been in their prime, and were also as much to enlarge their jurisdiction; see Struve's Ausführliche Historie der Religionsbeschwerden, i. 373, 374.

Thus Montorio, the Papal nuncio at Cologne, 1624, reported to the Pope that the German bishops filled the places in the reserved Papal months and gave dispensations in all cases. Ranke, iv. 409; [Am. ed. p. 296; Appendix, No. 109, p. 542].

At Trent the Spaniards and French vindicated this right for the bishops, the Italians opposed (Sarpi, lib. viii. § 31), and so nothing about it was determined. It is only declared, Sess. XXV. De Reform. cap. 18: Quodsi urgens justa queratio, et major quandoque utilitas postulaverint, cum aliquibus dispensandum esse; id causa cognita, ac summa maturitate, atque gratis a quibuscumque, ad quos dispensatio pertinebit, erit praestandum.


It belongs to the powers (facultates) which Innocent X., 1650, conceded to the Archbishop of Mayence (Ueber das unjustifizirliche Schreiben des Erzb. Pacca, Nunzius zu Köln, Frankf. u. Leipz. 1787, p. 95); also, 2. the facultas, tenendi et legendi libros prohibitos haereticorum ad effectum cos impungandi, et alios quomodolibet prohibitos, praeterquam opera Car. Molinaei, Nic. Machiavelli, ac libros de astrologia—tractantes, ita tamen, ut libri ex illis provinciis non efferantur. And this power was again conferred by Pius VI., about 1780, but with a large increase of the books unconditionally forbidden (ibid. p. 101). Besides this, the following powers are also here granted: 12. Conferendi Ordines extra temporam, et non servatis interstitiis usque ad sacerdotium inclusive; 14. Confeicendi olea cum quinque saltem sacerdotibus, non tamen extra diem Coenae Domini, nisi necessitas aliud urget; 16. Deferendi sacramentum Sacramentum occulte ad infirmos sine lumine,—si ab haereticis aut infidelibus sit periculum sacrilegi, etc. In glaring contrast with this stand especially the powers of the nuncios; see Note 48.
favored by the Papal See. But the efficiency of the Jesuits was on a grander scale, since they did not, like the mendicants, limit themselves to a one-sided culture, but received into their Society manifold characters and talents, to use them, under the strictest unity in government and with inviolable obedience, in the most varied services for the ends of their Order. Fanatical ascetics, and those that had talent for the arts and for organization, were employed in missions; the worldly wise and skillful were placed at courts, the learned in schools; orators were made preachers. But all were bound undeviatingly to one end—the elevation of their Society, and thereby of the Papacy, to sole sovereignty. In most of the Catholic states the higher instruction of youth came chiefly into their hands, and thus they formed a generation wholly submissive to them. And as most of the theological seminaries, instituted according to the direction of Trent, were given up to them, they won a great following among the best educated of the clergy. Through these, and also by their own assiduity as preachers and confessors, they got a most important influence over the people; while they worked upon princes by becoming confessors at the courts, a position very often confided to them. Their zeal was pre-eminently directed to those states and kingdoms which had fallen off from the Church; and they soon succeeded in kindling afresh the conflicts of the Reformation, and not only in setting limits to it in some lands, but also in forcing

---

*Litterae Apostolicae, quibus Institutio, Confirmatio, et Varia Privilégia conten-  
Societatis Jesu, Antwerp. 1635; also in the Corpus Institutorum Soc. Jesu, vol. I.  
Gregory XIII. conceded to the Jesuits, in the Bull *Decet Romanum Pontificem*, 1575,  
*νον omnibus privilégios fratrum et sororum Mendicantium, alarumque religionum  
inibus, et monasteriis, ac personis tam saculiaribus quam regularibus hactenus  
cessiss et in futurum concedendis uti, frui, ac in eis procedere possint. In the de-  
ciatorv address made by Louis Doll, in the name of the Paris pastors, against the  
uits, July 13, 1594, it is declared (d'Argentré, Collectio Judiciorum, ii. 1. 515):  
*Exerci XIII. en l'an 1575 leur donne permission de converser avec les herétiques,  
cette fin de changer d'habit, et se déguiser. This must have been a secret priv-  
nal, as there is no trace of it in the Litteræ Apostolicæ.*  
*Imago Primi Saeculi Societatis Jesu, a Provincia Flandro-Belgica ejusdem Socie-  
S Repraesentata, Antwerp. 1640, fol., Proleg. p. 33: Dispersa quidem sunt per om-  
orbis angulos Societatis membra, tot nationibus regnisque divisa, quot limitibus  
bus: sed hæc tantummodo sunt intervalla locorum, non mentium; discrimina  
nonis, non pectoris; colorum dissimilitudo, non morum. In hac familia idem  
un Latinus et Graecus, Lusitanus et Brasilus, Hibernus et Sarmata, Iber et Gal-  
Britannus et Belgæ: atque in tam disparibus geniis nullum certamen, nulla con-  
io; nihil ex quo sentias plures esse.—Nihil sua putant interesse, ubi nati sint.  
*propositum, idem tenor vitae, eadem volit copula colligavit.—Voluitur et revolv-  
* Rominis unius nulu Societatis universae tanta moles, moveri facilis, difficilis commoveri.*
it back. So particularly in Germany, where their most important polemical writers were found, viz., Martin Becanus, who worked in Mayence, Würzburg, and Vienna, d. 1624; Jac. Gretser, in Ingolstadt, d. 1625; Adam Tanner, in Prague and Ingolstadt, d. 1632; and Laurentius Forer, in Dillingen, d. 1569. They worked, too, in Hungary, and in Poland, where they succeeded, under Antonius Possevinus, in uniting with the Roman Church the larger part of the Greek Church of Lithuania and the contiguous Polish provinces (1590–1596).

In En-

---


5 Innumerable polemical works by him; against Aegidius Hunnius, especially dogmatic and polemical; historic and polemical on the Papacy, Gregory VII., and Henry IV., against Melchior Goldast. Opp. Ratisbonae, 1754, ss. 17 tom. fol.

6 By him: Lutherus, a. Anatomia Confessionis Augustanae, Ingolst. 1613, 4. Controversial works against Aegidius Hunnius on the Ratisbon Conference, etc.

7 He very often repeats that the Protestants had forfeited the Religious Peace (Div. I. § 11, Note 24). By him, among other works, Symbolum Catholicum, Lutheranum et Calvinianum cum Apostolico Collatum, Dillingen, 1622, 4; Bellum Ubiquisticum, Vetus et Novum, Dill. 1627, 12 (in German: Alteru. neuer Katzenkrieg v. der Ubiquität, Ingolstadt, 1629, 12).

8 Division I. § 16, Note 24 sq. See vol. iv. p. 263.

9 Division I. § 15, Note 30 sq. See vol. iv. p. 256.

10 The Jesuits drew the youth of the Greek Church, especially sons of nobles, into their colleges, and gained them for their party; they also succeeded in filling Greek episcopates with their adherents. As King Sigismund III. was wholly devoted to them, they were able to entice the nobility with offices and the bishops with senatorial chairs. Their chief instrument was Michael Rahoza, Metropolitan of Kiew, one of their pupils. At two synods in Brzesc Litewski, 1590 and 1594, the Union was inaugurated. In 1595 two bishops were sent to Rome; Clement VIII. ratified the Union by the Bull Magnus Dominus et Laudabilis, Dec. 23, 1595, under the stipulations of the Council of Florence (see vol. iii. Div. IV. § 150). A third synod at Brzesc Litewski, 1595, completed the work; and the King proclaimed it by a sovereign rescript, Dec. 15, 1596, in which he at the same time threatened the stanch adherents of the Greek Church with the loss of the royal favor. Persecutions against them were next set on foot, and their churches and cloisters were taken from them. But they had from the first the powerful protection of Constantine Ostrogoski, Vovode of Kiew; and, when more tolerant rulers succeeded, many of the Non-United Greeks still remained. The Romish view of these proceedings is given in Baronius, appended to his Annales Eccl. vol. vii.; also in the work, Die Neuesten Zustände der Kathol. Kirche beider Ritus in Polen und Russland, Augsb. 1841, p. 96 (with documents). The opposing view, see in Karamsin, Gesch des russ. Reiches, ix. 317 (Hefele, in the Tübinger Quartalschrift, 1845, p. 573, cites Karamsin, ix. 318, as authority for the statement that Sigismund III. did not threaten persecution; but on p. 321 he can read in what way Sigismund let them enter in). An impartial account is in Jos. Lukasczewicz, Gesch. d. reformirten Kirchen in Litthauen (2 vols. Lpz. 1848), i. 44. The Union had in itself the germs of its dissolution; since, in the view of its projectors, it was to be only a transition to entire Roman Catholicism. The United Church was subordinated to the Roman Catholics, and their ecclesiastical institutions were in
and in Sweden the Jesuits could only stir up disorder without permanent effects. On the other hand, in Spain and France perils awaited them which could only be overcome by Papal succor.

The Society was originally composed chiefly of Spaniards, and for a long time only Spaniards filled the office of General. As in Spain, under the Inquisition and the Dominicans, the theology of Thomas Aquinas had sway, this was also prescribed by Loyola to his Society. Lainez, however, moved by opposition to Protestant tenets, and by the prevailing tendency outside of Spain, took occasion in the Council of Trent to deviate from the Thomist theology. The Declaration (published under his generalship) to the Constitutions of the Order (1558) also indicated that the dependence of the Society upon the Thomist teachings was not unconditional. The Cologne Jesuits, in their Censura (1560), reservedly avowed Pelagian principles. Thus originated a tension between Jesuits and Dominicans; and in Spain, where the peculiarities of the Jesuit constitution and the workings of
their Society had become offensive to many, the number of their opponents was augmented. A still more violent opposition to the Jesuits was engendered at the University of Louvain, in which, after the precedence of Michael Baius, a pure Augustinianism supplanted even the theology of Aquinas. Pius V. condemned seventy-nine articles of Baius (1567) in a very mild form. Afterwards Baius (1569 and 1579) and the theological 

17 Melchior Canus (Dominican in Salamanca and Toledo, Bishop of the Canary Islands, d. 1560) had before this interpreted 2 Tim. iii. 1-7 of the Jesuits (Orlandinus, Hist. Soc. Jesu, i, 172), and wrote to the Augustinian Regula, confessor of Charles V., Tuba magna mirum clangens Sonum, per Liberum Candidum (i.e. the Carmelite in Liège, Henricus de s. Ignatio), Argent. 1713, p. 1: Si quo pede coeperunt Patres Societatis, pergere permittantur, saepius Deus, ne tempus tandem adventiat, quo Reges eis obsistere velit, nec possint. In his Loci Theologici, Salmant. 1563, fol., lib. iv. c. 3, he says: Societas Christi (1 Cor. i. 9) cum Christi Ecclesias sit, qui titulum sibi illum arrogant, hi videant, an haereticorum more penes se Ecclesiam existerent mentitur. Arias Montanus, royal chaplain and librarian, wrote to King Philip II., 1571 (Pauli Colomaei Opera, ed. J. A. Fabricius, Hamburgi, 1709, 4, p. 537): monce, unam illarum rerum, quas Majestas V. Gubernatoris ac Ministris, qui in Belgio sunt aut posthaer erunt, severissime debet injungere, esse istam, ut caveat Jesuitis commiseri, nec quiequam negotiorum cum illis communicet, neque ad id, quod nunc habeant auctoritatis vel opum in his provinciis, ullam accessionem facient; in specie autem, ut Gubernator Belgii nomine illorum pro Praedicatore vel Confessario utinam habeat: Deo enim et conscientia teste perspectum habebo, tum hoc quam quiequam alius referre ad rem M. V. et ad liberen executionem boni regimini harum provinciarum. Et M. V. pro certo habeat, perpaucos in Hispania inveniri extra ipsorum Societatem, qui pluribus et certioribus quam ego argumentis perspectum habeant, quae sint illorum praetensiones seu studia, qui fines, quantoque ingenio et conatu ad fines sibi propositos conglantur, similiterque de multis eorum rebus particolaribus, quibus observandis non ab uno, sed jam a quindecim annis animum adverti. —Nee enim me praeterit, quos passim explorabat, ut quicquid de suis et alienis negotiis agatur, resciscant, quantique nocentum, et quam tectum ex sua libidine attingere intelligat. The same Arias, in his Comm. de varia Hebraicorum Librorum Scriptione et Lectione prefixed to Biblia Hebraeo-Latina, Antverp. ap. Plantinum, 1584, p. 11: Utuntur quidem illi Jesuitae, magni et incredibili ad suas agendas res mysterio: sed quod facile ils, qui simplicius apertiusque agere volunt, pelluceat, quod non post multos annos tandem aperierendum est virtute illius, qui illustrabit abscondita cordis et occultas inimicitias contra minoris auctoritatis homines, quos quovis modo temporarum quiequam non satis ex sua libidine attingere intelligat. 18 By the Bull Ez Omnibus Afflictionibus, which is wanting in the Bullaria. The rejected points in Melch. Leydeckeri Hist. Jansen. Apoll. Trajecti ad Rhen. 1805, p. 278. E. g. 16. Non est vera legis obedientia, quae sit sine caritate. 20. Nullum est peccatum ex natura sua veniale, sed omne peccatum meretur poenam aeternam. 25. Omnia opera infidelium sunt peccata, et philosophorum virtutes sunt vitia. 27. Liberum arbitrium sine gratia Dei adjutorio non nisi ad peccandum valet. 39. Quod voluntarie fit, etiamsi necessario fiat, libere tamen fit. 59. Quando per eleemosynas aliqua poenitentiae opera Deo satisfacimus pro poenis temporalibus, non dignum pretium Deo pro peccatia nostra offerimus, sicut quidam errantes autumant (nam alioqui essesus saltem aliqua ex parte redemptores); sed aliquid facimus, cujus intitul Christi satisfacit nobis applicatur et communicatur. 60. Per passiones Sanc torum in indulgentiis communicatas non proprie redimuntur nostra delicta; sed per communionem caritatis nobis eorum passiones impartiuntur, ut digni simus, qui
faculty (1585) were compelled to reject these theses explicitly; but still this theological tendency was not thereby changed. During this period Claudius Aquaviva (1581) became General of the Order, 19 the first who was not a Spaniard, and by his Ratio Studiorum, 1586, he freed the Society still more decidedly from the Thomist theology. 20 In Salamanca, 1581, the theses of a Jesuit pretio sanguinis Christi a poenis pro peccatis debitis liberemur. 73. Nemo praeter Christum est absque peccato originali: hic b. Virgo mortua est propiter peccatum ex Adam contractum, omnesque ejus afflictiones in haec vita, sicut et aliorum justi-

um, fuerunt uliones peccati actualis vel originalis. 75. Motus pravi concupiscen-
tiae sunt, pro statu hominis vitati, prohibiti praecepto: Non concupiscite.

Unde eos sentientes, et non consentientes, transgreditur praeceptum: Non concupiscite; quamvis transgressio in peccatum non deputetur. 76. Quamdiu aliquid concupiscentiae carnalis in diligentia est, non factit praeceptum: Diligite Dominum Deus tuis est tota corda tua. Baius is not even named in the Bull: the tenets are said to have been avowed by men—spectatae alioquin probitatis et doctrinae; though it was generally known that Baius was meant. Of these opinions the Bull says: Quas quidem intentias stricto coram nobis examine ponderatas, quanquam nonnullae aliquo acto sustineri possent (:) in rigore et proprio verborum sensu ab assertoribus in intus (:) haereticas, erroneas,—scandalosas—respective—damnamus, circumscribi et abolemus; deinde et disputandae facultatem quibuscunque interdicimus. There was afterwards dispute upon the question, whether in the above sentence the (:) should be after possens, 1 "as the Jesuits would have it, or after "intento," as the adherents of Baius claimed. See Serry, Hist. Congregationum de Auxilios, p. 679. Baius main-

Ranke's Fürsten u. Völker, iii. 284. Ratio atque instituto studiorum per sex Patres ad id Jussu R. P. Praepositi earum Deputatos Conscripta, Romae, 1586, p. 9: De opinionum Delectu in theo-

cal Facultate. Regula I. Nemo quicquam doceat, quod cum Ecclesiae sensu, re-

ixe traditionibus non bene conveniat. Reg. II. Expedit etiam, ubi nullum tatis et fidel periculum imminent, suspicionem vitare studi res in mediis novas, novae condenda doctrinæ. Quare opinionem ullam nemo defendat, quae con-

ceperat philosophorum aut theologorum axiomata, vel contra communem scho-

num theologicarum sensum a plerisque viris doctis esse judicetur. Reg. III. Quae ideas, cujuscunque auctoribus sin, in aliqua provincia aut civitate multo—catho-

ica, et non indoctos offendere scelerum, et ob ibi nemo doceat aut defendat, quamvis sine offensione docerant. Hujusmodi vero opiniones a quolibet Provincialis generis forent, audito consilio Doctorum sua provinciae, ut, qui in ea docent, eas ignorend, nec ulias aliis esse praetera hujus generis existimem. Reg. V. eologia doctrinam s. Thomae (ut cavetur 4 parte Constitutionum cap. 14) Nosquantur, exceptis panibus, quae licet sint aut videri possint esse s. Thomae, quia contra præcepta et sine periculo et valde probabiliter defendi possint, si quis haec velt, connivente Superioribus ad ingeniorum exercitationem majorem et secu-

re veritatis exame. Noster itaque non cogantur defendere quae sequuntur. follow seventeen positions, ex prima parte s. Thomae; among them, 6. Secun-

us esse proprie et univoce instrumenta Dei: et cum operatur, Deum in

vol. v. — 6
FOURTH PERIOD.—DIV. I.—A.D. 1517-1648.

were assailed as Pelagian; in 1587 the Theological Faculty of Louvain condemned thirty-four theses of the same stamp by two Jesuits of that place, Leonh. Less and Joh. Hannel. The strife

illas primum influere aut eas movere. The Jesuits were especially charged by their opponents with doubts upon this doctrine, which was considered as the nerve of Augustinianism, as far as the human will belongs to "second causes." Reg. VI. In caeteris, quae hic excepta non sunt, a s. Thoma Nostris non recedant: expressae tammen definienda nonnulla videntur. Quedam, quia non tactuantur a s. Thoma: quaedam, quia ab eo attingantur quidem, non tamen sub expressa ac propriis terminis definitur: quaedam denique, et sane paucissima, contraria s. Thomae, quia magis sunt approbata communiter, nec parum adjuviant pietatem. Es vero sunt, quae sequuntur. 21 Propositiones ex prima parte s. Thomae. Reg. VII. Cum hae propositiones Doctorum sententias valide congruant, et sint modo receptae communiter, igitur in earum nonnullis de s. Thomae mente dubitari solet; quo major tamen sit et habuerunt auctoritas et Nostrorum consensio, cum secundum eas s. Doctor non incommode possit exponi, id Nostris praestare conetur, quoad ejus fieri poterit. Reg. VIII. In illis, in quibus aliqua libertas concessa fuit, nullus ita partem unam defendat, ut alteram plus quam par esset, exigunt: prioris etiam professores, si contrarium docuerant, existimationi consulat unusquisque: et cum commode conciliari possunt doctores, id vero non negligatur. Reg. IX. In his, in quibus aliqua libertas concessa fuit, nullus ita partem unam defendat, ut alteram plus quam par esset, exigunt: prioris etiam professores, si contrarium docuerant, existimationi consulat unusquisque: et cum commode conciliari possunt doctores, id vero non negligatur. Reg. X. In his, in quibus aliqua libertas concessa fuit, nullus ita partem unam defendat, ut alteram plus quam par esset, exigunt: prioris etiam professores, si contrarium docuerant, existimationi consulat unusquisque: et cum commode conciliari possunt doctores, id vero non negligatur. Reg. XI. Quae a s. Thoma non tactuantur, neque hac designata sunt, ita Nostris disputent, ut probatos maxime sequantur auctores, ex quibus docentur, quae et pro locorum et temporum ratione magis recepta sunt in Academis, et ad auditorum pietatem conferunt. Observent idem quoque in s. Thomae sententia assequenda colligendaque, si quando paulo obscurior est. This first Ratio Studiorum was examined by the Spanish Inquisition at the instance of Philip II., and declared to be liber temerarius, periculosus, jactantiae plenus. In consequence it was forbidden by Sixtus V. (Serry, p. 9). It is now one of the rarest of books; there is one in the Library of Treves, and in the Göttingen Library there is a manuscript copy.

21 Here first appears the doctrine De Scientia Dei Media, which was developed in the Jesuit schools; see Serry, pp. 5, 6.

22 These positions in Serry, p. 11. Comp. 1. Ut quid sit Scriptura sacra, non est necessarium singula ejus verba inspirata esse a Spiritu sancto. 2. Non est necessarium, ut singulae veritates et sententiae sint immediate a Spiritu sancto ipsi scriptori inspiratae. 3. Liber alicuius, quales forte est secundus Machabaeorum, humana industria sine assistentia Spiritus sancti scriptus, si Spiritus sanctus postea testetur nihil ibi esse falsum, efficiat Scriptura sacra (this was against the strict Protestant doctrine of inspiration). 5. Deus post praevisionem peccatum originale habuit voluntatem dando Adamo et toti ejus posteri sufficiens auxilium contra peccata, et auxilia ad consequendum vitam aeternam: ergo dat illis sufficiens auxilium ut possint reverti. 10. Deus vult dare Christum in redimotorem pro omnibus, nullo excepto: ergo omnibus praeparavit sufficiens media per Christum. 21. Omnes infideles semper et ubique habent sufficiens auxilium ex parte Dei, seu in actu primo. Si enim facerent quod in ipsis est, et quantum possent secundum praestem dispositionem naturalium vel supernaturalium, quam habent, Deus illuminaret eos, ut credere possent, vel converti. 22. Qui invincibiliter ignorat fidem, tenetur ad praecepta naturalia, i.e. Decalogue: ergo habet auxilium morale sufficiens ad illa implenda, quia Deus neminem obligat ad impossibile: aliquin videtur accedere ad insaniam haereticorum, qui dicunt, per peccatum originale amissam liberum arbitrium ad bo-
thus begun became more violent when the Jesuit Louis Molina, teacher of theology at the University of Evora, in Portugal, avowed, in 1588, a kind of Semipelagianism. In Spain many

23. Sententia quae dicit, eos qui salvantur non efficaciter electos ad gloriam ante praeventionem bonorum operum, vel applicationis meriti contra peccatum, vide- tur maxime probabilis. Tenent autem hanc sententiam omnes Patres Graeci, adeo ut communiter dicatur sententia Graecorum. Et in scholio: Quamquam diversa sententia Augustino adscribatur, non puto tamen esse Augustini. Quod si tamen contraria sententia esset Augustini, non admodum referret. 33. Numerus praedestinatarum non est certus ex praedestinatione, quae antecedit omnem praescientiam operum. 34. Hae sententia de praedestinatione et reprobatione maxime consentanea est divinae bonitatis, Scripturarum auctoritate, Patrum testimonio, et naturalis rationis sequituri, in nulla re omnino Pelagio favens, et quam longissime a sententia Lutheri et Calvinii, et reliquorum haereticorum nostraetempestatis recedens; a quorum sententia et argumentis difficile est alteram sententiam vindicare.

** Liberi Arbitriicum Gratiae Donis, divina Praescientia, Providentia, Praedestina- tione et Reprobatione Concordia, Doctore Lud. Molina auctore, Lisboae, 1588, fol. alteram sui parte auctori, Antverp. 1595, 4. The characteristic doctrines of this work, as drawn out by the Romish scrutiny, see in Serry, p. 241. E. g. I. Concursus Dei generalis non sat influenxus Dei in causam secundam, quasi ilia prius ab eo mota agat et producatur suo effectu; sed est influenxus immediate cum causa in illius actionem. — Influenxus vero ille, quo causa applicentur et moveantur ad agendum, est committitus, — multumque praecredicit libertati arbitrii nostris. — Deus enim et liberum arbitrium habet se tamquam sua praelectione, quam in se actu naturali. — Homini tamen si assentianti supernatu- ralisisus Deus ex certa lege se cum Filio suo statuta gratiam confert, auxiliis, quibus ille credat ut oportet ad salutem. III. Hominiabus, qui ad filiorum Del dignitatem nondum pervenerunt, catenus facta est potestas, ut illi Del statutum, quatenus, si quantum in se est contentur, praesto ilius aderit Deus, ut fidem et gratiam consequatur. V. Deus sine ulla intermissione ad ostium cordis nostri stat, parasit sper conatus nostros adjuvare, desideransque ingressum. VI. Licet auxilium supernaturalis gratiae non sit simplicitern necessarium, ut liberum arbitrium assentiat actum mere naturalis ilium; sed tantum est, ut sanctum redhibatur prout oportet ad salutem; nihilominus quam seepiscipisse non solum confert, ut assensum eliciat, quals oportet, ut etiam ut simpliciter eliciatur. IX. Vocabit Dei interna ad fidem, interior excitatio fideliis quod poenitentiam et per gratiam praevenientem, et et illustrationem et auxilia, quibus justificat Deo adjuvantur, tum ut majora Spiritus incrementa percipiant, tum ne tentationibus succumbant,—pendet quam maxime a libero arbitrio ejus qui vocatur et excitatur.—Est enim rationi valde consentaneum, ut illum potius misericordie vocet et adjuvet Deus, qui paratus obediatur veritati illamque amplecti, quam eum, qui sinistra intentione ad audiendum accedat. X. Post hoc solis virtus naturalis liberii arbitrii et concursus generali Del eliciere actum absolutum mere naturalem dilectio Dei super omnia, quae ad justificationem nequaquam sufficiat, et pari ratione propositionem absolutum—piae Dei in omnibus. XII. Interim dum judicium rationis non absorbetur, — in arbitrio humano, spectato in statu naturae lapso, sunt vires sine speciali auxilio Dei,—ad non con- sentiendum in quocunque temporis momento culcunque gravi—tentatione, et ad superandam quacunque magnam difficultatem, quam pro servanda—lege naturali necessesit vincere; —ita ut, si consentiat, peccet, eo quod, seclino quocunque alio majori auxilio, in potestate ipsius, tamen si sine ingenti difficultate, possum est
of the older Jesuits became discontented both with the new General and with these manifestations. The Society was di-
non transgressi tunc legem. XIV. Triplicem scientiam oportet distinguishamus in Deo, nisi periculose in concilianda libertate arbitril nostri et contingentia rerum cum divi-
vina praesentia hallucinari velimus.—Unam mere naturalem; alteram mere libe-
ram; tertiam denique medium scientiam, qua ex altissima et inscrutabilis comprehen-
sione cujusque liberi arbitrii in sua essentia intuitus est, quid pro sua innata liber-
tate, si in hoc vel illo vel etiam infinitis rerum ordinibus collocaretur, acturam esset, cum tamen posset, si vellet, facere re ipsa oppositum (comp. Note 21). XV. Non video,
video, praeter auxилиum particulare gratiae praeeventiis et concursum Dei genera-
lem, necessarium esse auxилиum allud particulare gratiae, ut liberum arbitrium ali-
quem illorum acturum posset elicere (credendi scilicet, sperandi, et poenitendi ut
apotet). XVI. Nonnulli—duplexer auxилиum divinum constituunt, quodam efficax,
et quoddam sufficiens, veruntamen inefficax. Quod vero auxилиum efficac sit aut
inefficax, cense volla ratione tribuendum esse libero arbitrio,—quod,—si consen-
tiat et cooperetur ut potest, efficat illud efficax; si vero non consentiat, neque co-
operetur,—reddat illud inefficax; sed ipsi auxilio, sive Deo, efficaciter aut inefficac-
ter per illud moventi, tribuendum esse, quod liberum arbitrium consentiat, aut non
consentiat.—Certe non dubitarem, sententiam hanc hoc ultimo modo explicitam
rerorem in fide appellare. Etenim ea data non video, qua ratione libertas arbitrii
noltri salva possit consistere. The Dominicans especially attacked the Scientia Dei
Media (Serry, p. 535), with which Augustine had already reproached the Pelagians,
as scientiam illam futurorum contingentium dependentium a causalibera, ante ac-
tualem decretum divinae voluntatis, volentis vel saltem permittentis illa futura esse
vel futura absolute, vel futura sub conditione.

24 The Jesuit Henr. Henriquez, teacher of theology in Salamanca, declared de-
cidedly against Molina, and handed in severe criticisms upon him to the General
Inquisitor in 1594, and to the Pope in 1597; Serry, p. 101. Joh. Mariana, Jesuit in
Toledo, Des Defauts du Gouvernement des Jesuites, c. 4 (Mercure Jesuite, ii. 107),
on the other hand, gives a judgment about these matters on the ground of discre-
tion : Que dirai-je du livre de ratione studiorum, par le moyen duquel nostre General
au commencement de son Generalat pretendit, non seulement d’ordonner la police
de nos escholes, mais aussi la relgie de doctrine pour tous?—Le zele est donft bon,
mais la maniere d’y proceder estoit la plus estrange, qui se soit jamais entreprise en
compagnie quelconque. Il est fort mal aisé d’assujettir les esprits; mais lei spe-
ciallement d’autant que des quatre, qui furent choisis a cet effet, les trois estoient
mal propres. Ce qui en resulta, fut, que les provinces s’en ressentirent, l’inquisi-
tion s’y interposa, et interdit le livre. Et ce nonobstant, l’opiniastrety passa bien
avant: en quoi il se passa des choses indignes de personnes tant prudentes, qui
aussi ne doivent estre mises par escrito.—Ainsi la libert de avoir ses propres opinions,
nonobstant ce, est demuerue, et reste en son estat precedent. Dont sont procedees
plusieurs et ordinaires brouilleries et debats avec les Peres Dominicans, lesquels
nous devions plustost reconnoistre pour maistres. Je ne tairai de confesser, que
ces Peres la pourroient bien un petit moderer leur rigueur, comme aussi, que nos
gens leur avoient donne quelques occasions: mais tout se pouvoit excuser. Je ne
veux pas aussi refraichir la memoire de tous les differents, qui ont esté en grand
nombre. Je dirai seulement, qu’à l’occasion d’un livre, qu’escritit le Pere Molina
sur le sujet de la grace et du francoarbire, ces Peres la s’altererent bien fort, recou-
rurent à l’inquisition, et de là à Rome, là o enco a present le procés continue, et
se mene avec beacoup d’opiniastrety et de passion: et quand bien nous en sortis-
rions victorieux, ce qui est encore fort douteux, il aurit toujours cousté plusieurs
milliers, et l’inquietude de plusieurs annes. Je me souviens, qu’un personnage,
qui avoit quelque connoissance de ces choses, donna avis aux nostres, qu’ils se gar-
dissent de s’embarasser, ou s’engager bien avant en cette affaire, criuant ce qui
vided into two opposite parties. We know the grievances of both from the writings of John Mariana, the most important

est arrivé. Cela ne servit de rien. Car le General se trouva engagé à cause de la permission, qu'il avoit donnée d'imprimer ledit livre: et en ces quartiers de deça les jeunes gens faisoient le tout fort aisé. Le malheur voulut, que tant l'Assistant à Rome, que le Provincial en ces quartiers (par les mains desquels tout passa) estoient hommes sans lettres, fourrés dans ces charges par gens de meme humeur et gaillardisc.—At the instance of Spain, Clement VIII. called (1592) a General Congregation of the Order. The written complaints of the Spanish Jesuits then addressed to him are in the Mercure Jesuite, ii. 196; Tuba Magna mirum Clangens Sonum de Necessitate Reformandi Soc. Jesu, Argent. 1713, p. 400. Among other things: Nova quacdam miseria et concitati mala in nostra sodalitate qui negat, amens est aut caecus.—Cum quis est creatus Superior, nullum timet, facit quod vult, tractat subditos ut libet, obliviscitur obedienciae, humilitatis, paupertatis,—quia scit a nullo posse pri- vari praetura, praeclarum a Generali, qui ad conservationem suas Monarchiae pu- at expedire, ut Superiores dextrissime gubernent. Et licet sint insufficientes, scan- dalosi et perturbatores pacis, tamen Generalis vel non credit subditis, vel si credit, vo videatur fecisse malam electionem, pertinaxerit alius illos gubernare. Hinc est, quod tam multis coguntur egredi extra Societatem nostram, quia Generalis magis credit Superioribus mendaclum, quam allis veritatem.—Videmus cum magno detrimento Religionis nostra et scandalo mundi, quod Generalis, nulla habita ratione nec antiquitatis nec laborum nec meritorum, facit quos voit Superiores, et ut plurimum juvenes et novitios, qui sine ullis meritis, et sine illa experientia, cum maxima arrogantia praesunt senioribus et illis, qui diu laboraverunt et laborant in Ecclesia Del. Et denique Generalis, qui homo est, habet etiam suas affectus particulares, et cum affectuat erga aliquem, promovet illum, etiamsi vere indignus: et quia est Neapolitanus, mellioris sunt conditionis Neapolitani.—Licit Generalis habeat suas consiliarios, tamen non tenetur stare ipsorum consilio, sed est dominus dominantium, et facit quod voit, nullis legibus adstrictus, unde mortificat et vivificat, deprimit et exaltat quem voit, ac si esset Deus.—Sciit autem S. V. paucissimos esse Professos, inmo Constitutiones ordinant, ne multiplicentur Professi, quod an sit bene constitu- tum, videat S. V. Nam hoc est certum, quod pauci sunt contenti in Societate prae- ter paucos Superiores et Professos. Et si salt tem creandis Professis observaretur justitiam, —esse aliquo modo tolerandum: sed res dependet a beneplacito Generalis, qui homo est; quod quam sit indignum, nemo est qui non intelligat. Then follow proposals to limit the power of the General, and to change the Superiors every two or three years. From other provinces, however, came petitions to leave the Constitution unaltered (see Mercure Jesuite, ii. 293; Tuba, p. 406 sq.). The fifth General Congregation (Nov. 1593 to Feb. 1594), the first held while a General was living, was wholly on the side of the General, but was obliged to accept the Papal order to change Provincials and Rectors every three years. This Congregation, too, by the desire of King Philip II., conceded the renunciation by the Society of the use of several privileges in Spain, demanded by the Inquisition, and already acted upon by Aquaviva, viz. (Decret. XXI.) of the facultas legendi libros prohibitos; absolvendi ab haeresi in foro conscientiae; et exemptio, ne Nostri absque expresso Superioris sui consensu ac mandato ad quodvis munus—obeundum—adigi vel cogi possent. Hist. Soc. Jesu, P. V. t. ii. auct. Jos. Juvenco, p. 1 (lib. XI. Societatis domesticis motibus agitata ab anno 1591 ad 1608). Ranke, iii. 280.

26 Mariana, Discurso de las Enfermedades de la Compañía de Jesús, appeared after the death of the author, in Spanish, French, Italian, and Latin, Bordeaux, 1625 (in Spanish and French, as Discours des Defauts du Gouvernement des Jesuites, in Mer- cure Jesuite, t. ii., Genève, 1693, p. 1). The Jesuits have declared it to be spurious or interpolated; against this, see Serry, p. 116. Here appear the same complaints against the omnipotence and arbitrary rule of Superiors as in works named in Note
24. Besides this, chap. 3 (Mercure, ii. 100): Le gouvernement est fondé sur censures et syndications, qui est un fiel respuad par tout ce corps, qui lui cause une jaunisse universelle: d'autant que nul ne se peut fier de son frère, qu'il ne lui rende quelque mauvais office de mouchard et espion, et ne veuille aux despens d'autrui gagner les bonnes graces de ses Superieurs, et sur tout du General. Chap. 4: Des Troubles et Debats entre les nostres (p. 101), on les disturbances in Spain, occasioned by the mistakes of General Aquaviva in the appointment of Provincials and Rectors. Chap. 6: Complaints as to the lack of good teachers in the humaniora, whose power in the administration was too great, and that hence debts accumulated immoderately; p. 129: les debtes'sont telles, qu'elles nous accablent. Chap. 10: De la Monarchie. Nous sommes arrivés à la source de nos desordres et des degoustemens que nous experimentons. Singularis ferus depastum est eam. Cette monarchie, autant que je puis juger, nous accable, non en tant que Monarchie; mais en tant que non bien attemperée : c'est une best sauvage, qui degaste tout, et si on ne l'arreste, nous ne pouvons esperer repos. Chap. 11: Si le General seul usoit de ce gouvernement et Monarchie, la chose seroit tolerable, au moins ses maux n'en se- roient si grands. Mais le mal est, que les Provinciaux et les Superieurs immediats se gouvernent de la meme façon en leurs ressorts; estant absolu, sans qu'aucun les puisse retenir, ni empescher.—De là s'ensuit peu de contentement;—et pour mon avis, c'est une mesme chose, gouvernement sans contentement, et gouvernement fautif. Chap. 12: On establit es charges des jeunes hommes, peu lettrés et de petit fonds, non pourcuoi ils ont les parties necessaires; ains,d'autant qu'estans plus entremains et hardis, ils savent pateliner à propos et à temps.—La nation Espagnole s'est persuadée, qu'elle demeure pour tousjours excluse du Generalat. Et cette persuasion, vraie ou fausse qu'elle soit, ne peut qu'elle ne produise des mescontentemens, et de la desunion, d'autant plus que ça esté cette nation, qui a fondé la Compagnie. Chap. 13: Des syndications. Ce point des syndications, qui sont informations secrettes des fautes ou delits d'autrui, donnees au Superieur en secret, et sans preuve, et sans ont parler, a de trans-grandes difficultés.—J'ose bien assurer, que si on venoit à feuiller les Archives de Rome, on ne trouvera pas un seul, qui soit homme de bien; au moins d'entre nous autres, qui sommes estoignés, et ne sommes point connus du General. Car tous sont marqués, les uns plus, les autres moins. Chap. 14, p. 155: Il semble, que tout nostre gouvernement n'a autre but, qu'à couvrir les fautes, et à jeter de la terre dessus.—Et n'y a presque autres, sur qui ils exercent leurs rigueur et tranchans acerés, que quelques pauvres chétifs, qui n'ont ni forces, ni protecteurs. En autres choses et matieres un homme fera des grands maux et iniuités, sans qu'on touche seulement à sa robe. Un Provincial, ou Recteur fera choses fort indues,—le chastiment, qu'on lui donnera au bout de plusieurs années, sera, qu'on lui osterà sa charge, et encor le plus souvent meliore-on sa condition. Chap. 19: La Compagnie a des loix en nombre desmesuré: et comme ainsisoit, qu'il soit impossible de les observer, voire mesmes savoir toutes, on perd le respect à toutes. Il y a Constitutions, il y a Reigles, Decretes de Congregations, visites, et surtout ordonnances de Rome sans nombre et sans fin. Je puis bien assurer qu'elles passent des milliers. Chap. 20: Affaires en grand nombre chargent ceux de la Compagnie. Nostre Institut commande et embrasse grand nombre d'œuvres, prescher, confesser, missions, visites de prisons et d'hopitaux et de malades, enseigner le patenoste és lettres humaines et és plus hautes sciences, et en quelques endroits s'abaisser jusque là, que d'enseigner aux petits enfans à lire, et à escrire. Mais il y a d'autres affaires, fort ma propre, plus seculiers, qui se rangent à nous, outre les precedentes, sous titre d'œuvres de pieté. L'importunité du monde est grande: et comme ils nous assistent de leurs aumonies, ils veulent aussi, qu'eus leur assistions en toutes choses, en leurs mariaiges, à leur faire leurs testaments, à les favoriser en leur pretentions avec seigneurs, en leurs procés, és difficulties de leurs
of the Spanish Jesuits, and of the General Aquaviva, on the defects of the Society, and at the same time gain an insight into these internal dissensions. The Inquisition in Spain had already begun investigations against several Jesuits on account of errors in doctrine and carnal transgressions in the confessional, when Clement VIII. transferred all these cases to Rome, and appointed the Congregatio de Auxiliis, 1597, to decide upon the disputed dogmas. For a long time the Jesuits were threatened with an unfavorable issue; but yet they had been so useful to the Popes, and in any case they threatened to become so danger-

contes, avec juges; et nous tiennent occupés jusques à leur pourvoir de delices et plaisirs, ou des choses necessaires pour leurs maisons.—Par ce moyen nos gens se secularisent, et trottent plus qu'il ne faudroit hors de la maison.

Claud. Aquavivae Industriae pro Superioribus Soc. Jesu ad Curandos Animae Morbos, Romae, 1600; also in Corpus Institt. S. J., containing directions to the Superiors on the spiritual treatment of those under them, open here and there an outlook into the special relations of that period. Characteristic of the general spirit of the Society are the directions given to every Jesuit: Cap. VIII. 9. Si peculiari aliquo affectu, etiam naturali, et velut sympathy affici se erga aliquem sentiat; curat statim omnem extraordinarium communicationem abrumpere, et communi tantum caritate illum amplet(rix enim dici potest, quanta incommoda oblo- cutionum, detractionum, querelarum, delationum, suspicionum, inimicitiarum, conventicularum, munusculorum et similiom ex singulariet extraordinae communicacione oriantur), sed omnes uno spiritu complectatur. Cap. XIII. Tentatio contra Institutum et aliquot Regulas, quae non placent. Morbus his plane periculosus est, et valde curato difficilla, praesertim in antiquioribus. 3. Diet forte (infirmus), non probari sibi diversitatem graduum, professionis dilationem, tam amplam Superiorum potestatem, reddere rationem conscientiae, manifestationem defectuum et caeterorum per quemlibet, qui extra confessionem ea seiret. 9. Diet forte, non tam hac in Instituto et legibus Ignati, quam in praxi displicere ei, quod male a Superioribus practicentur. Cap. XV. Saecularitas et Aulicismus insinuans in Familiaritates et Grationem externorum. Morbus hic in Societate et extra periculosus est, et istor qui eum patiuntur, et nobis fere nescientibus paulatim subintrare, specie quidem licrificiendi Principes, Praefatos, Magnates, conciliandi ad divinum obsequium hujusmodi hominum Societati, juvandi proximos etc. Sed revera quaequis interdum nosipsoe, et paulatim ad saecularia defectum. 1. Attendenda igitur signa, quibus dignoscere possit. Ea autem inter cetera non obscure illum indicant, si quis frequentius illos adeat; si, cum abstinet, sentit desiderium praesentiae et congressus illorum; si corum rebus et negotiiis tanquam propriis se affici sentiat; si libenter ampletacta negotia saecularia; si Superiore inscio tractet; si hujusmodi Principes et Magnates sibi, non Societatii conciliet; si observantia et obedientia incipient illi sororizzare. 3. Aveullendi hujusmodi homines tempestive bono aliquo nomine: quia si incipient altiores radices extendere, non poterunt sine magna Principum offensione divelli.

Serry, p. 122 ss.

Clement VIII. was already inclined to decide against them (Serry, p. 570); the Dominicans published a draft of a Bull of Paul V. wholly in their interest (Serry, Append. p. 214). The Jesuits declared it to be a forgery; see Theodori Elenthorii (rather, Livini de Meyer), Hist. Controversiarum de divinae Gratiae Auxilliis, Antwerp. 1705, fol. p. 704.
ous to them in the future, that it was not possible for Rome to consent to their humiliation. Paul V. in 1607 reserved his decision, and then ended the matter by enjoining silence on both parties.\textsuperscript{29}

While the Jesuits were in this way severely attacked by Spain, they were still Spain's truest adherents in the contest with Queen Elizabeth of England and with the Huguenots in France; but thus, too, they became involved in other entanglements. For in these conflicts they not only made use of the mediæval notion of the authority of the Church over temporal rulers,\textsuperscript{30} but they also pressed the idea—advanced before this on the part of the hierarchy—that the rights of earthly rulers, being merely human, could be forfeited by injustice; and hence drew the conclusion that the highest temporal authority has its roots in the people, and is given by them to rulers, and hence can be revoked;\textsuperscript{31} and

\textsuperscript{29} The nuncios directed all ecclesiastical rulers, ne sitant imprimi in materia de auxilia, etiam sub praetextu commentandi a Thomam, aut alio modo: et qui volunt de hac materia scribere et imprimere, prius mittant tractatus et compositiones ad hanc sanctam Inquisitionem (Romanum). Serry, p. 786.

\textsuperscript{30} R. Bellarminus, De Potestate Summi Pontificis in Temporalibus adv. Guil. Barclajum, Romae, 1610 (Opp. VII. 287), precedes his work with a long list of Sententias illustrius scriptorum occidentalis Ecclesiae de potestate Papae in temporalibus.

\textsuperscript{31} Nicolas I.; see vol. ii. § 21, Note 12. Gregory VII.; see vol. ii. § 47, Note 2. R. Bellarminus, De Controversiis Christianae Fidei adv. hujus Temporis Haereticos (Ingolstadt, 1586, and often afterwards, sometimes in three vols., sometimes in four), tom. ii. Controv. II. lib. iii. De Laicis, ac potissimum de Magistratu politico, cap. 6: Hic observanda sunt alia. Primo, politicam potestatem in universum consideratam, non descendendo in particularis ad Monarchiam, Aristocratiam, vel Democratiam, immediate esse a solo Deo.—Secundo, nota, hanc potestatem immediate esse tanquam in subjecto, in tota multitudo.—Tertio nota, hanc potestatem transferri a multitudo in unum vel plures codem jure naturae.—Quarto nota, in particularis singulas species regimini esse de jure gentium, non de jure naturae: nam pendet a consensus multitudinis constituere super se Regem, vel Consules, vel alios Magistratus, ut patet: et si causa legitima adsit, potest multitudine mutare Regnum in Aristocratiam, aut Democratiam, et e contrario, ut Romae factum legitimus. Quinto nota, ex dictis sequi, hanc potestatem in particulari esse quidem a Deo, sed mediante consilio, et electione humana, ut alia omnia, quae ad jus gentium pertinent: jus enim gentium est quasi conclusio deducta ex jure naturae per humanum discursum. Ex quo colligitur duae differentias inter potestatem politicae et ecclesiasticam: una ex parte subjecti; nam politica est in multitudine, ecclesiastica in uno homine, tanquam in subjecto immediate: altera ex parte efficientis, quod politica universae considerata est de jure divino, in particulari considerata est de jure gentium: ecclesiastica omnibus modis est de jure divino, et immediate a Deo. In respect to the Pope, Bellarmin maintains, Controv. tom. i. Controv. III. lib. v. De Potestate Pontificis Temporalis, cap. 4: Papatam directe nullius loci esse dominum temporalem jure divino (hence, non esse dominum totius orbis, utlius provinciae aut oppidi, cap. 2). Against this, cap. 6: habere summam temporalem po-
that in the case of heresy it must be revoked.\(^\text{32}\) At the same time they revived the doctrine that tyrannicide is allowable.\(^\text{33}\)

\(\textit{testamentum indirecto, viz. Pontificem, ut Pontificem, et si non habeat ullam mere temporalem potestatem, tamen habere in ordine ad bonum spiritualia summam potestatem dispensuindice temporalibus rebus omnium Christianorum.}\) —Quantum ad personas, non potest Papa, ut Papa, ordinari temporales Principes deponere, etiam justa de causa, eo modo, quo deponit Episcopos, i.e. tanquam ordinarius judex: tamen potest mutare regna, et unì auferre, atque alteri conferre, tanquam summas Principes spiritualis, si id necessarium sit ad animarum salutem, ut probabilimus. Quantum ad leges non potest Papa, ut Papa, ordinari condere legem civilem, vel confirmare aut iufrmare leges Principum, quia non est ipse Princeps Ecclesiae politicus: tamen potest omnia illa facere, si aliqua lex civilis sit necessaria ad salutem animarum, et tamen Reges non velint eam condere, aut si alia sit noxia animarum saluti, et tamen Reges non velint eam abrogare. And even this theory appeared to Pope Sixtus V. as lowering the papal power so greatly that he had these books put on the Index: but immediately after his death the cardinals had them struck out. See Bellarmini Vita, \(\text{lib. ii. c. 7.}\)

\(\text{\textit{Guil. Alanus (above, § 28, Note 12), ad Persecutores Anglos pro Christianis Re}
\text{ponsio, 1582: Si Reges Deo et Dei populo fidem datam fregerint, vicissim populo non solum permititur, sed etiam ab eo requiritur, ut jubente Christi Vicario, suprema nimirum populi Christiani omnium pastore, ipse quoque fidem datam talis Principes non servet. Elizabethae Angliae Reginae, saevissimum in Catholicos sui Regni Edictum, cum Responsione per D. Andream Philopatrum (i.e. the Jesuit Rob. Persons), Ludg. 1593, p. 106: Hinc infert universae theologorum et jurisconsultorum schola (et est certum, et de fide), quemcumque Principem Christianum, si a religione catholica manifesta deferretur, et alios avocare voluerit, excidere statim omni potestate ac dignitate ex eis, tanquam Apostatae, haereticum,—hostemque ex hominum christianorum dominatu ejicere. Bellarmini Controv. tom. i. Controv. III. \(\text{lib. v. c. 7.}\) \textit{Aphorismi Confessariorum}, Auctore Emanuele Sa (Jesuit in Ghent, Coimbra, and Rome), Colon. 1590: these \textit{Aphorismi} teach the same doctrine; and although the Magisterium changed more than eighty passages in this Hand-book for Confessors, which was universally disseminated, these doctrines were not touched.

\(\text{\textit{Johannes Parvus; see vol. iii. § 118, Note 5. Eman. Sa, Aphorismi Confessor.}}\)

p. 363: Occupantem tyrannice potestatem quisque de populo potest occidere, si alius non est remedium, est enim publicus hostis. And the Jesuits held that Elizabeth of England and Henry IV. of France were occupantes tyrannice potestatem. 

So they defended the murder of Henry III. and the exclusion of Henry IV. from the throne. But when Chastel's attempt upon the life of the King was traced back to their influence (1594), the royal power was already strong enough to banish them from France. They now accommodated themselves to circumstances, took part with Henry IV., and did the most for his reconciliation with the Pope. Thus they gained the favor of the people.
of this king, and as he wished to have this powerful Order wholly on his side, he reinstated it in France (1603). But the Jesuits still adhered to these principles, and avowed them unre- servedly wherever they dared. In this way they came into constant collisions with the Gallicans, which hindered not a little their influence in France.

§ 60.

SHAPING OF SCIENTIFIC THEOLOGY AND CHURCH LIFE UNDER JESUIT INFLUENCE.

The Jesuit Order, which now determined the genius and life of the Church, made further invasions upon the sphere of morals, and forced their innovations into practice. In order to restore the confessional, neglected in many places, and to make

24 Ranke's Fürsten u. Völker, iii. 301.

25 A collection of passages by Jesuit writers on the murder of rulers is found in La Morale des Jesuites, extraite fidèlement de leurs Livres (par Nic. Perrault), à Mons, 1669, 12, iii. 285; upon lèsemajesté et régicide, see further, Extraite des Assertions dangereuses des Jesuites, vérifiés et collationnés par les Commissaires du Parlement (à Paris, 1769, 4.; 5ième ed. à Amstert. 1763, 3 tomes, 8.), iii. 256.

26 Mariana's work, De Rege et Regis Institutione (see Note 34), was circulated in Paris just before the murder of Henry IV. (see Mémoires de Sully) and was burned, June 8, 1610, by order of Parilament (D'Argenté, ii. ii. 12). Bellarmini Tract. de Potestate Summi Pontificis in Temporalibus adv. Guilt. Barcajam, Romae, 1610 (Opp. VII. 830), in which he developed his principles (see Note 31) more at length, was forbidden by Parilament, Nov. 26, 1610 (D'Argenté, ii. ii. 34). In defense of the Society appeared, Lettre Declaratoire de la Doctrine des Pères Jesuites conformes aux Decrets du Concile de Constance, par le Père P. Coton, de la Comp. de Jesus, Prédictateur ordinaire de sa Majesté, Paris, 1610, 12. Reply: Anticoton, ou Refutation de la Lettre Declaratoire du P. Coton. Livre où est prouvé, que les Jesuites sont coupables et Auteurs du Parricide Execrable commis en la Personne du Roi Henry IV. 1610, 12. Next appeared : Réponse Apologetique à l'Anticoton faite par un Père de la Comp. de Jesus, 1611. Against the assertion of this last work that Mariana on this point agreed with the Council of Constance and the Sorbonne, the Sorbonne published a Censura (D'Argenté, ii. ii. 37; where also later decisions against the Jesuits may be found).

themselves favorites as father-confessors, the Jesuits were very indulgent in the confession-chair: and for this purpose they adopted a very lax code of morals and had a large number of
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themselves favorites as father-confessors, the Jesuits were very indulgent in the confession-chair: and for this purpose they adopted a very lax code of morals and had a large number of

º Vinc. Filliucii Moral. Quaest. t. I. Tract. VI. de Contritione, cap. 7: Contritio, ut contra distinctur attritio, est detestatio de peccato quatenus est offensa Dei, et propter Deum summe dilectum, cum proposito non peccandi de caetero.—Attritio est dolor imperfectus de peccato, quotiens est offensa Dei, et propter Deum summe dilectum, cum proposito non peccandi de caetero.—Attritio, ut contritio, est detestatio peccati disponens hominem ad gratiam remotum et insufficiens, excepto cum Sacramento: est per se supernaturalis.—Attritio vero acquisita est naturalis. Cap. 8: Primo quero, an contritio cadat sub speciali praecesso. Respondo affirmativum, et quidem nomine contritionis intelligatur tam proprium contritio, quam attritio; et quidem substantia contritionis cum Sacramento non tenetur, quotiens insufficiens a certa post Trident.ideoque homo cum ea satisfecit quantum debuit.—Quinto quero, an contritio, ut praecipue urget contritionis obligationem, se habet ex jure peccatum commissum. Pro responsione suppono esse duplicem sententiam. Prima, quia in tempore, a quo contritio se habet, nudam habet contritionem, nec habet Sacramentum confessionis; secunda, quia non videtur in Sacramentum confessionis, nec in contritio, nec in praecesso.
peccatorum omnium. Septimo quaero, an requiratur certa intensio ad veram contritionem. Respondeo esse quatuor sententias. Prima, necessarium esse summam intensioen actus absolute, eam sollicitum, quam homo exhibere potest per constum sibi possibilem. Secunda est, debere esse summam comparative, i.e. ut homo doleat de peccato magis, quam de quolibet algo malo, et quam diligat quodlibet creatum bonum. Tertia, requiri certum gradum intensioen. Quarta, non requiri certum intensioen, sed sati esse substantiam actus contritionis. The first three opinions are rejected; the second, among other reasons, quia justificatus contritione ut quatuor, non possit diligere creaturam ut sex, alias peccare mortaliter; et ita pejoribus conditionibus esse quod non justificatus, quia possit amare ut sex vel septem, quia hic non dicere aliter praefeceret creaturam Creatore, quem nullo modo diligit; ille dicet, quia intensius amaret creaturam Creatore. Against the third: actui contritionis is proportionata dispositione ad gratiam, et non constat, Deum requere aliquem certum modum actus: ergo per suum substantiam sufficiet, quia minima gratia est sufficientes ad remissionem omnium peccatorum. Ad minimam gradum sufficit minima contritio, tanquam dispositio. Hence the fourth opinion is adopted, sufficeret subjectum actus contritionis, in quocunque gradu sit.—Quodcumque mortale tollit gradum, ergo quaecumque contritio tollit peccatum. 

Tract. VII. de Confessione, cap. 6: Primo quaero, an ad effectum sacramenti Confessionis, h.e., ad gratiam, sit necessarius aliquis dolor. Respondeo affirmative. Secundo quaero, quid dolor requiratur et sufficient ad effectum Sacramenti Confessionis. Respondeo et dico primo, requiri dolorem verum, seu attritionem veram. 

Et quidem quod non sit necessaria contritio, probatur ex communiore sententia Doctorum. Septimo quaero, an hic dolor debeat esse verus et realis, an vero sufficient existimatus. Respondeo et dico primo, probable esse, dolorem existimatum sufficere, modo oritur ex ignotantia inculpabilis. Primo constat auctoritate Doctorum, secundo, ratione. Dico secundo, probabilius videri, quod requiratur vera attritio; et non tantum existimatur. 

Cap. 12, No. 386: Non proponat Confessor difficultates multas in peccatis vitandis, unde poenitens consititatur in periculo non habendi efficacem propositionem in futurum. Satis enim est proposita generaliter peccati foeditatis, Dei bonitate, et pecculis damnationis, inducere poenitentem ad concipiendum generale propositionem non peccandam ampiam mortaliter. Tertium, non est necessae, ut Confessor sibi persuadeat, aut probabiliter judicet futurum, ut poenitens a peccato abstineat: satis est, quod existimat, poenitentem, quando est absolvendus, habere propositionem illud generale, quod diximus, quamvis illud sit per breve tempus mutaturas. 


An possit Confessarius poenitentiam omnino ibere faciendum arbitrio poenitentis impo-
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writers employed in expounding and developing their principles.⁴ They unfolded in particular the doctrine of moral Probabilism (which had, indeed, been before propounded),⁴ in such manner and measure,⁵ that while they condemned sin in general, yet in

₉₄ Ex Suaril sententia affirmo non semper requiri, ut aliquid opus in particulari injunegatur, praeßertim spiritualibus personis; sed sufficiere, si dicat: Impono tibi pro poenitentia quidquid hodie vel hac hebdomada boni feceris, vel mal passus fueris.—Quid, si (poenitens) affirmet, se velle purgatori poenas subire? Leveo poenitenti
tiam adhuc imponat (confessarius) ad sacramenti integritatem; praeçiuee cum ag
noscat grave sem non acceptatarum.

⁴ The most important moralists of the Jesuits: Franc. Toletus, Spaniard, Cardinal, d. 1596 (Summa Casuum Conscientiae s. Instructio Sacerdotum, Romae, 1603, and often). Emanuell Sa, Portugusee, in Ghent, Coimbra, and Rome, d. 1596 (Aphorismi Confessariorum, Colon, 1590, and very often). Thomas Sanchez, Spaniard, in Granada, d. 1610 (De Sacramento Matrinomal, 3 vols. Genuæ, 1592, and often; a work which the doctor of the Sorbonne Petrus Aurelius [Opp. Paris, 1646, II. 243], describes as opus non gloriamund, sed pudendum; tam immensi curiositate, tam invisa in rebus spurcissimis et infandis et monstrosis et diabolicis perseverandis sagacitate horrend

⁵ See vol. iii. § 118, Notes 7 and 12.

its particular manifestations they very frequently excused and palliated it. At the same time they so defined the difference between mortal and venial sins, and made such statements upon

secuiuir sententiam tutam et probabilem: Confessarius vero eandem speculative improba

biliem censet: potestne se accommodare opinioni poenitentis? Potest, modo sciat, illam
tanquam probabilis a peritis Doctoribus admitti. Imo ex Laymani sententia tenes

tur poenitentem absolvere, quia Confessarius non potest negare disposito absolutio

nem. Doctor potestus alteri consultari dare consilium non solum ex propriis, sed etiam

e x aliena sententia probabile, quas consulant fit favorabilior? Posse affirmo cum eodem

Laymano.—Potestne judez in ferenda sententia ex duabus probabilibus opiniones sequi,
quam maluerit? Castro Palao (Jesuit in Leon) respondet posse, imo sceluso scanda

lo modo juxta unam, modo juxta aliam judicare: satius enim juste et prudenter agit

sequens sententiam, quam ipse probablem agnoscit, nec quia secus est unum, altera

sua est apolipta probabilitate. Thom. Tamburini (Jesuit in Messina), Explicatio De

calogi, Lugd. 1659, lib. i. c. 3, Sect. 3, Note 8: Absolute puto cum Salas, Vasquez,

Sanchez, Merolla, Pasquier, saties esse in omnibus casibus, constare probabili, opinio

nem esse probablem.  

* That this tendency was developed very early in the Society is proved by the Co

logen Censura of 1560 (see above, § 59, Note 16). Here it is declared, fol. 44: Pecca

tum est non quicquid legi Dei repugnat, sed hoc proprioe vocatur peccatum, quod lib

bera voluntate, et a scientia committitur. Fol. 194: Quoam pecca, contra quae

ex tonat et fulminat, adeo sunt in se et per se levia, ut factores nec sordidos, nec

malos, nec impios, nec Deo exosos reddere possint.—illa quae lex consecutatur de

perfecta integritate ex toto corde, tota mente, tota anima, et omnibus virtibus, ita ut

nulla sit mala concupiscencia, ad nos, qui in hac mortalitate versamur, non perti

nent. Hence it is taught, legi plene et abunde a nobis satisfacere, si quantum in nobis


ad peccatum mortale requiritur? Plena et expressa adverterunt malitiae, aut saltem

dubium expressum. Nisi enim quis adverterat, opus quod geritis esse malum, vel mali

periculum adnexum habere, aut nisi formaliter dubitet, censeatur invincible inadver-
tentia laborare, quae non minus excusat a pecato, quam invinciblee ignotantia. Paul Laymann, Theol. Mor. lib. I. Tract. III. c. 6, No. 13: Supra monul, Tract. II.
c. 3, hominem nonquam peccare, nisi actualiter adverterat ad moralem malitiam ope-

res aut omissiones.—Idemque, quamvis rarius, etiam in loci locum habere potest, quae

per se mala sunt, ut animus in vehementc passionc irac und vel tristitiae adeo absorbem-
tur cogitatione commoditatis vel utilitatis, ut vel nihil omnino, vel valde tenuiter

attendat ad operis malitiam seu in honostatem: quo casu vel nullum, vel duntaxat

imperfectum ac veniale peccatum crit. Jo. Dicastillo (of Naples, taught in Murcia

and Toledo, at last Chancellor in Dillingen, d. 1637), De Justitia et Jure, caeterisq

ue Virtutibus Cardinalibus, libb. II. Antverp. 1641, lib. II. Tract. II. Disp. IX. Dub. 2,
No. 48: Furtum esse potest veniale ex indeliberazione. Quamvis enim, ut docet

Less., difficile videatur, furtum ratione imperfectae deliberationis esse veniale, tamen

alius qui contingere potest. Quidam enim ex consequedino ita sunt propensi et

veluti determinati ad furandum, ut rem auferant prius quam pleno adverterant quid

agant. Idem etiam contingere potest ex vehemente tentatione, praeceoptim in

estinatione, ubi non conceditur deliberatio. Georg. de Rhodes (of Avignon, d. in

Lyons, 1661), Disputationum Theologiae Scholasticae tom. I. Lugd. 1671, De Actibus

humanis, Disp. II. Quaest. II. Sect. I. § 2: Si quis committat adulterium aut honici-

edium, adverteret quidem malitiam et gravitatem eorum, sed imperfectissime tamen

et levisisse; ille, quantumvis gravissima sit materia, non peccat tamen nisi leviter.

Ratio est, quia, sicut ad peccatum requiritur cognitio malitiae, sic ad grave peccatum

requiritur plena et clara cognitio et consideratio illius.
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the sufficiency of repentance, that men’s minds were cradled in complete moral [carnal] security. 9

While the Jesuits were in this way perverting moral truth to an almost incredible extent, they at the same time fostered those tendencies in dogmatic theology which favored their aims. They elevated the Papal power above every thing, since their own rested on it. Their most skillful divine, Robert Bellarmine, taught them how to give a more attractive form to the mediæval doctrine on this head by seeming alleviations of it, and at the same time to hold it fast in essentials. In the Pope, it was said, with the highest spiritual is also united the highest temporal power. The episcopal authority, which at times threat-

7 See above, Note 2.
8 The Jesuits boasted that by their moral system they had made the way of salvation easier; Ant. Escobar, Universae Theol. Mor. receptores Sententiae, vol. i. lib. ii., Sect. 1, cap. 2, No. 22: Profecto dum video, tot diversas sententias in rebus moralibus circumferri, divinam reor providentiam fulgurare, quia ex opinionum varietate jugum Christi suaviter sustinuatur.—Superna providentia cautum, plures operationum morialium vias exponi, rectamque inveniri posse actionem, sive juxta unam, sive juxta alteram opinione homines operentur. Joh. Caramuel Lobkowitz, too, a Cistercian, Bishop of Vigevano, in Italy, d. 1682, who had appropriated the Jesuit morals, in his Theologia Moralis (Lovan. 1645, fol. p. 627), defended the Jesuit doctrine of Probability. To the objection that in this way the whole Decalogue was transformed into Sententiae Probabiles, he replied that this was not to be anticipated; but yet, if it should happen, that it would be fortunate, for then man would earn a great increase of grace, without being able to sin (Schröckh, iv. p. 111). Against this the distinguished Benedictine Jo. Mabillon, after speaking of the ancient Church, replies (Tractatus de Studiis Monasticis, lat. versus a Jos. Porta, Venet. 1729, P. I. cap. 7): Tunc itaque moralis doctrina purius ac sincerius expendebatur, nec tot tantisque dubbis metaphysicis, ut nunc, erat obnoxia; verum eo ex tempore ad tot speculaciones deuentum est, ut ex nimio ac immoderato ratiocinandi acumine nonnullum quam vel ipsa ratio desierit; quinimo non sine animi nostri moerore compertum est, Ethniconrum ethicen quorundam theologiae Summis aliquando fuisse pudori. Postquam plurimi liberrum sibi campum vindicarunt, de humanis actibus et peccatis disserendi, etiam Inconsultis sacris Ecclesiæ canonibus, eo devenit moralium opinionum relaxatio, ut nullum paene ex criminiis se sustaret, quin aliquo indulgenti colore calamistretur. Tantum igitur abest, ut Istorum Summarum studium ad christiana philosophiae consecutionem quaudantenus dirigit, quod potius ex libera ipsos legendi facultate non modicum sequatur detrimentum.—Fructus longe major ex Ciceronis de officiis lectione haeritur, quam nonnulorum Summistarum, qui praeter amplam doctrinarum ac ratiociniurum farraginem nil aliud saepius inerat, praeter quam molestias legentibus tricas, unde difficilime subinde emergunt. Numer qui rectior norma ad probabilitatem attingerat in Istorum Summis apparat, ea Tullii praeferat, in qua praescribit, ab his universim nobis cavendum esse, quae licita necne sint quodammodo dubitamus? Quocirca bene praecepit (inquit) qui vetant quidquid agere, quod dubite, aequum sit an iniquum. Aequitas enim tucet ipsa per se, dubilatio autem cogitationem significat injuria (De Offic. i. 9). Quot conscientiae casus, inquit egregius quidam Schollastes, ex isto solum principlo liquido resolverentur, si Christifideles hoc ipsum serio vellent animadvertere!

9 Jo. Ozorii (Spanish Jesuit, rector in Soria, d. 1594) Concionum de Sanctis t. III.
enened to be inconvenient to the Papacy, was represented as a mere emanation from the Papal; and councils were liable to


Angelus Rocca (Augustinian, and Bishop of Tagaste, in Rome, d. 1630), Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Commentario illustrata, Romae, 1591, p. 5: Cum Pontifex coronatur, capiti ejus tiara, quam regnum mundi appellant, imponitur, tribus constans coronis, trae potestates, h. e. imperatoriam, regiam et sacerdotalem, plenariam s. i. et universalem totius orbis auctoritatem, repraesentantibus. Corn. a Lapide (Jesuit in Louvain and in Rome, d. 1637), Comm. in Acta Apost. et in Epist. Canonicas, Lugd. 1627, in 1. Petr. 2, p. 227: Sacerdotalis regnum Ecclesiae imprima cernitur in Episcopis et Episcopatu.—Maxime vero idipsum cernitur in Summo Pontifice et Pontificatu, cujus summa et amplissima quaquaquaversum est potestas, totum orbem sese extendens, qua etiam Regibus imperat (unde et Regis se ei supremae prosterunt, sive auctoriae subesternunt), ac Reges Ecclesiae rebellis regno privati potestatem, uti sepe privavit. The Popes, too, laid claim to this power unreservedly: comp. the Bull of Excommunication of Sixtus V. against Henry of Navarre (Sept. 1585), in Thuanus, lib. 82. There is a copper coin of Julius III. with his effigy and the inscription, D. Julius III. Rex ac Pater. See Phil. Bonanni Numismata Pontif. Rom. i. 254. James I. of England once declared to Henry IV. of France that he was ready to recognize the Pope as the head of the Church if he would accept the power of the Pope over temporal rulers (see § 59, Note 31). The Sorbonne, 1613, condemned the work of the Jesuit Mart. Becanus, Controversia Anglicana de Potestate Regis et Pontificis, Mogunt. 1612 (l. c. p. 64): and with this the Parliament also condemned Bellarmine's Defensio Fidei Catholicae adv. Anglicanae Sectae Errores, Colmarae, 1618, and publicly burned the latter (p. 86).

So Lainez in Trent (see § 57, Note 15). Rob. Bellarminus, De Controversis Christ. Fidei, t. i. Tertia Controv. Generale de summo Pontifice, lib. iv. c. 29: Re-
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er. The Pope, on the contrary, was not only the infallible

stat postremo quas est de derivatione potestatis ecclesiasticae a Pontifice summo ad Episcopos caeteros. Scendium est, triplicem esse in Pontifice alicurque Episcopis potestatem. Unam Ordinis, alteram jurisdictionis interioris, tertiam jurisdictionis exterioris; quarum prima referatur ad Sacramenta conficienda et ministranda, altera ad populum christianum regendum in foro interiori conscientiae, tertia ad eundem populum regendum in foro exteriori. De prima et secunda non est quas est nostras, sed solum de tertia: nam de prima certum est apud omnes, illam aeque immediate habere a Deo Episcopos ac ipsum summum Pontificem. Confertur enim per quandam consecrationem, quae aeque operatur in uno atque in alio.—De secunda est quidem aliqua disensus inter auctores: nam Abulensis—existimat, hanc potestatem conferri omnibus sacerdotibus immediate a Deo, quando ordinantur.—At Joannes de Turrecremata—docet, hanc potestatem non conferri a Deo ex vi ordinationis, sed ab homine per simplicem injunctionem. Ambo tamen in eo conveniunt, quod usus hujus potestatis pendet a jurisdictione exteriori, et idae satis erit de illa exteriori agere.—Omnes in eo conveniunt, jurisdictionem Episcoporum saltem ingenere esse de jure divino. Nam Christus ipse ita ordinavit Ecclesiam, ut in eae sint Pastores, Doctores etc. (Eph. iv. 11). Et praeterea nisi ita casset, posset Pontifex mutare hunc ordinem, et instituere, ne ullassit in Ecclesia Episcopos, quod sine dubio non potest facere. At quas est, an Episcopi canonice electi accipient a Deo exam jurisdictionem, sicut eam accipit summum Pontificem: an vero a Pontifice. Sunt autem tres de hac re theologorum sententiae. Prima eorum, qui volunt, tam Apostolos, quam caeteros Episcopos immediate a Deo acceptisse et accipere jurisdictionem.—Altera est eorum, qui volunt, Apostolos non a Christo, sed a Petro, et Episcopos non a Christo, sed a Petri successor accipisse vel accipere jurisdictionem.—Tertia est media eorum, qui volunt, Apostolos quidem accipisse a Christo immediate omnem suam auctoritatem; tamen Episcopos non a Christo, sed a summum Pontifice sacram accipere;—qua sententia verisim ea est, et ideae breviter confirmanda. This proof now follows, e.g. cap. 25: Regimen ecclesiasticum est monarchicum,—ergo omnis auctoritas est in uno, et ab illo in alios derivatur.—Si habereont Episcopi a Deo suam jurisdictionem, non posset Pontifex illam auferre, aut mutare. Cap. 25: Dicuntur Episcopi succedere Apostolis non proprie, eo modo, quo unus Episcopus sit, sed duplici alia ratione. Primo ratione Ordinis sacri episcopalis. Secundo per quandam similitudinem et proportionem: quia nimirum, sicut Christo in terris vivente primo sub Christo erant Apostoli duodecem, delinde LXXII. discipull, ita nunc primi sub Romano Pontifice sunt Episcopi, post eos Presbyteri, inde Diaconi, etc. In France, on the other hand, Parliament and the Sorbonne held fast to the old Gallican doctrine (see § 58, Note 22). Thus the Sorbonne, Oct. 2, 1610, revived against the Jesuits the condemnation of the theses of Joh. Sarrazin (see vol. iii. § 136, Note 23, p. 331), and again insisted upon the propositions opposed thereto (D'Argentré, II. ii. 15), e. g.: I. Omnes potestates jurisdictionis Ecclesiae aliquae a papali potestate sunt ab ipso Christo quantum ad institutionem et collationem primarum, a Papa autem et ab Ecclesia quantum ad limitationem et dispensationem ministerialis. II. Hujusmodi potestates sunt de jure divino et immediate Instituta a Deo (viz. bishops and parsons).
source of orthodoxy, but also—a doctrine till then unheard—
could himself never lapse into heresy; indeed, he was so far
the lord of Christendom that sin itself, enjoined by him, would be
a duty. Thus he was elevated so far above the human sphere

13 Bellarminus, De Controv. t. i. de Rom. Pontif., lib. iv. c. 3: Summas Pontifex
cum toto Ecclesiam docet, in his quae ad fidem pertinent, nullo casu errare potest.
L. xxii. 32, is interpreted thus: quod Dominus duo privilegia Petro Imptetravit.
Unum, ut ipse non posset unquam veram fidem amittere, quantumvis tentaretur a
Dialobo:—Petro Dominus Impetravit, ut non posset unquam cadere, quid ad fidem
attinet. Alterum privilegium est, ut ipse tanquam Pontifex non posset unquam
docere aliquid contra fidem, sive ut in sede ejus nunquam inveniretur, qui doceret
contra veram fidem. Ex qubus privilegiis primum fortasse non manavit ad poste-
rors: at secundum sive dubio manavit ad posteros, sive successores. Cap. 4: Non
solum Pontifex Romanus non potest errare in fide; sed neque Romana particularis
Ecclesia.

12 Alb. Pighius (Provost in Utrecht, d. 1542), in his Hierarchiae Ecclesiasticae Ad-
sertio, lib. iv. c. 8, first maintained outright, Papam non posse fieri haereticum; and
the Auditor rotae Franc. Pegas. (d. 1612) says on this in his Comm. in Eymerici Di-
rectorium Inquisitionem, P. III. Qu. 25: Sententia satia probabilis videtur, et consona
rationi, et fortasse etiam antiquorum Patrum dicta. To the Jesuits was prescribed
this rule, Ratio Studiorum, 1586, p. 327: De facto nullum unquam Romanorum Pontifi-
cum fuisse haereticum prohibuit est, et a Nostris strenue defendendum: posse vero,
ut hominem et Doctorem privatum, haereticum esse, probable fact communlor
Scholasticorum opinio, licet contrarium satia pie credi possit. So too, Bellarminus,
De Controv. t. i. de Rom. Pontif. lib. iv. c. 6, and tries to evince this in what follows.

14 Bellarminus, De Controv. t. i. de Rom. Pont. lib. iv. c. 5, in proving quod non
possit Pontifex errare in moribus, says: Secundo, quia tunc necessario erraret etiam
circa fidem. Nam fidem catholicae docet: omnem virtutem esse bonam, omne vitium
esse malum: et autem Papa erraret praeipiendo vitia, vel prohibendo virtutes, ten-
retur Ecclesia credere, vitia esse bona, et virtutes malas, nisi vellet contra consci-
centiam peccare. Tenetur enim in rebus dubiis Ecclesia sequescere judicio summ;
Pontificlia, et facere quod illa praecepit, non facere quod illi prohibet: ac ne forte
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that he must be looked upon as a demi-god. As it was with the doctrine about the Pope, so the other doctrines assailed by Protestants were for the most part carried to excess. That the clergy were independent of the civil power was declared to be of divine right. Their celibacy was ordained by the apostles. The worship of saints, in the way most attractive to the rude multitude, was not changed, though this had been generally desired at the Council of Trent; the Immaculate Conception of contra conscientiam agat, tenetur credere bonum esse, quod ille praecepit, malum, quod ille prohibet.


11 Emm. Sa, Aphorismi Confessariorum, Colon. 1590, p. 41: Clerici rebellio in Regem non est laesae Majestatis, qua non est subditus Regii. Ferd. de Castro Palao (Jesus in Valladolid et Compostella), Opus Morale de Virtutibus ac Vititis, Part VII. Lugd. 1631 ss. i. 171: Per se et ex natura rei tam Clerici quam Laici transgredientes leges publicas puniri a Rege poterant: at ex privilegio et exemptione illis concessa a Christo, vel a Summis Pontificibus, puniri non possunt ab alicuius, quam ab ecclesiastico judice.


13 See § 57, Note 41.
Mary received increasing recognition. The shame which checked the system of indulgences for some time after the beginning of the Reformation vanished after Trent had spoken. To obtain money it had for a time been necessary to practice a certain degree of economy; but this being no longer the case, indulgences were granted with a prodigality never before known. Gregory XIII. ventured again to grant "privileges"

When the Spanish Jesuit Joh. Maldonatus was teaching in Paris, he censured the Sorbonne for exacting an oath in favor of the Immaculate Conception of Mary (see vol. iii. p. 388, § 145, Note 19): thereupon the Faculty assembled (Feb. 1575) and most of its members solemnly declared—se de fide tenere, b. Virginem conceptam esse sine macula originali. As this contradicted the Council of Trent (§ 55, Note 11), they got into a controversy about it with the Bishop of Paris. The Pope was called upon to decide, but gave no reply (D'Argentré, II. l. 448). At the beginning of the seventeenth century, the Minorite Franciscus a Sant Isgo, of Seville, came forward as the champion of the Immaculate Conception: he maintained that the Holy Virgin of Guadalupe bound him to this by the gift of a ring. There was the most violent contention between Franciscans and Dominicans, in which the Jesuits took sides with the former, while the people were fanatical for the Immaculate Conception; and thus sprang up perilous disturbances. The Jesuits here let out their hate against the Dominicans, stirred as it had been by the contentions—De auxiliis gratiae (§ 59, Note 27): see Serry, Hist. Congreg. de Auxiliis, lib. iv. c. 27, p. 766: Plebem confictum revelationibus ac miraculis, institutis festivitatibus et sodalitiis, vulgatis tabellis, numismatibus, libris, concionibus usque commoverunt fervidi susurrusone, ut Praedicatores in Castrorum penetralibus delitescre coacti sint, ne palam lapidibus appeterentur. Eoque perducta res est,—ut sacra Doctoris Angelici imago, per ljudibrium vili jumento superposita, per vicos, per fora, per compita circumducta fuerit, dementi lymphatoque insequente, ut Praedicatores in Claustrorum penetralibus delitescre coacti sint, ne palam lapidibus appeterentur. 

The affair became so dangerous that King Philip III. by a formal embassy implored the Pope to decide the controverted question (Legatio Phil. III. et IV. ad Paulum V. et Gregorium XV. de definienda Controversia Immaculatae Conceptionis b. Virg. Mariae, descripta per P. Fr. Luc. Waddingum, Lovan. 1624, fol.). But Paul V. did not dare to touch the disputed dogma in the face of the dreaded Dominicans: 1617 he merely decided (Wadding, p. 14) ut non audent in publicis conicionibus, lectioibus, conclusionibus, et aliis quibuscumque actibus publicis asserere, quod eadem beatissima Virgo Maria fuerit conceptacum peccato originali. Per contra, he strictly forbade the others, quod negativam opinionem, videlicet quod non fuerit concepta cum peccato originali, in praedictis publicis actibus asserentes, aliam opinionem non impugnent, nec de ea aliquo modo agant, seu tractent. This did not quell the disturbances, and Philip IV. sent a new embassy to Gregory XV. The latter extended the orders of his predecessor to private controversy as well (letter of July 28, 1623, in Wadding, p. 456), and only allowed the Dominicans ut de caetero in quibuscumque privatis eorum colloquis seu conferentis, inter se duntaxat, et non inter alios, aut cum aliis, de materia ejusdem conceptionis beatissimae Mariae Virginis disserere et tractare libere et licite possint. Therewith he expressly declared that the dogma remained undecided.

Besides the Inevitable Indulgences, the Crusade Bull for Spain (Amort de Origine, Progressu ac Fructu Indulgentiarum, Ang. Vind. 1735, fol. l. 79) and the Jubilees of 1555 and 1550 (Amort, l. 102), there are no others before the close of the Council of Trent: but after that the General Indulgences (p. 103) and the Minor Indulgences (p. 211) increase so rapidly that there were often several in a single year.
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to a given altar. The Jesuits especially were inexhaustible in discovering new objects of devotion: miracle-working images were constantly multiplying. To keep dangerous light away, not only were the Indices Librorum Prohibitorum set to work, but Indices Librorum Expurgandorum were also published, mutilating the ancient writings. Though the Fathers of the Church were in these Indices only indirectly purged, yet they were frequently falsified in new editions.

---

22 See vol. iii. § 147, Note 17, p. 397. The privilege of 1577 (Amort, II. 285): concedimus, ut, quoties quocunque sacerdos—ad altare, in quo—corpus s.Juvenalis quiescit, situm in cathedrali Ecclesia Narnensi, pro liberatione unius animae in purgatorio existentis celebraverit, ipsa anima—easdem indulgentias et peccatorum remissiones consequatur, quas consequeretur,—si praedictus Sacerdos hac de causa Missam ad altare situm in Ecclesia s. Gregorii de Urbe ad id deputatum celebraret.


25 First by order of the Duke of Alba, Index Expurgatorius Librorum qui hoc saeculo proderunt, Antwerp. 1571, often republished, e. g. cura Franc. Junil, Argent. 1609. Index Librorum Expurgandorum, Madriti, 1584. 4. Index Expurgatorius cura J. M. Braschelliani, Mag. Palat, Romae, 1607. Index Expurgatorius Inquisitiorum Lusitanicæ, Olsip. 1624. fol. Sentences and whole sections are noted to be struck out. Such erasures are often found in copies belonging to libraries of cloisters.

26 Viz. only Prefaces, Notes, and Indexes: but in the Indexes unpleasant passages are struck out, even when they are exactly taken from the Fathers of the Church. Thus the Index Expurgat. Antwerp., Argent. 1609. p. 8, would erase in the Index Frobenianus in Augustini Opera these sentences: Fides, non opera, justos ab injustis discernit; Fides sola justificat; mortuis nullam curam de vivis, etc. The Index of the Inquisition, ed. by Bernhard de Sandoval, Madrit. 1614, in the Index Operum Athanasii, commands the following words to be erased—adorari solius Dei est, although these are the very words of Athanasius. Less important ecclesiastical writers are corrected outright. Comp. the corrections in the Bibliotheca sa. Patrum collecta per Marg. de la Bigne in the Index Antwerp. p. 305.

27 This evil practice was indeed of older date. Erasmus complains of it in the
The real source of all these developments was the attempt to impose upon the whole Church the Jesuit principle of subjecting all minds to their yoke. For this the Jesuits labored everywhere, recklessly, arrogantly, lustfully for power, and using corrupt means. Thus they raised up against themselves many opponents even in their own Church, and especially in the Galli-
can Church. On account of their claim to a share in the cloisters given back by the Edict of Restitution (1629), the hostility of the older Orders against them was almost as great as that of the Protestants, against whom they waged unceasing


29 The bitterest complaints were made against them in the speeches in Parliament, July, 1594: Plaidoyé de M. Ant. Arnauld, Advocat en Parlement, pour l'Université de Paris, demanderess, contre les Jesuites Defendeurs, des 13 et 13 Juillet 1594, à la Haye 1594. 8 (extracts in Thuanus, lib. cxi. t. iii. p. 690), and in the address delivered July 13 by Louis Doll, in the name of the Paris pastors: D'Argenté, Coll. Judic. II. 1. 510. They were here accused especially for their political intrigues, kindling the Peasants' War in the interest of Spain, exciting to the murder of the King, and intrumulating the Papal principles in general; also of craftily obtaining inheritances, accumulating property, corrupting youth, infringing on the rights of curates, etc.

30 Sallig, Gesch. d. Augsbg. Confession, I. 810. Their most violent foe was Caspar Scelopius (from the Palatinate, became Catholic 1598, d. at Padua 1649). His writings against them are partly anonymous, partly pseudonymous, and thus many works are wrongly ascribed to him. His chief writings: Actio Perduellionisin Jesuitas, Jura sacri Romani Imperii Hostes, 1632. 4; Jesuita exenteratus s.1.et a.; Anatomia Soc. J. 1633. 4; Colloquium inter Paulum V. Papam, Philippum Hisp. Regem, et Ferdin. Archiducem Austriae, ex Jesuitarum Monacensium et Ingolstadiensium secretis Consilis Institutum, 1632; Mysteria Patrum Soc. J. 1633; Astrologia ecclesiastica, 1634. 4. etc. The Jesuit Laur. Forer, of Dillingen, was the chief defender of his Order against Scelopius.


32 The first weighty Protestant work against the Jesuits was Theologiae Jesuvitaorum praecipua Capita, ex quadam ipsorum Censura, quæ Coloniae anno 1560 edita est, annotata per Mart. Chemnitium, Lips. 1563. 8 (above, § 59, Note 16, § 60, Note 6). E. g. on their origin, B. 2: Sentit homo ille peccat et filius perditionis, coeptum jam illud esse, quod Paulus praedixit: Quem Dominus conficiet spiritu oris sus h. e. verbo suo, et videt reliquorum Ordinum quantumvis praepingentes, et crassos ventres non posse fulcire labascentem Romanam sedem, hanc maxime ob causam, quia illam partem regulæ Francisci, quæ se habet: necientes non curent litteras, omnes solita observant, ita ut Ordo fratrum ignorantiae factus sit etiam universals. Anima quotum non attendit Pontificem,opus esse regno suo novum creaturum. — Aggressus est igitur Pontifex, —opus esse regno suo nova creatura. — Aggressus est igitur creaturam, creationem hujus novi Ordinis, et in regna cavet, non esse onerandos immodi
cis ceremonias, sed adhibendas summa diligentia ad discendas litteras, ad cognoscenda studia literarum, ad evolwenda scripta veterum, ut erroribus et abusibus, ex verbo Dei toti jam mundo detectis, præsumus aliquam speciem onerionis lenocinio inducere, et nervos regni pontificii conservare discerner et conarentur, ut si usus percolanter jam in tanta Evangeliu luce regni pontificii igitur agitaret, ex illo Ordine possent tanquam emissarii in omnem terram submitti pontificis turpitudinis patroni. — Deinde animadversus est, et hoc in Germania praestertim, etiam illos, qui Pontifici jurati sunt, imo apostatas etiam, qui magna mercede conductitiam linguam Romanae sedi locarunt, quasdam in manifestis erroribus, et nimium crassa abusibus impro-
ly the most embittered strife. Among the innumerable works which appeared against them, the most remarkable are the apt satires entitled the Monita Secreta Societatis Jesu,33 and the Monarchia Solipsorum.34

bare, quaedam timidius defendere, de quibusdam imis modo et mitius, quam status regni pontificii faret, loqui, propter eam quod in Germania educati clarissimam Evangelii lucem etiam invenit sentiant in testimonium ipsius. Initis igitur in exordio hujus religiosis fuit haec ratio, ut in teneris annis puere, in quibus speces aliqua videretur ingeni, in hunc Ordinem cooptarentur, et procul a luce Evangelii, quod Dei benignitatem Germaniae affulit, Romam missi, ibi in medias abominationibus educa rentur, etiam infersent et formarentur; et postquam viderentur hisim visceribus imbiase abominationes et aperiret quae meretrici Babylonicae Apoc. 17. calices suo propinat, et satis esse charactere bestiae confirmati, ut tunc per Germaniam, tamquam locustarum exsertarum examina, disperserentur, si hoc forsan arte Germaniae posset rursus sub jugum pontificii reduci, et Ecclesialis lux illa, quae ex verbo Dei affulit, erit. —Tibi igitur, o Germania, et salutis tuae, Jesu virtutem secta principaliter in exordio sua creationis opposita fuit. Et res notoriam est, occuparunt enim Jam examina illa Austriam, obsederunt Bavariam, et recens invaserant magno strepitu Westphalian, et prospectam Jam de alvareis suis latius proferendis, et in illis quos occuparunt locis apertum ludum pro puere, etiam illis, qui prima literarum elementa discunt. Et ut multis ad auditoria sua alliciant, profitentur ibi non tantum theologica, verum etiam studia politiora litterarum, id quo consilio fiat, lector exillis quae diximus intelligit. Other Protestant works of this period against the Jesuits see in Walchii Biblioth. Theol. ii. 288. A collection of Catholic and Protestant works against the Jesuits was published at Rochelle, 1580: Doctrinae Jesuitarum Praecipua Capita, a doctis quibusdam Theologis—confutata, ed. 2, 6 voll. Rupellass, 1584. S. (comp. Salig's Gesch. d. Anges. Conf. ii. 178). Several Catholic writers, even Alzog, Ch. Hist. p. 913 (5th ed.), falsely ascribe to Calvin the declaration: Jesuitae vero, qui se maxime nobis opponunt, aut necant, aut, si id commode fieri non potest, ejectionem, aut certe mendacius ac calumniis opprimendi sunt. A most remarkable misunderstanding! This sentence is in the work of a Jesuit, Mart. Becani Aphorismi Doctoris Calvinistarum, ex eorum Libris, Dictis et Factis collecti, and there it is the 15th Aphorism (M. Becani Opera, Mogunt. 1649, fol. p. 888): but the author does not pretend to cite any Calvinistic writer as the author of this opinion: he only tries to prove, from occurrences in England and Holland, that it is a Calvinistic principle.

33 The first edition was: Monita Privata Soc. Jesu, ex Hispanico Latina Facta, Notobirgae (Cracow), 1612, cf. Gretseri Opp. xi. 1012. 1015. Hieronymus Zaborowski, Parochus in Godzicze, was subjected to a prosecution because suspected of having published it (l. c. p. 1015): of the result nothing is found in Gretser. A wholly new edition next appeared under the title Aurea Monita religiosissimae Soc. Jesu, edita a Theoph. Enalio, Placentiae in 4., without giving the year, for the “Turnati anno 1612” at the end refers to the Prosa, appended to the work. In this edition the Monita Privata are followed by Testimonia de Jesuitis; and at the end the Prosa in Laudem Jesuitarum. Another impression, Arcana Monita religiosae Soc. Jesu, Anno Dom. 1618. 8. adds an Appendix and a Dialogus. The Privata Monita alone are in the Anatomia Soc. Jesu, 1633. 4. p. 63, with the allegation that the Duke Christian of Brunswick found them in the Jesuit College of Paderborn. In Holland the book was several times reprinted, sometimes said to have come from the Jesuit College in Antwerp, sometimes to have been taken from an East Indian traveler. It is reprinted in the Fragm. Gesch. der vornehmen Mönchsoorden, vol. ix. Leips. 1782. p. 270: but the literary notices of it there given (p. 230 sq.) are largely incorrect. These Monita Privata underwent a recasting in the seventeenth century, in which the conclusion of the former editions is made the Prose, several chapters are dif-
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§ 61.
MISSIONS OF THE JESUITS.

The first Jesuit missions sent from Portugal were established in the possessions of that empire beyond the seas, in East India and Brazil, and thence were more widely propagated. As the Jesuits in this field of labor showed themselves more adroit than other missionaries in the use of existing relations, and more unscrupulous in the choice of means, they had here likewise greater, but also more dubious success.

Francis Xavier labored from 1541 in Goa, the chief city of the Portuguese East Indies, supported by the government, with great results. In 1547 he went to Japan, and there converted many, in spite of the resistance of the heathen priesthood. He died...
on a journey to China, in 1552. In the latter country the first missionary, 1584, was Matthew Ricci, who, by his mathematical attainments, obtained the favor of the higher classes, and overcame the prejudices of the Chinese against foreigners in general by accommodating himself to their customs and peculiarities, and especially by proclaiming Christianity to be the completion of the teaching of Confucius.

---

Venet. 1645. 12 (also in the Tuba Alters majorem clangens Sonum, Argent. 1715. p. 660). On the name, see cap. 4: gloriantur Solipsi, se mundum instar sollis illuminasse, mortalis anima, in signum pacis et foederis sempterni cum coelestibus, inspeditur, denique humanum genus verse sapientiae sole conditivae. Cap. 5: Solipsos Europaeis singulos soles esse, tot mundis illuminantis idoneos; Monarcham tamen super omnes milie mundis regendis, illustrandis parem esse, idque totum unius vocabuli Solipsorum mysterio contineri. Caspar Scioiplius was at first reputed to be the author, then for a long time the Jesuit Melchior Inchofer, who died at Milan, 1648. It was more probably Clemens Scotti, who long time a Jesuit, afterward left the Order and died in Padua, 1669. See Niceron's Nachrichten von berühmten Gelehrten, xxii. 221.

---


---

Caspar Scioipius was at first reputed to be the author, then for a long time the Jesuit Melchior Inchofer, who died at Milan, 1648. It was more probably Clemens Scotti, who long time a Jesuit, afterward left the Order and died in Padua, 1669. See Niceron's Nachrichten von berühmten Gelehrten, xxii. 221.
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Venet. 1645. 12 (also in the Tuba Alters majorem clangens Sonum, Argent. 1715. p. 660). On the name, see cap. 4: gloriantur Solipsi, se mundum instar sollis illuminasse, mortalis anima, in signum pacis et foederis sempterni cum coelestibus, inspeditur, denique humanum genus verse sapientiae sole conditivae. Cap. 5: Solipsos Europaeis singulos soles esse, tot mundis illuminantis idoneos; Monarcham tamen super omnes milie mundis regendis, illustrandis parem esse, idque totum unius vocabuli Solipsorum mysterio contineri. Caspar Scioipius was at first reputed to be the author, then for a long time the Jesuit Melchior Inchofer, who died at Milan, 1648. It was more probably Clemens Scotti, who long time a Jesuit, afterward left the Order and died in Padua, 1669. See Niceron's Nachrichten von berühmten Gelehrten, xxii. 221.
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rumque tegmen certis distinctum, quae propriae sunt literatorum notis (a picture see in Du Halde, Description de la Chine, iii. 87). Ricci used his high connections
for Christianity, p. 521: Id maxime in convivio patuit, in quo cum de christianis sa-
cris sermonem, velut alid agens, iniecerat, eaque confirmaret ex ipsorum Sinensium
libris, quorum locos plurimos et bene longos expedite recitabat, haerebant admira-
tione deftixi. Then, p. 525, the doctrine of Confucius was set forth, which the Jesu-
its made their starting-point. P. 530: In his Confucii effatus, caeterisque annui
vi scriptis, et auctoritate momentum ingens et lumen P. Matthaeo Riccio paratum
erat, quod tenebris occupatas et libidinibus mentes illustraret. Tum ea tanti viri
commendatione id assequatur, ut magnam ab eruditis omnibus inretr gratiam, et
eos ad suscipiendam christiana sacra procliviores habet. At last Ricci succeeded in
going to the Emperor in Pekin, 1601, and gave him pictures of Christ, Mary, John
the Baptist, and others, two clocks, a map, a musical instrument, etc. (p. 531). He
had to stay there to keep the clocks going (p. 533). An example of the confession
of faith as prescribed and exacted is that of a mandarin, p. 540: Ego Li, christianae
legis discipulis, cum toto pectore compлектor, et sublatis in coelum oculis Domi-
ni coel orquae soque, mei ut verba placiadas aures accommodet. Agnosco, me,
upote qui nilii hac tumus de sancta, quae nunc profiteor, lege ad divinam, neque
ullos ejus vidislum praecones, vitam coelestium rerum experiar, instar mutae pecu-
din in errore tenebrsibus duxisse. Incidi non ita pridem, singulari Del beneficio, in
Occidentis magni doctores doctos, morum probitate insignis, Matthaeum Ricci et
Didacum Pantoyam: ipsi me legem Christi docuerunt, ipsi ejus ostenderunt igni-
num, quam debito cultu sum veneratus. Hic mihi primus fult gradus ad cognitio-
nem Patris mei coelestis, ac divinae legis, quam mortalis sanctitate vera impendis
dedit.

Possunmne illum non magni aestimare, non omni cura et contentione servare? Cum
nihilominus intelligam, in multis me et gravior lapsum esse per annos, quos
explevi, quatuor et quadraginta, summum gentis humanae patrem obtestor, ut pro
sua misericordia meorum mihi scelerum, quae contra justitiam, integritatem, casti-
moniam, idem, caritatem admisi, ac al quid alid verbo vel tacita cogitatione impie,
temorae, turpiter, inique, sciens ac prudens, imprudensve peccavi, veniam dignetur
imperti. Nunc enim sancte polliceor ac denuncio, me statim atque novam a sacro
fonte vitae hausero, daturum operam diligenter, ut pristinos mores emendem, et
facta mea, sermonem, consilia exigam ad normam divinae legis, decemque precepto-
rum, quibus illa maxime continetur, a quibus ne transversum quidem unguem disce-
dere certum mihi ac deliberatum est. Nuncium remittoprofani et scelelari saeuli
moribus, placitis et erroribus: quicquid cum divina legem pugnau, horreo ac detestor.
Unum peto, Pater creatorque hominum Deus, ut hunc tironem tuum in hac sancti
oris, quam ingredior, vita evia rudem et imperitum, coelesti luce collustres; qua
cognoscam, quicquid acceptum tibi sit, et cognitum amplectar: donec aevi mortalis
emensus iter, consequi te, vita in coelo bonis frui possim. Simul orai illud, per te
mih in ejusdem divinae legis tuae cognitioem vocare quosque potero, ac tantae felicitatis socios quamplurimos, more atque exemplo tot Christiano-
rum tibi unice docitorum, adsiscere. Fave mei votis, arundarium Numen, nec pre-
cantis famuli tenetatem aspere. Christiety is essentially only the adoration of
the One God as taught by Confucius (see p. 552: Negabat (Riccius) religionem, quae
unum sine consorta Deum doceret, peregrinam esse: hanc proelbat fasile a Sinensi-
bus philosophis et eorum principe Confucio traditam, sed obliteratam paulatinum
temporum vitio: restitui tantummodo a Christianis et instaurari, additis de Christo,
quae Confucius, quingentes ante Chrismum annis natus, rescire non potuerat:)- and
the Jesuits, when attacked by the idolaters, worshipers of Fo, made appeal to this
point (p. 540)—idem sentire Literatos, qui religionem apud Sinas velut arbitri sunt.

Their first church in Nankin bore the inscription (p. 555): Deo Opt. Max. primum
templum publice dedicarunt. It must be confessed that there is a certain similari-
bility between the relation of the Jesuits to the Chinese philosophy and that of the
first Christian philosophers in the second century to the Greek philosophy (vol. i.
This Christianity in Chinese garb was widely diffused under the guidance of the Jesuits, who had as mathematicians great honor at court.

This process was also imitated by the Jesuits on the Malabar coast. As long as the missionaries paid no heed to the distinctions of caste, Christianity was here confined to the lower castes, and the nobles were disinclined to it. But when the Jesuit Robert Nobili, 1606, began to separate himself as a Brahmin carefully from the lower castes, and to permit the new Chris-

§ 53). Yet the latter had its roots in the whole education of these early Christians, while the Jesuit scheme was invented as a means of training, and was merely an accommodation for a time. The positive part of Christianity, under this Jesuit training, was chiefly in the cultus, and could be apprehended by the Chinese literati only in a symbolical sense.

§ 51. Yet the latter had its roots in the whole education of these early Christians, while the Jesuit scheme was invented as a means of training, and was merely an accommodation for a time. The positive part of Christianity, under this Jesuit training, was chiefly in the cultus, and could be apprehended by the Chinese literati only in a symbolical sense.
tians to practice many of the earlier heathen customs, the Jesuits found favor also with the Brahmins and the higher castes.

These missionary methods were at first disallowed even by the Jesuits in Europe. But when the Franciscans laboring in
Madura complained of them in Rome, and after the Dominicans, who came to China in 1631, made the same complaints, the whole Jesuit Order put itself on the side of its missionaries;

sentés au Souverain Pontife Benoit XIV. sur les Missions des Indes Orientales, par le P. Norbert, Capucin (t. iv. Luques, 1745), i. 20: Evangelium Christinon eget coribus et simulationibus; et minus quodem est ut Brachmani non convertantur ad fidem, quam ut Christiani non libere et sincere Evangelium praedicent. Christi crucifixi praedicatio stultitia gentibus, et Judaeis scandalum erat, sed nonideo divus Paulus et easter Apostoli Christum crucifixum praedicare liberrime desliterunt. Nolo de singulis articulis disputare, sed illud omittere nequeo, imitari superbiam Brachmanorum, videri mihi e diametro pugnare cum humilitate D. N. J. C., et certos ritus observare valde periculosum fidel. Afterward Bellarmine had to succumb to the decision of his Order: see Juvenicus, p. 506.

* On these contentions about the so-called Malabar Usages, see Mémoires par Norbert (above, Note 7), and the same further elaborated in the Mémoires Historiques sur les Affaires des Jésuites avec le Saint Siége, par l'Abbé C. P. Platel (Norbert), à Lisbonne, voll. vii. 1766. 4. The substance of these complaints is in the Mémoires par Norbert, i. 12: Ces nouveaux venus commencèrent à construire deux Eglises, une pour les Castes nobles, l'autre pour les Parreas: et en conséquence on défendit à ces derniers de venir se mêler avec les premiers, fut-ce même à la table de la Communion, ou au tribunal de la pénitence. Les fonts baptismaux dès-lors ne furent plus communs.—On chassait honteusement de l'Eglise les nobles les personnes de la Caste des Parreas. On refusait d'entrer dans la maison de ceux-ci pour leur administrer les derniers Sacrements. On exigeait, qu'ils apportassent sur le seuil de la porte les morbidons, qui demandoient ces secours spirituels (Les Pères Jésuites en administrant l'extrême Omission aux Parreas, prenoient un petit instrument pour appliquer l'huile sur les parties du malade. Ils se donnaient bien de garde de les toucher. Un tel tact chez les Indiens est une souillure). On se prétoit aux mariages des enfants à l'âge de sept ans, aussi bien qu'à la publication des marques de la puberté d'une fille. En un mot, il n'étoit plus guere possible de faire quelque difference entre les mariages des Chrétiens, et ceux des Gentils. Un Crucifix, l'image de la Sainte Vierge, qu'on plaçoit au milieu de l'endroit des cérémonies, faisoit presque toute la distinction. Les épouses chrétiennes portoient au col comme les payennes la figure du Dieu Poullear. Les Sacrements ne s'administroient plus selon les cérémonies observées dans toute l'Eglise. On omettoit l'insufflation, la saliva, le tact immédiat, et certaines octions. On imposoit aux enfants Indiens, qu'on baptisoit, les noms de certains faux Dieux connus, et adorés parmi leur nation. Les Chrétiens Malabares, dont la plupart vont dans les rues publiques sans être seulement à moitié habillés, paroissent dans nos Eglises en présencedu s. Sacrament, la tête couverte d'une toque formée d'une pièce de toile fort longue à la maniere des Turcs. Les Chrétiens comme les Gentils portoient en tout temps de la cendre bénite fait de'excremens de vache sur le front, et sur les autres parties du corps, dans l'intention d'effacer par-là leurs péchés. Ils récitoient les uns comme les autres les mêmes prières, en prenant les bains, qui sont d'usage dans les Indes. Un Chrétien des Jésuites aurait crû se souiller de manger avec les Capucins. P. 11: On disoit publiquement: voilà les Chrétiens des Capucins, voilà les Chrétiens des Jésuites.  

* On these complaints, see Theatre Jesuitico (by the Spanish Dominican Idefonso a Sancto Thoma), Coimbra, 1654, and the Tratados Historicos, Politicos, Ethicos y Religiosos de la Monarchia de China, por el Fr. Domingo Fernandez Navarrete (Spanish Dominican), 3 t. Madrid, 1676. fol. The most significant parts of these works are translated in the Morale Pratique des Jésuites (8 tomes; t. i. published as early as 1699; several times reprinted, e. g. in Amsterdam, 1746), t. ii. vi. vii. The Dominicans and Franciscans, on account of their opposition to the national customs, were
and there sprang up the long and weary contentions about the Malabar and Chinese usages, which the Jesuits declared to be civil customs, while the other missionaries said that they were religious and heathenish. In Rome the Jesuits at first made

banned from China in 1633, and betook themselves to the Philippine Islands. The General Procurator of the Jesuits in China and Japan, Barthol. de Roboredo, defended against their attacks the course of the Jesuits in China, 1638; the Dominican Antonius de Sancta Maria, who had labored in China, at once responded: both works are in Navarette, ii, and in part translated in the Morale Pratique des Jesuites, vi. 66 sq. Roboredo gives the first complaint thus: Ils disent, que c'est une coutume inviolable en la Chine, que dans toutes les provinces il y a differens temples et fort somptueux de dieux morts depuis long temps. Qu'en quelqu'un de ces temples de la parenté s'assemble deux fois l'an, pour offrir des sacrifices solennels avec un grand appareil de ceremonies et d'autels, et à l'un desquels est l'image de celui qui a été le chef de la race, avec des cierges allumés, et parfums, des fleurs, etc. Qu'on désigne une fois l'an ceux, qui doivent être les ministres de ces sacrifices, qui sont comme parmi nous le Prêtre, le Diacre, le Sous-diacre, et beaucoup d'autres; qu'on offre dans ces sacrifices de la chair, du pain, du vin, des cierges, des parfums. Qu'on y joint des prières où l'on demande la conservation de la vie, la santé, la prospérité en ce monde et en l'autre, en se mettant à genoux devant ces images, et baisant la terre en signe de reverence; qu'ils font les mêmes sacrifices dans leurs maisons, aux tombeaux de leurs ancêtres avec la même intention de les honorer et leur faisant les mêmes prières. The Jesuit expressly declared that these allegations were true: ce qu'ils ajoutent est vrai aussi, que les chrétiens vont aux dits temples et aux dits sepulchres, et qu'ils rendent les dits honneurs à leurs ancêtres, pour éviter la peine et l'infamie qu'ils encourraient, s'ils ne les faisaient. Et néanmoins ce que font ces chrétiens dans ces temples et à ces sepulchres à l'égard de ces défunt ne sont pas des idolatries ni des superstitions. Viz. p. 69: Les Chinois usent de deux sortes de ceremonies pour honorer leurs parents morts. Les unes sont propres à la secte des Lettres, et celles là sont purement politiques, qui n'ont pour but que de rendre à leurs parents morts un honneur purement civil. Les autres sont prises de la secte des idoles, et celles là sont superstitieuses. Nos Pères expliquent dans leurs catechismes, quelles sont les politiques, dont on peut user pour temporiser avec les gentils, et quelles sont les superstitieuses, et pour celles là, on ne les doit jamais pratiquer. Nous ne les distinguons pas ici pour éviter la prosélytisme. Nous disons seulement, que les gnaudlications, les inquisitions du corps et de la tête, se prosterner en terre, les parfums, les fleurs, les choses à manger, etc., que les Chinois tant gentils que chrétiens offrent en l'honneur des défunt, sont choses indifférentes et politiques, et honnêtes civiles, que cette nation a accoutumé de pratiquer envers les vivans, comme nous faisons même en Espagne, quand nous avons à recevoir chez nous quelque hôte de grande qualité. The opponents show in reply (p. 71) that the worship is idolatrous, that these worshipers expect all sorts of happy effects from it: and the Dominicans Jo. Bapt. de Morales and Anton. de S. Maria assert on their priestly word that they have seen heathen and Christians equally taking part in such a cultus, and a learned Christian serving as the priest. The second objection refers to the reverence paid to Confucius, and is thus stated by Roboredo, p. 77: qu'il y a eu à la Chine, il y a tres long temps, un Philosophe moral, qui y est estimé que dans toutes les villes il y a des temples, qui lui sont dédiés, où les Mandarin qui en sont Gouverneurs doivent faire deux fois l'an des sacrifices solennels, dont le Mandarin est lui-même le prêtre; et entre ces deux-là d'autres moins solennels.—Qu'on offre dans ce sacrifice (outre le pain, la Morisqueta, le vin, les cierges, les parfums et les fleurs) un mouton entier, et une piece de tafetas ou de satin, que l'on brûle. The opponents of the Jesuits main-
known only some of the Malabar usages, and these were allowed, with some restrictions, by Gregory XV., 1623. On the other

tained that this reverence of Confucius had for its object de lui rendre graces de la bonne doctrine, qu'il leur a enseignée, et de le prier comme un homme très saint qui peut beaucoup auprès du Dieu d'en haut, à côté duquel ils croient qu'il est assis, afin que par ses mérites il leur obtienne toute sorte de bon esprit, de sagesse et d'entendement.—Ils ajoutent que les Chrétiens baptisés par nos Pères font toutes choses pour temporeriser avec les Gentils, et pour empêcher qu'on ne parle mal de la loi de Dieu, en mettant une petite croix entre des fleurs ou des feuilles, à laquelle ils dirigent leur intention,—ils évitent le péché de scandale à l'égard des fidèles, et la peine que leur pourroient faire les infidèles, s'ils n'avoient pas satisfait à cette loi. Le Jesusit concède que les alleged facts are true, only he denies that they expected any benefits from Confucius, and that Christians brought to the service a cross where-to pay homage to Confucius: and he maintainsthat this reverence is an estime politique and an honneur civile, but not a sacrifice superstitieux. The third charge is thus given by Roboredo, p. 83: Ils disent, que dans toutes les citéz et les villes, qui ont un Gouverneur, il y a des temples bâtis et dédié à une Idole nommée Chin-Hoan, que les Chinois croient être d'office le gardien de ces villes: que c'est une loi établie dans le Royaume, que les Mandarins qui en sont Gouverneurs, sont obligés avant que de prendre possession de leur charge, et ensuite deux fois tous les mois, sous peine de privation de leurs gouvernemens, d'aller â ces temples, de se prosterner et s'agenouiller en mettant devant le front contre terre devant l'autel de cette idole, et de lui offrir en sacrifice du pain, des morisqueta, du vin, des cierges, des parfums. Ils mettent tout cela sur cet autel, et ils font serment de se bien acquiter de leur charge. Ces Religieux ajoutent, que les Mandarins Chrétiens font toutes ces choses, qui sont des superstitions et des idolâtries, par la permission de nos Pères, qui le enseignent que pour s'accommoder aux infidèles, et ne point scandaliser les fidèles, ils doivent mettre une petite croix, ou de bois ou de papier, cachée sur l'autel entre les fleurs, ou peinte sur les cierges, à laquelle ils rapportent les adorations, que les Gentils font à l'idole, et que parlà ils évitent le péché d'idolatrie, et ne perdent point leur Mahardinat. The reply of the Jesusits: Nous répondons, qu'il est vrai, qu'il y a des temples dédiz à cette Idole Chin-Hoan, et que les Mandarins Gentils, selon qu'il leur est commandé par la loi du royaume, font ces sacrifices et ces prières. Mais pour les Mandarins Chrétiens conduits par nos Pères, ou ils ne les font point, s'ils s'en peuvent excuser, ou ils apportent une croix, qu'ils mettent sur une table (i.e. on the altar of sacrifice) à découvert, à laquelle ils rapportent leurs adorations et leurs prières. Et les Gentils sachant, qu'ils sont Chrétiens, voient bien, que c'est à cette croix, et non à l'idole, qu'ils dirigent leurs adorations et leurs prières, et ils ne privent pas pour cela de leur Mandarinat. In the Theatro Jesuitico the Jesuits are reproached thus (Morale Pratique des Jesuites, li. 11): Ils dispensent les Chinois de tous les commandemens de l'eclige, viz. fasts, annual confession and communion, hearing mass on festivals and Sundays. P. 13: ils ne donnent aux femmes ni les onctions du baptême, ni le Sacrement de l'extrême-onction, because the Chinese from jealousy allowed no contact with women. P. 15: ils justifient les plus exorbitantes usures, comme de trente pour cent. Afterward, the most prominent charge made was that the Jesusits called God Thian (heaven) and Thian-chu (lord of heaven), expressions borrowed from the literati. [The word Shin was used in all the earlier Protestant versions, Morrison, Milne, and Marshman, but it is strongly opposed on account of its too great generality. See Rev. S. C. Malan, Who is God in China, Shin or Shang-te? Lond. 1855. Jas. Legge, The Notions of the Chinese concerning God, Lond. 1852, and Legge's Chinese Classics, 1867. Bluntschli, Altasiatische Gottesideen, 1866.] Of the numerous vindications of the Jesusits, see especially, Daniel (a Jesusit), Recueil de divers Ouvrages, ill. 1.

10 The Bull Romanae Sedis Antistes, Jan. 31, 1623, in the Mémoires par Norbert, I.
hand, the Chinese observances were forbidden \(^{11}\) by Innocent X. in 1645, and allowed by Alexander VII. in 1656.\(^ {12}\) But the controversies about them were not ended until a century later.

Portugal had before this time endeavored to bring the monophysitic Abyssinians into political and ecclesiastical subjection by supporting the tottering throne. Jesuits from Goa went there in 1556 to work for this object. The Emperors showed themselves by turns favorable or the reverse, according as they needed, or could dispense with, the Portuguese aid. In 1642, Seltan Saghed, by a general persecution, brought Romish Christianity in that region completely to an end.\(^ {13}\) A short time before, it had been exterminated in blood in Japan, where it was very widely diffused, and this country was, after 1637, wholly closed to foreigners.\(^ {14}\)

To Brazil, also, many Jesuits went from Portugal in 1549, to

---

\(^{11}\) See the Responsa sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide confirmed by the Pope, upon seventeen questions submitted by the Dominicans, in Navarette, i. 451.

\(^{12}\) See the new Responsa of the same Congregation to questions of the Jesuits, in Navarette, i. 460. 1. Missionaries were allowed to dispense from fasts, observance of festivals, and annual confession and communion. 2. It was determined, ex gravi necessitate, propter posse omittam Sacramentum in baptismate foeminarum, ac etiam posse omitti ipsum Sacramentum extremae unctionis. 3. The ceremonies at the conferring of the learned degrees, and the inclinationes more Sinico in honor of Confucius, were sanctioned, qui avidetur cultus esse civilis et politicus (the Jesuits had asserted that the Aula Confuci was a gymnasium, and not a temple proprie dictum, and that, as was in fact the case, there was no acting Sacrificulus, vel ex idolatria secta Minstrellus). 4. On the usages in honor of the dead, it was determined, in reference to the Jesuit descriptions of the same, posse tolerari, Sinas conversos adhibere dictas caeremonias erga suos defunctos etiam cum Gentilibus, sublatis tamen superstitionibus. Posse etiam assisterent tantum cum Gentilibus, quando agunt superstitiones, praeceptum facta fidei protestatione, et cessante periculo subversionis, et quando altera odia et inimiciliae vitaris non possint.


labor as missionaries among the cannibals; and there had such success that in 1586 they were called to the neighboring Spanish Paraguay. These Jesuits then began to work with great success among the contiguous free Indian tribes, who had until then been hunted by the Spaniards in their forests like wild beasts. That they might educate their new converts without hindrance in accordance with their plans, they placed them, by permission of the King of Spain after 1610, in reservations (Reducciones), in which, separated from all Spaniards, they kept them under the exactest oversight, instructed them in agriculture and handicraft, and gathered them into a social state which they lauded as a model Christian community. These Indians certainly attained to a good degree of external culture, and led an orderly

---

17 Comp. P. F. X. de Charlevoix (Jesuit), Histoire du Paraguay, à Paris, 1756. 3 t. 4.; another edition, Paris, 1757. 6 t. in 12. The Jesuits were established chiefly among the Guaranis, Indians. The description of their Reductions (Reducciones) see in Charlevoix, 1, 233 (12mo ed. ii. 84). In each Reduction there were generally two Jesuits, the pastor and an assistant: the former directed every thing. The Caciques were allowed to retain their high standing: besides these, there were chosen from the Indians the usual Spanish magistrates, Corregidors, Regidors, and Alcaldes, but they could do nothing without the permission of the pastor. The men able to bear arms were enrolled, and drilled every week; their weapons, when not in use, were kept in the arsenal. Magistrates and officers had fine uniforms. Every family had a small farm to gain the necessaries of life; but most of the land was held as property of the community (possessiones Dei), which was tilled by all (especially those under sentence). Its produce was deposited in the public magazines, and was used for the support of churches and clergy, officers and soldiers so long as in service; for the payment of tributes, the needs of the community, and making good the losses of bad harvests. Sales from these magazines were of course made in commercial places to supply their other needs. None but the native language was allowed, and no foreigner, especially no Spaniard, could come into the Reduction. There were two schools for children: in one they were taught to read and write (Spanish and Latin—without knowing the languages), in the other music and dancing. Many Indians copied writing admirably, and could sing hymns—without understanding a word. Young men were instructed in all sorts of arts and handicraft, with wonderful success in the way of mere imitation. The vices of the Indians were indolence, gluttony, and drunkenness, joined with entire carelessness about the future. They were kept to strict labor: the women had to spin silk and wool. They were always under the inspection of the missionaries or of overseers appointed by them. In their warlike expeditions the missionaries went with them. By night the Reductions were always patrolled. The punishments were prayers, fasts, imprisonment, lashes, public penances. The church and its services were splendid: much was done for music and singing, for which the Indians had great aptitude. Before service and during processions dancing was carried on. Fraternities were formed by age and sex, and these had their own religious services, in which special instructions and warnings were given. The common worship was restricted to masses, vespers, and telling of beads: but the Christian creed was sung every day by the children, and the catechism taught. Public entertainments in the shape of singing
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life. But they were not permitted to rise above this stage. They remained children in mind, and in absolute dependence on the Jesuits. Complaints were soon made against the Jesuit missionaries that they not only tried to supplant the missionaries of other orders, and to make themselves independent of and dancing were also arranged. These Reductions gradually grew into handsome cities. They had straight streets, houses all alike, in the centre a large plaza, on which were the church, the residence of the clergy, the arsenal, magazine, workshops, and the houses of refuge for widows and women whose husbands were away. The Indians accepted the sovereignty of the King of Spain, and after 1649 every man of them over eighteen had to pay to him a dollar a year as tribute. This tax, however, was provided for out of the profits of the magazines, and so the Indians knew little of this sovereignty, as no Spaniard was allowed in their Reductions except in the train of the governors of the provinces or of the bishops, who came very seldom, but were then received with great ceremonials, to impress these rulers favorably. In the commercial intercourse with cities, Indians accompanied the expeditions; but a Jesuit was always at the head, who kept the closest watch, and prevented all intercourse between the Indians and the Spaniards. The Jesuits have always taken pains to glorify these settlements as copies of the first Christian congregations, and as the model of a Respublica Christiana. A description in this sense is the work of L. A. Muratori, Il Christianesimo Felice nelle Missioni di Padre della Compagnia di Gesù nel Paraguay, Venez. 2 tom. 1743 and 1749. 4.; but it is taken from the letters of Father Cataneo, for Muratori could not get any other reports and documents from the Jesuits. (See the Life of J. F. S. Muratori, p. 90.)

It is to be considered that the Indians, constantly supervised, and working only under direction, must lose all mental activity; that they learned to read and write only in languages which they did not understand, and that it never occurred to the Jesuits to train the more capable ones for missionaries and teachers. They educated at least three generations of the Guaranis, one after another, and yet they imparted so little self-reliance to these Indians by their culture, that when the Jesuits were removed they fled for the most part back into the forests, and began again the life of their ancestors. After the suppression of the Jesuit Order [in Portugal, 1759; by Pope Clement XIV. in 1772], these missions were spoken of almost always either with excessive praise or extreme reprehension. The favorable side is exhibited in P. Wittmann’s Die Herrlichkeit der Kirche in ihren Missionen seit der Glaubensspaltung (1841), i. 29; and the same writer’s Allgem. Gesch. d. kathol. Missionen, ii. 427. In some later Protestant reports (e. g. B. F. Tietz, Brasilianische Zustände nach gesandtschaft. Berichten, Berlin, 1839, p. 77; more unprejudiced, M. Bach, Die Jesuiten u. ihre Mission Chiquitos in Südamerika, herausg. von Dr. Kriegk, Lpz. 1843), the protection which the Jesuits procured for the Indians against the barbarities of the Europeans, and the Jesuit institutions, are emphasized with one-sided praise. Not less one-sided have been the reproaches made against them, especially violent in a work said to have been left behind by Father Ibagnez, an expelled Jesuit (transl. in Le Bret’s Magaz. zum Gebrauche der Staaten- und Kirchengesch. ii. 359, entitled The Jesuit State in Paraguay). It is most frequently objected to them that they intended to found an independent state. It was never a secret that these Reductions internally were quite independent of the Spanish governors, and that their dependence on Spain was essentially recognized only in the tribute, and in giving aid in war. Circumstances made it necessary that the Jesuits should here exercise the highest civil and penal jurisdiction (Le Bret, ii. 406): there were indeed no capital punishments, but crimes deserving death were punished by the fearful penalty of imprisonment for life in irons, until the General of the Order
the bishops, but also used their missions for lucrative mercantile transactions for the advantage of their Order.

§ 62.

NEW ORDERS.

In the founding of the New Orders the object constantly in view was to remedy the defects in Christian knowledge and alleviated it (Le Bret, ii. 418). But the Jesuits could not have intended to establish a wholly independent kingdom, for this would have made it impossible for them to exist in Europe. The Jesuits also commenced similar missions in other parts of America; other orders followed their example, and, after the abolition of the Jesuits, took their place. The judgment of a keen and unprejudiced observer, who abode for some time in several of these missions, is of weight: see Alex. von Humboldt's and A. Bonpland's Reise in die Aequinoctialgegenden, etc. 1799–1804, 6 Thl. Stuttgart. 1815–1829. Humboldt saw the missions of the Capuchins and the Franciscans in the provinces of Barcelona and Guiana (a general sketch, in the above work, vol. v. p. 325). The general arrangements are just like those of the Jesuits, only the similar struggle to be free from governors and bishops (iv. 670) had not been successful; and the Spaniards and the Spanish language, in spite of the best efforts of the missionaries, were not so far excluded, nor were the industrial pursuits of the Indians so far developed, as in Paraguay. Humboldt grants that the missionary institutions had made the Indians attached to landed property and fixed abodes, and given them a desire for a milder and more pacific way of life (ii. 180), and he also praises the cleanliness of their houses (ii. 35). On the other hand, by their monotonous, carefully watched, and less active way of life, they had forfeited their strength of character and native cheerfulness: they had a sombre and reserved look, were stern, quiet, and joyless; in short, they had become obedient but stupid (ii. 4, 187, 194). Like all Indians, they were indifferent to religious opinions, but had a great love for forms of worship—not alone the Catholic, but secretly for those of their old cultus (ii. 180). Nothing could be said of any higher intellectual culture among them than among the free Indians: they were rather kept in an uncivilized state, and the effects of these institutions must become more corrupting the longer they were continued (ii. 5). Humboldt strongly urges the renunciation of this irrational attempt to transplant the regimen of the cloisters into the woods and savannas of America. The Indians should be left free to enjoy the fruits of their own industry without limiting their natural freedom at every step, and the monks who were to labor among them should be trained in the mission schools (iv. 503).

* In Japan they opposed the Franciscans and Dominicans. In 1615 a Franciscan, Louis Sotelo, was appointed bishop of a part of Japan, but the Jesuits would not allow it, and on his landing he was taken prisoner and burned: see the letter of Sotelo, written from his prison to Pope Urban VIII. 1624, in La Morale Pratique des Jésuites, ii. 108, and the report of the Dominican Diego Collado, to the King of Spain, 1631, ibid. p. 303: comp. vii. 169. The Bishop of Angelopolis, in Mexico, Joh. de Palafox, got into controversy with the Jesuits, 1647, was excommunicated by them, but justified in Rome: he died as Bishop of Osma in Castile, 1655, in the repute of sanctity (Hist. de Dom Jean de Palafox in the Morale Pratique, vol. iv.). Also Hist. de la Persecution de deux Saints Evêques par les Jésuites, l'un Dom Bernardin de Cardenas (Bishop of Assumption, the chief city of Paraguay, who, in controversy with the Jesuits from 1646, was several times driven away), l'autre Dom Phil. Pardo (Archbishop of the church of Manilla, who opposed their legacy-hunting and traffic, and hence was banished by Royal order, 1683, but restored, 1684). See La Morale Pratique, t. v. **The Jesuits, to justify themselves, appealed to the Bull of Gregory XIII. Ez De-
Christian life among the people, and for this purpose to educate a new clergy, inspired with insight and zeal. Philip of Neri, after the pattern of the first apostolic Church, endeavored to awaken new interest in behalf of the poor and the sick; and, also, along with the mechanism of the regular Church service, to enkindle a more living worship in houses of prayer (Oratoria). He founded

b) Pastoralis Officii, Non. Aug. 1582 (Litterae Apost. quibus Institutio, Confirmatio et varia Privilegia continentur S. J., Antv. 1635, p. 200), in which was conceded to them facultas quosvis contractus emptionum, venditionum,—necon omnium obligationum et cessionum quorumlibet rerum temporalium, mobilium et immobili—celebran di. Anton. Arnauld already says in his Plaidoyé, 1594 (§ 60, Note 29, f. 40: Le grand vaisseau Jésuite, qui porte leur or et leurs marchandises des Indes (car ils tirent de tous costez, à fin d’augmenter leur tresor de Rome et d’Espagne) ce grand vaisseau, dis-je, ne paye point de quint au Roi Philippe. Ce qui leur vaut plus de deux cent mille escus tous les trois ans. Urban VIII. forbade in the Bull Ex Debito Pastoralis Officii, Feb. 22, 1633 (in the Bullaria), Religiosius omnibus cujuscunque Ordinis,—etiam Societatatis Jesu, in Japan, China, and the East Indies, omnem et quamcumque merca turam, seu negotiationem, under penalty of severepunishments. Clement IX. was obliged to renew this prohibition in the Bull Pastoralis Officii, June 17, 1669: in particular he denied the sufficiency of the pretext of necessity for their missions, by which this traffic was excused. The Jesuits admitted that they disposed of a part of the proceeds of the possessions Desi: on the sales of skins, Paraguay tea, cotton, honey, wax, etc., see Ibagnez in Le Bret, ii. 389. A part of this went to the needsof the mission; the excess was at the disposal of the General, and he insisted upon the greateeconomy in the missions (ibid. ii. 421). That no treasures were found at the missions when the Jesuits were suppressed does not prove, as the friends of the Jesuits have often inferred, that the Order did not profit largely by the traffic of the missions.


2 Comp. the account of Caesar Baronius, who was one of the first and most eminent members of the Society (Ann. Eccl. ad ann. 57. No. 162): Divino plano consilio factum est, ut nostra seate, antee annos XXX. ad ejusmodi apostolici conventus for maga, ex parte, ex potissimum, quae ad audientium sodificationem ex rerum divinarum sermonibus comparata, ad profectum Ecclesiaeperagimandavit Apostolus, in urbe fuerint instituta; opera in prims R. P. Philippi Nerili Florentini, qui tanquam sapis architectus posuit fundamentum, et ejus in Christo alumnis, fideliter institutum, et ejus Anglicanis, et ejus Franciscanis, et ejus Dominicanis, et ejus etc.

Horum igitur studio et industria institutum primitus fuit, ut per singulos ferme die, qui ardentior studi christianarum vitam excolerent, ad oratorium S. Hieronymi (in an oratory fitted up under the roof of the church of St. Jerome) convenirent (ex eo namque et nostro collegio nomen est inditum, ut Oratorii congregatio dicetur), ubi hoc ordine religioso haberetur conventus: Praemissa in primis silento facta precatione, ex fratibus aliquis lectionem auspicaretur, ad permovendos animos ad pietatem accommodatum. Inter legendum etiam idem qui praeecessit Pater solutis esset interiori qui, eadem quae dicta essent, accuratus explicando, amplificando, et ardenteri studio in audientium corda insinuando, interdum etiam aliquidum ex fratibus, quid de aliquis re sentirent, rogando sententiam, in modum fieri dialogi sermonem ad horae spatum magni audientium alacritate perduceret. Ejusdem iussu postea suggestum gradibus sublimiorem concenderet ex fratibus aliquis, qui ex vitis Sanctorum probatis atque receptis, divinaque Scripturae, ac sa. Patrum sententiis absque fuco vel pigmento intextum orationem haberet. Qui huius succederet, eodem plane
for this end the Congregatio Oratorii (1564), without imposing vows on its members. After this pattern, Pierre de Berulle founded an association with the same name for France in Paris (1611). Both these congregations are distinguished for their services to theological learning. Vincent de Paula established in Paris, for missions among Christians, the Congregation of the Priests of the Mission, or the Lazarists (1624), to which, being a great friend of the Jesuits, he gave a Rule formed on theirs.

dicendi genere, sed diverso argumento sermonem diceret. Denum tertius his acce- deret, qui historias ecclesiasticas ordine temporum dispositas enarraret. Quibus
dimidia horae spatios singulis ad dicendum concesso, mira audientium utilitate pa- riter et voluptate perfecit, cantato hymno ac repetitis iterum precibus, jam con- ventus absolveretur. Rebus igitur in hunc modum dispositis, et Romani Ponti- fices auctoritate firmatis, visa est pulchra illa conventus apostolici facies pro ratione temporum reddi : cui adgaduentes probo omnes, complures ex ipsa induis mutuati exemplum alia in locis eadem pietatis officia instituere ac propagare conatis sunt.

COMP. the daily service in Wittenberg, Note 4, and in Zurich, Note 26.

* Until then the priests who took part in the exercises of the Oratory had lived separate in different relations. In 1564, Philip first united several of these priests in a cloister for the service of the church of John Baptist, given him by the Florentines. Baronius was the chief of them. Philip remained at the church of St. Jerome, and there alone the exercises of the Oratory were continued, until, in 1574, he built a house with an Oratory by the church of St. Jerome, and there collected his whole congregation (Raynald, 1564, No. 5).

* Confirmation of the Congregation by Gregory XIII. 1575, in Aub. Miraei Regulae et Institutions Clericorum in Congregatione viventium, Antverp. 1688. 4. p. 78. The Institutio Congregationis, Romae, 1612. Ibid. p. 79. See cap. 3: In Ecclesia nostra, die Sabato ad vacandum excepto, quatuor quotidie, nisi etiam dies festi sint, cum aliquis tantum unus sermonem solet e Sacerdotibus nostris, qui fuerint ad hoc oneris numerisque defecti, ordinata successione, verba ad vulgi praelimator captum accommodantes, et ad nullam prorsus pompan vel vanum populi applausum declinantes, genere dicendi vere fructuoso audientium animos pascunt, Sanctorum praesertim exemplis ac probatis historias sermonem confirmantes. Vitandae enim sunt eis quaestions difficiles, dogmatum tractatus, et quaeque scholas magis quam Oratorium.—Sermonibus absolutis sacer concentu musico canitur hymnus.


* See the Rule of the Lazarists compared with the Regulæ Communibus of the Jesuits, in Le Bret’s Magazin f. Staaten. u. Kirchengesch. I. 273.
Angela de Brescia formed in Paris (1537) a society of young women, devoted to St. Ursula, for the care of the sick and the instruction of poor girls. These at first, like the Tertiaries, continued to live on in their families; and later, a part of them were united in a common life. After the first Ursuline cloister was founded in Paris, 1612, the order of nuns thus formed spread rapidly. For the instruction of boys the Spaniard Joseph Calasanz founded the Order of the Piarists (Patres Piarum Scholarum) in 1622, which also was soon generally introduced. Francis of Sales (see above, vol. iv. p. 242, § 13, Note 16) founded in 1610 an order of nuns, called the Ordo de Visitatone Beatae Mariae Virginis, which had for its special duty the care of the sick.

The prescriptions of the Council of Trent as to the forming of congregations were but slowly carried out by the older orders, and often apparently. A brilliant exception was the Benedictine Congregatio S. Mauri in France, which began on a small scale in 1618, but afterward, under its General, Gregory Tarisse (1630–1648), with the powerful aid of Richelieu, received a strong impulse. It encouraged to an unusual degree learned studies in its cloisters, and gave to the distinguished

---

8 Pragm. Gesch. vi. 303.
10 Pragm. Gesch. vi. 159.
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scholars which it trained the necessary means and appliances for the most comprehensive literary labors. In the historical sciences they rendered incomparable services. This Order comprised more than one hundred and eighty cloisters: its chief seat was the abbey St. Germain des Prés in Paris.

FOURTH CHAPTER.

HISTORY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SCIENCES.


§ 63.

While Erasmus could merely invite the Catholic theologians to a more thorough knowledge and correct interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, the latter were forced, by the attacks of the Reformers and the knowledge of the Bible which was gaining ground among the people, to occupy themselves more earnestly with these subjects. The Cardinal Thomas de Vio Cajetanus (d. 1534), the most distinguished among the scholastic theologians of the day, already felt this after his colloquy with Luther at Augsburg in 1518, and now commenced to study the Holy Scriptures with a strict sense of truth. Another cardinal, Jac.
Sadoletus (d. 1547), furnished, in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, a model of a tasteful and impartial exegesis. And thus we find in the Catholic Church, during the sixteenth century, much active effort for the publication of authorized texts of the Holy Scriptures, as well as for their interpretation.

It was necessarily of particular importance to this Church to preserve the Vulgate, which was at that time much corrupted, with an amended text, and to see it more widely spread. The printer Robert Stephanus, of Paris, was first instrumental in furthering both objects by the issuing of eight editions; then, at the suggestion of the Emperor Charles V., the Theological Faculty of Louvain, by its editions of 1547 and 1573, the latter of which was largely made use of in the revision of the Sistine Vulgate under Clement VIII.

The Complutensian Polyglot edition was succeeded by the more complete one of Antwerp, of 1569–1572, in eight volumes, which had been prepared by Benedict Arias Montanus; upon this followed the Paris edition of 1629–1645, which was still richer. It was in nine volumes, and was published at the expense of the Parliamentary advocate Guido Michael le Jay.

Although the doctrine of a manifold interpretation of the Holy Scriptures was retained in the Catholic Church, it was yet
deemed necessary, in consideration of the Protestants, to lay particular stress upon the verbal sense in the Commentaries. The Dominican Santes Pagninus, of Lucca (d. at Lyons, 1541), who rendered great services to theological literature by his study of Hebrew, issued a Latin translation of the Bible, which was highly valued for its verbal accuracy, although, on that very account, it was often incomprehensible. Johannes Maldonatus (Paris and Rome, d. 1583), one of the few Jesuits who maintained his independence in the Society, became eminent as an exegete. A model of grammatico-historical exegesis was furnished by Andr. Masius, councilor of the Duke of Cleves (d. 1573), in his Commentary on the Book of Joshua.

After the establishment of the text of the Vulgate by Papal decree had put a limit to the Catholic interpretation, the exegetical zeal among the Catholics abated in the seventeenth century. The diffuse Commentaries of the Jesuit Cornelius a Lapide (in Louvain and Rome, d. 1637), abounding in allegorical interpretations, became particularly popular, however little value they had for genuine interpretation of the Scriptures. On the other hand, Joh. Morinus, priest at the Oratoire in Paris (d. 1656), like his contemporary Cappellus of the Reformed Church, appeared as a liberal critic against the prejudices in favor of the Masoretic text of the Old Testament.
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On the field of dogmatics the scholastic theologians, particularly Petrus Lombardus and Thomas, retained their theological authority, but the scholastic form was abolished. Melchior Canus (Dominican in Salamanca, d. 1560) became, by his Locoi Theologici, an introduction to dogmatics, the originator of a new method. Augustine and Thomas, indeed, remained nominally the highest dogmatic authorities; in reality, however, this position was held, at least in that portion of the Church which was under the rule of the Jesuits, by the Jesuit and cardinal Robert Bellarmine (d. 1620).

A great deal was done by Catholic theologians to make the ancient Church literature more generally known, as it had a peculiar theological interest for them, and they in particular had


17 Commentaries on Lombardus, by Johannes Major, Prof. in Paris and Glasgow (d. 1540); Dominicus Soto, Dominican and Confessor of Charles V. (d. 1560); Wilhelm Estius, Chancellor and Professor of Theol. in Douay (d. 1613). St. Thomas was chiefly commented by Jesuits (comp. S 59, Note 13 sq.), particularly Molina, Valentina, Suarez, Vasquez, Becanus, Tanner.

18 Loci Theol. Salmant. 1563, and often. Schröckh, iv. 66. M. Cani Opera, illustrata a P. Hyacintho Serry (Prof. in Padua), 1759. 4. His opinion of scholastic theology, Loc. Theol. lib. viii. c. 1: memento lector, eam me defender scholae doctrinam, quae se titulis magisterii defendat, miseram etiam, atque haud scio an multo magis, quae detracta Scripturae sacrae auctoritates syllogismis contortis de rebus divinis philosophatur. Imo ne de rebus divinis quidem, sed nec de humanis, verum de his, quae nihil ad nos attinent. Intelligo autem, fuisse in schola quosdam theologos ascrip titios, qui universas quaestiones theologicae frivolis argumentis absolverint, et vanis invalidisraelae magnum pondus rebus gravissimis detrahentes, ediderunt in theologiam commentaria, vix digna lucubrationes anecularum. Et cum in his sacrarum Bibliorum testimoniam rarissima sint, conciliorum mentio nulla, nihil ex antiquis sanctis oleant, nihil ne ex gravi philosophia quidem, sed fere puerilibus disciplinis; scholasticci tamen, si superis placet, theologoi vocantur, nec scholasticci sunt, nedum theologoi, qui sophismatum facientes in scholam inferentes, et ad risum viros doctos in citant, et delicatior ad contemptum. Quem vero intelligimus scholasticum theologum? aut hoc verbum in quo homine ponimus? Opinor in eo, qui de Deo rebusque divinis sapt, prudenter, docete e literis institutisque sacrasi ratiocinetur.

access to libraries rich in manuscripts. Thus we owe to them
the Bibliothecae Patrum, the Collections of Councils, the Bul-
laria, and the Collections of Lives of Saints. The most dis-
tinguished among the editors of the works of Church writers
were Heinr. Canisius, teacher of canon law in Ingolstadt (d.
1609), Nich. Rigaltius, parliamentary councilor, subsequently
intendant in Metz (d. at Toul, 1654), and the Jesuit Jac. Sir-
mond, in Paris (d. 1651).

The father of Catholic Church history was Caesar Baronius,
priest of the Oratoire and cardinal in Rome (d. 1607). In
France, under the impulse and protection of the Gallican prin-
ciples, the history of ecclesiastical polity was more freely in-
vestigated by Edm. Richerius, Doctor of the Sorbonne (d. 1631),
and Petrus de Marca, finally Archbishop of Paris (d. 1662).

20 Here the Protestants commenced with smaller collections: Jo. Sichardi Anti-
Heroldi Orthdoxographa, Bas. 1555. J. J. Grynaei Monumenta Orthodoxographa,
Bas. 1569. fol. These were followed by larger ones on the part of the Catholics:
Margarini de la Bigne Bibliotheca SS. Patrum, Paris, 1575, 8 t. Appendix, 1579.
tment to the Paris Bibl. by the learned printer Fr. Morellius), Paris, 1639, 2 t. fol.

21 The first by Jac. Merlin, Canon of Notre Dame (merely the common councils
and Pseudosidornis), Paris, 1523. 24. 2 t. Then by the Franciscan Petr. Crabbe, Co-
lon. 1558, 2 vols.; enlarged 1557, 3 vols. by the Carthusian Laur. Surius, Colon. 1567,
4 vols. Venet. 1565, 5 vols.; by Paul V. through the Jesuit J. Sirmond, Rome, 1608,

22 The publication of the first Bullarium Magnum was commenced by the jurist
Laertius Cherubinus, Rom. 1617. fol.

23 Laur. Surius (Carthusian in Cologne) Vitae Sanctorum, Col. 1569, 6 vols.; enlarged,

24 Antiquae Lectiones, Ingolst. 1601–8, 6 vols. 4. (new edition by Jac. Basnage:
Thesaurus Monumentorum Ecclesiasticorum, Amst. 1735, 4 vols. fol.)


26 Among the numerous writers whose works he edited are to be distinguished,
8.; Sidonius, Par. 1614 and 1652. 4.; Avitus, Par. 1643. 8. Facundii Defensio III. Ca-
pitul. Par. 1629. 8. Servatius Lupus, De Tribus Quaest. Par. 1650. 8. The most note-
worthy of his historico-critical writings are those against Salmasius: Censura Con-
jecturarum Anonymi de Suburbicaris Regionibus et Ecclesiis, Par. 1618. Adventoria
de Suburbicaris, 1630. Propempticon de Suburbicaris, 1623. 8. Further: Diss. in
qua Dionysii Paris. et Dion. Areopagitae Discrem ostenditur, Par. 1641. 8. Dis-
quis. de Asymo, semperne in usu fuerit apud Latinos, Paris, 1651. 8.—J. Sirmond,

27 Comp. vol. I. p. 18, § 3, Note 11.

28 De Ecclesiastica et Politica Potestate, 1611. Defensio Libellii de Eccl. et Polit.
Potest.; see above, § 58, Note 33. Historia Conciliorum Généralium, Colon. 1683,
3 vols. 4. and 8.

29 De Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii libb. vili. appeared in part, Paris, 1641, edited
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Gabriel Aubespine, Bishop of Orleans (d. 1630),
Franc. Bernardine Ferrari, Professor of Sacred Antiquities in Milan (d. 1669), and Joh. Morinus, priest of the Oratoire, were active in the investigation of Church antiquities; while Dionysius Petavius, Jesuit in Paris (d. 1652), distinguished himself in the advancement of chronology and the history of dogmatics.

The Jesuits, indeed, accomplished much for theological science; but in proportion to the fact that they at that time attracted all men of talent to themselves, they did in reality but little. They wasted their learned powers in the development of a reprehensible morality, which, unfortunately, found favor with a large portion of the Church, and in polemics.

In opposition to that Jesuit morality which, engaged in a constant bargaining with the divine law, endeavors as much as possible to spare Christian virtue the renunciation of sinful propensities, some mystics still pointed to an inner union with God as the highest aim of the Christian. The most distinguished


24 See § 60, Note 3.

25 Polemic writers among the Jesuits, besides Bellarmine (Note 19) were Becanus, Greter, Tanner, and Forer (§ 59, Note 2-6), and, in particular, Gregorius de Valentia (a Spaniard, in Dillingen, Ingolstadt, and Rome, d. 1608, De Rebus Fidel hoc Tempore Controversis, Lugd. 1591); Franc. Costerus (from Mechlin, in Cologne and Brussels, d. 1619, Enchiridion Controversiarum Praedipuum Nostri Temporis de Religione, Colon. 1585); Petrus Cotton (Confessor of Henry IV. and Louis XIII., finally in Bordeaux, d. 1626, Instituio Catholica, in qua Fidelis Veritas comprobatur contra Haereses et Superstitiones hujus Aevi, Mogunt. 1618, directed against Cal- vin's Institutio).
among them was Francis de Sales, Bishop of Geneva and Annecy (d. 1662). 
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§ 64.

HISTORY OF THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES.

The considerate treatment which the Greek hierarchy had experienced from the Turks immediately after the conquest of Constantinople had soon changed. The Patriarch of Constantinople, beside whom the three remaining ones had become quite insignificant, had, indeed, the highest spiritual and tem-
poral jurisdiction among his people, and was their representative at the Porte; but he had therefore to struggle all the more with jealousy and cabal among the demoralized Greeks. He was obliged not only to pay a heavy tribute to the Porte, but to endeavor to secure the favor of the Turkish authorities by bribery and intrigue, in spite of which he frequently succumbed to secret attacks from those who hesitated at no means to attain their end. The Patriarch extorted his income from the bishops, they from their priests, and these again from their parishes; the awful Anathema protected these extortions.

Russia availed itself of a visit of Patriarch Jeremias to Moscow to obtain from him his consent to the establishment of a patriarchate at Moscow (1589), in order thus to become ecclesiastically independent of Constantinople, which was under foreign rule.

Melanchthon already had sent to the Patriarch of Constanti-

4 Comp. the official communication which the Patriarch Dionysius received from the Porte in 1671, Aymon, p. 486. There, among other things, the authority is conferred upon him, that, according to his vain and inutile ceremonies, he established or depose the Metropolitans, the Bishops, the Princes, or the Caloys, as he might judge proper; that no ecclesiastic shall presume to exercise any functions or charges—against the will—of this Patriarch; and that every will in favor of the poor churches by some dying priest shall be valid, if the Patriarch so judge; or if a woman of the jurisdiction of this Patriarch should leave her husband, or if a husband should leave his wife, no one shall give or concern himself with the divorce, unless it be the will of the Patriarch. The Patriarch has the highest secular jurisdiction for things which are contested solely among the Greeks, according to ancient Christian tenets (vol. i. p. 241, § 69, Note 6; i. p. 361, § 91, Note 4), and maintains his authority by his power of excommunication, Th. Smith, De Ecclesiæ Graecæ Statu Hodierno, p. 55, in his Opuscullis ex Itinere ipsius Turcico Enatis, Rotterad. 1716.

5 Smith, p. 54.

6 Karamsin, Hist. of the Russ. Emp. vol. ix. p. 181, Leipz. 1837. In the document drawn up upon the subject it was said (p. 185) "that ancient Rome had fallen through Apollinarian heresy; the new Rome, Constantinople, was in the hands of ungodly Mussulmans; and that the third Rome was Moskwa; that instead of the liars of the Occidental Church, whose mind was darkened by the spirit of pseudo-wisdom, the first general bishop of the world was the Patriarch of Constantinople; the second, he of Alexandria; the third, the Patriarch of Moskwa and all Russia, and the fourth and fifth those of Antioch and Jerusalem." In explanation of the Apollinarian heresy, see Metrophanis Critopuli Confessio, in Weissenborn, Appendix Libr. Symb. Eccl. Orient. p. 130, that Apollinaris was the inventor of unleavened bread at the communion: ἰκείνος γὰρ δοµατίζων, τὸν Κύριον σάρκα ἄφησεν καὶ ἀκούεις ληφεῖν, καὶ τὴν ἄφεσιν—τὴν βεβαιῶσιν ὑμῶν προσέφερε τῷ μυστηρίῳ ἄρτῳ, ἀλλ' ἄχωμα, φάσκειν' ἀπο τῆς ἡμιστήριος τούτω ἡ ἡμιστήριος ἄρτος.

7 Several letters, which, already in 1543 and 1555, had been sent to Melanchthon by Greeks of distinction, see in Mart. Crusiil Turco Graecia, p. 543.
nople, Joasaph II., a Greek translation of the Augsburg Confession (1559),\(^8\) in order to give the Greeks correct ideas of the Reformation. While Stephen Gerlach, of Württemberg, was preacher to the Imperial Legation at Constantinople, the Tübingen theologian, Jacob Andreae, and Martin Crusius, Professor of Greek, sent through him letters of peace to the Patriarch Jeremiah (1574). The opinion on the Augsburg Confession, which the latter sent back in 1576, occasioned a correspondence between him and the theologians of Tübingen, which, however, remained without any results.\(^9\)

In the Greek islands under the Venetian rule the Roman Church had long since succeeded in establishing itself;\(^10\) now it endeavored also to seize upon other portions of the Greek Church. When Czar Ivan IV. Wassiljewitsch, surnamed the Terrible, laid claim to the Papal mediation in his unfortunate war with Poland, the able Jesuit Antonius Possevinus came to Moscow (1581) in order to effect, on the conditions of the Council of Florence, a union between the Russian Church and Rome.\(^11\) But the unfavorable peace with Poland could not overcome the deep-rooted aversion of the Russians against this union, and Possevinus was obliged to depart without having accomplished his object.\(^12\) On the other hand, he succeeded, at the head of other members of the Order, with the assistance of the bigoted King of Poland, Sigismund III., in inducing a large number of the

---

\(^8\) By the deacon Demetrius Rascianus, who was sent to Wittenberg by the Patriarch to investigate the Protestant doctrine. The Confession was translated by Paulus Dolscius (Ἐκκλησίας ἱεράς τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς πίστεως, graece reddit a Paulo Dolscio Plauensi, Basil. 1559. 8., also in the Acta et Scripta Theolog. Wirteberg.): Melanthon’s accompanying letter in the Corp. Ref. ix. 921.


\(^12\) Possevin gives a report of his three religious colloques with the Czar in “Moscova.”—The false Demetrius, who was supported by Poland, immediately joined the Romish Church, but by so doing alienated the Russians, 1606. Karamsin, x. 109. Ranke, Fürsten u. Völker von Südeuropa, iii. 390.
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Greeks in Lithuania to take part in the union (1590–1596). A portion of the renitent Greeks attempted, indeed, a union with the Protestant dissidents, but it was prevented by the resistance of the Greek clergy.

At that time the priest Cyrillus Lucaris, a native of the Venetian island of Crete, and educated in Venice and Padua, was sent by Meletius, Patriarch of Alexandria, to Lithuania, to aid the oppressed Greeks in that province. He there gained an insight into the intrigues of the Jesuits, and became well acquainted with the Protestant clergy. Soon after, he became Patriarch of Alexandria (1602), and saw how the Jesuits, under the protection of the French embassy, built a college at Galata (Pera), a suburb of Constantinople (1603), and succeeded not only in attracting a large number of Greek youths, but also in gaining over some of the clergy. On the other hand, he made the acquaintance, at that time, of the Dutch ambassador to the Porte, Cornelius Haga, obtained through him many Reformed

13 See above, § 59, Note 10.
16 He went there in 1596, and as late as 1600 had occasion to give a letter from his patriarch to the king (see in Regenwolscii Systema Hist.-chronol. p. 467). Meletius was a decided opponent of the Latins, Leo Allatius, De Eccl. Occid. et Orient. Perpetua Cons. p. 967.
17 Cyrillus himself speaks of this in his Epist. ad Jo. Uytenbogaert, 1613, in Aymon, p. 163.
18 Leger, in Smithi Collect. p. 73.
20 Thus Cyrillus, in 1612, had a controversy with a priest in Constantinople who was an adherent of the Jesuits, and preached in favor of the Romish Church; thus, from reports of the English legation, Smith, p. 15.
21 This acquaintance, according to Cyrillus ad Uytenbogaert, in Aymon, p. 196,
theological works, and was brought by him into communication with Reformed theologians.\textsuperscript{22}

Greek theology, since Damascenus, had had no further development, and that which the attempts at union of the Latins had forced upon it was still felt to be heterogeneous by the more learned.\textsuperscript{23} They laid great stress upon the emanation of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone,\textsuperscript{24} and on the rejection of Romish supremacy; in the Protestants, it took exception at the rejection of a hierarchy, as well as of the worship of saints and images.

On the other hand, with regard to many points which were at that time disputed between the Romish Church and the Protestants, the Greek theology still adhered to the older general acceptation, which was capable as well of a Romish as of a Protestant development. The Greek religion, however, had become almost entirely an outward worship, attaching an exagger-
ated value to certain forms which even a slight degree of enlightenment could not but recognize as partly indifferent, partly superstitious rubbish.

It was the desire of Cyrillus to effect a closer union between the Greek and the Reformed churches, the theology of which he considered as harmonizing perfectly in its fundamental principles, so that the former might gradually be purified by the latter, and regain the spiritual vigor necessary for resisting the Romish oppression with which it was threatened.  

He therefore entered into a correspondence with various Reformed theo-

---

25 Compare his remarks ad Uytenbogaert, 1612 (Aymon, p. 130): Videntur aliqui exprobare Ecclesias Orientis τὴν ἀμαζόναυς, quod videlicet inde literarum studia et philosophia in alias partes migravert. Sed certe ob hoc, quod nunc ἀμαζόνας sit Orientis, valde beatas reputari potest:—quia non novit quasam sint illae pestiferae questiones, quae hoc tempore hominum inflectunt aures; nova portenta monstra sunt et ai κανονσελίδια, metuenda magis quam amplectenda. Contentus est incompta fide Christi, quam ab Apostolis, majoribusque suis est edoctus, in illaqua usque ad sanguinem perseverat, nunquam demit, nunquam addit, nunquam mutat, semper idem manet, semper integram τὴν ἀρχαιολόγιαν tenet servatque. Ad eundem, 1613 (l. c. p. 161): Ob veritatem ego et cum propriis mea fratribus, Ecclesiasticis Graecis, controversor: hostias sum ignorantiae, et ut populum simplicem esse, ἀμαζόναθ, non molestes fero, cum sciam, και ἐν τῇ ἀμαζόνα καὶ λίανω (leg. ἐιδωμίσε) salvari posse homines adversus fidelis hostes in dies quasi diminctae, non armis sed patientia certantes, ut undequeae se Christi fidlices probent: iia mihi displicet, Pastores et Episcopos nostris tenebris ignorantis obsergi: hoc est quod nostrisibus exprobro, at nil proficio. Nacti istam commoditatem, Jesuica in Constantinopoli fundamenta jecerunt, ad erudiendos pueros, et proficiunt quod vulpes inter gallinas. Ob ruet tandem Romana doctrina mundum, dummodo huic negotio tantam operam impendunt Curiae Romanae satellites, nisi Deus propitius fuerit, cujus dextras sola navem nostram turpi isto naufragio salvare potest etiam. To Professor Dioscati in Geneva, 1632 (Aymon, p. 29): Tal è dunque questa Chiesa Greca, che se ha qualche superstizione, che non manca simil rogna, lo dico in buona consciencia, gli e taccato da tempo, dalla Romana Chiesa, usa infetar dove tocca; unde bisogna con lenie lentientidipropoverde, se à qualcheduno Iddio dal cielo donasse questa gratia di metterli in perfectione. Da molti anni consigliavo sopra questo negozio con l’ eccellissimo Signore Imbasciadore dell’ potentissimi Signori Stati di Hollandia, Cornelio Haga, etc. Ad D. David le-Leu de Wilhem (Aymon, p. 174) on the controversy between the Remonstrants and Contrarmonstrants: Mih lidetur, quod possit convenire, dummodo voluerint verbo Dei non abscondito, sed revelato adhaerere, omni alla contentione postposita. Ad eundem, p. 178, on the reformation to be desired: Ego omnia illa capita apte credo ad tria posses reduci, quae si missa fierent et opposita introducierent, facilia esset reformationi. Explodatur ambitio, avaritia et superstitio. Introductur humilitas ad exemplum Christi Domini, contemptus temporium et simplicitas Evangelii, et faciles obtinetur caputum. Nella Chiesa Romana non si ha da sperar questo, che gia molto bene sapiamo che loro non danno segni di Riforma, ma obstinatamente defendono il loro dogma. Ecclesiæ Graecæm tam nihil pessundat quod superstitio. Iddio proveda come sa, e gli piace. To the senators, preachers, and professors in Geneva, by Leger, on his return in 1636, p. 5: Eccò che alle Amplissime vostre Persone, e Reverentie vostre e pro le viscere del mio cuore. come à fratelli mi ci amantissimi, abbrazzando
logians, and, in 1616, sent Metrophanes Critopulus to Oxford to be educated there. 26

Thus Cyrillus drew upon himself in the highest degree the hatred of the Jesuits, and they commenced their attacks on him particularly after he had become Patriarch of Constantinople. With the Greeks they held him up to suspicion on account of his intercourse with the Reformed theologians; to the Porte they accused him of a secret understanding with the Florentines. Bribery accomplished the rest. Cyrillus was actually banished to Rhodes (1622), but was permitted to return after a short time. 27 On the part of Rome, meanwhile, the most strenuous efforts were made to either win over the hated Patriarch, 28 or ruin him. The instruments made use of were the Jesuits and the French ambassador. Cyrillus, on the other hand, was supported by the ambassadors of England and Holland. A representative of the Pope even made his appearance in Constantinople in 1626, but was soon forced to withdraw. 29 When the Jesuits made use of a Greek printing-press which Cyrillus had imported from England (1627) for spreading the calumny that it was intended for disputing the Koran, 30 they were publicly humiliated by the Mufti, 31 and immediately after banished from

---

26 Cyrillus recommended him to the Archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot, see Aymon, p. 46, and in Paul Colomesil Opp., ed. Fabricius, Hamb. 1709, p. 557. Abbot's gracious answer see in Colomesius, p. 561. Subsequently the same Metrophanes visited the German Protestant universities, and in Helmstadt, where he was permitted for some time, in 1625, was induced to make a statement of the doctrines of his Church: Confessio Catholicae et Apost. in Oriente Ecclesiae, conscripta compendiose per Metroph. Critopulum, edita et Latinitate donata a Jo. Hornejo, Helmst. 1661. 4.; reprint in Weissenborn, Appendix Librorum Symb. Eccl. Orient. Jenae, 1850. — Cyrillus presented to the King of England, Charles I., the famous Codex Alexandrinus, from which Patric. Junius, Oxon. 1633. 4. first published the Epist. Clementis Rom.; see his Preface.


28 Comp. the instructions to that effect received about 1624 by Canachio Rossi, a native Greek, but educated by the Jesuits in Rome, in Aymon, p. 211. There it is also said, Note 3, that the Pope would willingly spend ogni gran summa di denaro, per riunir si nobil membro (the Patriarch) alla Chiesa.


30 Chrysoculus, in Aymon, p. 217 ss. Smith, p. 35. Leger, in Smith, p. 82. The Patriarch had an explanation of the Apostolic Symbol printed for popular instruction; this was made use of for the above-mentioned calumny.

31 The latter, questioned by the Grand Vizier, gave the explanation (Chrysoculus, in Aymon, p. 233), dogmata contra Mahometis instituta non esse continuo blasphe-
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the Turkish empire (1628). Others, however, soon arrived under a different name, and continued the persecution assisted by a number of Latinized Greeks. A new impulse was given to them by Cyrilus's Confession, written with a view to an agreement with the Reformed Church, and published in 1629 by the Dutch ambassador Cornelius Haga. Cyrilus was repeatedly

mils ant criminibus annumeranda. Cumque permisisset Imperator Christians doctrinam suam profiteri, ipse non magis reos esse typis mandando, quam pro concionone praedicando publice, quid crederent: neque diversitatem opinionum, sed scandalum legibus poenisque obnoxios facere.

22 Chrysoculus, in Aymon, p. 227. Smith, p. 43.
24 It first appeared only in Latin: Confessio Fidei Rev. Dom. Cyrilli, Patriarchae Const. 1629, made a great sensation, and gave rise to a reply: Matthaei Caryophilli, Archlep. Iconiensis, Censura Confessionis Fidelis, seu potius Perfidiae Calvinianae, quae Nomine Cyrilii Patr. Const. circumfertur, Romae, 1631 (Smith, p. 43). In the beginning its authenticity was doubted: the French ambassador was ordered to question Cyrilus particularly with regard to it (Lettre du Sieur van Haghe of Jan. 7, 1632, in Smith, p. 71, and Cyrilus's Letter to Diodati of Apr. 15, 1632, in Aymon, p. 31). Cyrilus sent the Confession in Greek to Geneva by Leger, and gave his permission to have it printed (to Diodati, in Aymon, p. 30). It appeared, Genevae, 1633; republished, ostensively by Grotius: Cyrilli Luc. Confessio Christ. Fidei, cui adjuncta est Genuinea ejusdem Confessionis Censura Synodalis, una a Cyrillo Berhoeensis, altera a Parthenio promulgata; in 1645, also in Kimmel, Libri Symbol. Eccl. Orient., Jenae, 1643, p. 24. It consists of eighteen epifālaia and four added ἑρωτήσεις καὶ ἀποκρισίαι, and is Calvinian throughout: the Holy Ghost, however, is designated, κεφ. α', as ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς δι' ἐνόο προερχόμενον. The following declaration on the worship of images is remarkable: ἀπόκρ. δ': τὴν ιεραρχίαν, ἐπισκόπων τίγχαν ὤνεια, οὐκ ἀποβάλλεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰκόνας ἔχων καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀγίων τῆς βουλαμένας παράχομεν. τὴν δὲ λατρείαν καὶ Χριστιανίαν αὐτῶν, ὡς ἀπήγγειλαμενή παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων πιστοῦμεν ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ γραφῇ, ἵζουσινweise, ἵνα μὴ λάβουν σοὶ τοῦ κύστος καὶ ποιητοῦ χνίματα καὶ τίγχαν καὶ κτισματα προσκυνεῖν. Καὶ τὸν ἅγιον φρουροῦτα ἔλλα υἱοῦ ἔνωσιν, ὡς δεινον ἕκτο σκότον ἐν ταῖς φρεσκιαίς, καὶ παμφυλίας τῆς καρδίας. Καὶ ἵνα καλύτερον ἐν τούτῳ ἐντολή ὑποστηθήσωται, ἢ ἀνδρώτων πιστεύεται ματαιολογίαν. "Ὅτερ ἐν φόβῳ ἔστω καὶ ἁγία συνειδέτοι ἐκτίσεις μας, καὶ στέψη τὴν φορὰν κρίσεως ἢ καὶ ημᾶς ἐν τῶν ὁμολογούμεν. The greater part of the educated Greeks in Constantinople must have been in unison with this Confession at that time. Cyrilus designates it (Letter to Diodati, 1633, in Aymon, p. 33) as la Confession mia e della Chiesa Greca; and the Dutch ambassador, Corn. Haga, writes, Jan. 7, 1632 (in Smith, p. 76): It seems, that by the providence of God the Catholics remaines n'effeectront point antre chose par leur inoye, odicess, et intolerable persecution, that d'inciter le Patriarche et toute l'Eglise greque a un plus grand zèle de poursuivre l'œuvre commun, et faire paralostre la verité. Je vous puis assurer, Monsieur, qu'il n'y a personne ici entre les Metropolitains (dont il y a present grand nombre chez le Patriarche), et des Principaux de Grèce, qui ne veuille mettre sa personne, sa vie, et son bien pour la defense du dit Patriarche et sa Confession. The Monk Arsenius, too, who in 1642 reports most unfavorably on Cyrilus and his Confession, says of the former (Cyrilli Luc. Confessio, 1645, p. 104): ἀληθινῶς τινα συγκρισάμενον συνώνων ἐκ τῶν ὁμολογῶν ἄντρη καὶ ἐντραπέζων ἀνθρώπων,—ὁ τὴν δαμασκίνης ἐκείνης τῆς πίστεως ἐκέκτεσθαι τοῖς Καθιστοῖς δόξας συμβόλους εἰκοσαίς. The Romish writers, Leo Alliaius at their head, accuse Cyrilus of grave misdeeds, and assert that he was bribed by the Calvinists (Smith, p. 69); so, too, the later Greek writers. But Grotius, too,
ousted from his seat and reinstalled, until at length his enemies, under pretense of his having an understanding with the hostile Cossacks, induced the Sultan to order him to be strangled (1638). His successor, Cyrillus of Berrhoea, who was in favor of Latinization, immediately caused the heresies of his predecessor to be condemned at a synod in Constantinople; the party of the latter, however, was so far from being dissolved, and the Church in Constantinople seemed so undecided, that the Metropolitan of Kiew, Petrus Magilas, was thereby induced to write a creed, which was acknowledged in 1643 by all the patriarchs, and won high consideration in the Greek Church.

The relations of the Armenian Church to that of Rome long judges him harshly, Votum pro Pace Ecclesiae, 1642, p. 57: Cyrillus illum Constantinopolitanum novi pridem et ille me. Doleo illum consilis externis, politicis sane, non theologicis, ad ea abductum, quae si fecisset Papa, jam illum aperte κατακυρευειν των κληρων, omnes scholarum, omnes basilicarum parietes resonarent. Discussio Rivetian Apologetici, Irenopoli, 1645, p. 10: Sumenda est Ecclesia Graeca, non qualem ex suo capite Cyrillus nuper inductus pretio confinxerat, sed qualis est revera. P. 87: Cyrillus ille—absque Synodo, absque Patriarcharum, absque Metropolitanarum consensu fidem ritusque Graecos mutare voluit ad Calvinisticam formam. Nonne in eosibi arrogavit, quod erat pluri? These reproaches are mostly canceled by that which precedes them. It seems, indeed, as if the ambassadors of Holland and England had worked for Cyrillus by bribery, as his enemies, the French embassador in particular, worked against him; but if Cyrillus himself had been actuated by avarice, he would have been more likely to fare advantageously on the other side; see above, Note 28.

**He was banished to Tenedos in 1634, to Chios in 1635, to Rhodes in 1636; comp. his letters in Aymon, p. 2, 66. Smith, p. 56.**

Smith, p. 60. Already in 1628, Chrysoculus complains, in Aymon, p. 209: Nec unquam eluent hanc invidiam Jesuitae et fautor ipsorum Gallus, quod Turcas docuerint hisce altercationibus, possese ingentes summas extorqueria a Christianis, qui prius pauperes monachi audiebant: quod quidem unquam dediscetur, et aliquando sedem ipsam patriarchalem peseadmabat. En zelum religiosum et Patrum caritatem! Thus, later, too, the intrigues for the dignity of patriarch were continued; according to Cyrillus, there were fifteen changes of patriarchs before 1671 (Aymon, p. 314). This proved too much even for the Turks, and the Grand Vizier, in 1671, received the new Patriarch, Dionysius of Larissa, and his clergy with the words (De la Croix, Etat Présent des Nations et Églises Grecque, Arménienne et Maronite en Turquie, à Paris, 1715. 12. p. 113): Chiens, sans foi et sans loi, la zanizie, la discorde et la jalousey regneront-elles toujours parmi vous, et ne cesserez-vous jamais de vous persécuter les uns et les autres?—je vous ferai tous mourir, si l’entens parler de vous de plus de six mois.


remained in the old undecided state: the Armenian patriarchs, in their tribulations, sought to retain the assistance hitherto received from the Romish Church, and therefore paid homage to the Pope, but the doctrine and customs of the Armenian Church remained unchanged. The Armenians, as a commercial nation, had spread over all countries, and settled particularly in commercial cities, but still remained in connection with their Patriarch. It was only since the Propaganda had begun to operate in Rome, to educate Armenians in the strict Romish faith, and to send out missionaries in order to gain Armenians for the Romish Church, that there were in reality United Armenians, who, with their own church ordinances, combined the Romish faith, and thus there occurred at this time frequent dissensions and separations between United and non-United Armenians. Already, since the eleventh century, Armenians had spread over the Crimea, Moldavia, Wallachia, and in Southern Russia as far as Southern Poland, where Lemberg became their chief seat. It was there that the Archbishop Nicholas Torosowicz, in 1624, gave the first example of a real union by withdrawing from the supervision of the Patriarch in Edshmiadsin and subjecting himself to the Pope. For a long time he met with resistance: the Armenians in Poland did not submit till 1652, when the union was established by an Armenian college which the Propaganda founded in Lemberg in 1664. Nevertheless, the patriarchs in Edshmiadsin still kept up for some time their friendly relations with rich and powerful Rome, until the frequent

---

* Short Historic Description of the Present Condition of the Armenian People, St. Petersburg, 1831, p. 8, 25.
* The Patriarch Stephen V. came to Rome in 1545, and remained there two years; Neumann, Hist. of Armenian Literature, Leips. 1836, p. 288. His successor, Michael, in 1563, sent an ambassador with a letter of submission to the Pope; see the letter in Raynald. 1564, Note 51. Likewise Moses III. (1629–1633); see Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1414, and Jacob IV. (1635–1680) ; ibid. i. 1415.
* See above, § 58, Note 35. In consequence of the impulse given by the Propaganda, the Patriarch Moses III. (1639–1633) also founded several schools, Neumann, p. 287.
* See above, Note 40. Under the Patriarch Philip I. (1632–1665) the Dominican Paulus Fironnall, who had been sent as missionary to Armenia by Urban VIII., was for several years instructor in the school at Edshmiadsin, Neumann, p. 241.
unions which took place toward the end of the seventeenth century disturbed them, and at the same time widened more and more the breach between United and non-United Armenians.

The remaining Oriental churches continued to lie motionless under heavy oppression and in spiritual torpidity. Rome untiringly carried on its attempts at union, and frequently suffered itself to be deceived by hollow demonstrations of respect, of which the heads of those churches were by no means sparing, if there were any advantage to be gained by them.

44 Jeremias Tshelebi, in Constantinople (d. 1695), wrote against the United Armenians, Neumann, p. 282. Joh. Golod, who was Armenian Patriarch from 1715, brought about a cruel persecution of the same, which lasted nine years, Neumann, p. 256.

45 Characteristic of this is an occurrence of which Franc. Sacchinus, Historia Soc. Jesu, pt. ii., gives a detailed account. Under Paul IV. there appeared in Rome Abraham, an envoy from the Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria, with a letter from the latter, which was construed in Rome as an assurance of submission. Further inquiries in Egypt through the Venetian Consul seemed to show a great desire for union on the part of the Patriarch. Pius IV. therefore, in 1561, sent several Jesuits, Christopher Roderic at their head, to Egypt with costly gifts (Sacchinus, ii. 193 ss.). After the Patriarch had received the gifts, however, it was found that the prospect opened did not amount to anything. Abraham, together with another named Georgius, was finally authorized, in 1563, to enter into negotiations with the Jesuits, but Abraham no longer remembered all his promises made in Rome (Sacchinus, ii. 248).

When Roderic demanded a formal declaration of submission from the Patriarch, the commissioners answered (p. 249), eum sermonem accidere sibi novum, postque Chalcedonense Concilium et Patriarcharum disjunctionem unumque sua in Ecclesia caput esse magistrumque summum; immo Romanum Pontificem, si sorte erraret, a caeteris Patriarchis judicari oportere. Litterissim modeste se et officiosum locutos, atque obedientiam professum quo ritu, quo humaniter cum amicis agitur, dum ad eum jussa nos paratos professurum: suae humilitatis causa titulus illis et nominum insignibus Romanum Patriarcham affecisse: adjeicie autem suis in litteris fidem summam, quod hujuscemodi communicatione se invicem salutare Patriarchas decet: atque hominem petisse, quod, ut ipse ex caritate salutasset Pontificem, ita gratum sibi futurum esset, si a Pontificem missio nuncius vicissim ipsi salutaretur.

The Jesuits continued their negotiations, but all the craftiness was of no avail against the resoluteness of the shrewd barbarians. Nevertheless, the Romish passion for union soon allowed itself to be again deceived. In the year 1594 a new embassy of the Coptic Patriarch came to Rome (Baronii Ann. Eccl. ad Ann. 452, No. 23), was entertained and presented with gifts, and signed whatever was demanded. Thus Baronius, in a Corollarium ad T. VI. Annalium, p. 905, celebrates the union of the Copts, which soon proved just as void as all the former ones. Cyril Lucaris ad Jo. Uyttenbogaert, 1613, in Aymon, p. 157, writes thereupon: Papa Clemens VIII. Romanus multa fecit tuliturque se componere cum illis (Coptis), et ridere Vestra Dominatio, si scirot, qualis us fuerint Copiae in hoc negotio stratagemate, quamquam Papa ab illis delusus fuerit, quamvis Baronius novas historigraphus, antequam bene veritatem percepisset, cum forsann pro more aulae Romanae adulaetetur Clementi, istam el gloriam referre propeverit.—voluntique ea de Coptarum in Ecclesia Romana conversiones scribere in suis Chronicis, quae tempus non multum postea falso fuisse omnia probavit. Imo Paulus praeceps Papa istam ob causam aliquos Copias ejectit Roma.
The Maronites alone, in their isolation, clung firmly to Rome, and by the Collegium Maroniticum, which Gregory XII. founded in Rome in 1584, were bound more and more closely to the Papal See.\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{47}Cyrillus Lucaris ad Jo. Uytenbogaert, 1613, in Aymon, p. 159: Maronitica secta est semi-Romana, lmo incipit esse tota Romana; quia multi Maronitae profecti Romam litteris operam navarunt, indeque in montem Libanum, castellum in Provincia Phoeniciae, ubi est eorum residentia principallis, migrarunt, optime a Romanis instructi, et modo tota quasi gens illa Romanam sequitur religionem. Cum maxime eorum primus Episcopus se Papistam profiteatur, et quia Antiocheni Patriarchae Dioecesis contigua est Maronitis, timeo ne incipient et vicinos in sicere, præsertim, cum a parte Patriarchae, et a nobis admoniti, conveniens tamen non sit cautio: homo enim Arabs non capax est mali, quod serpit.
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PART FIRST.

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY IN ITS RELATIONS TO CHRISTIANITY.

§ 1.

INTRODUCTION. THE EARLIER SECRET OPPONENTS OF CHRISTI-
ANITY.

The revival of the ancient literature subsequent to the fif-
teenth century furnished men of learning with such abundant
facilities for testing the existing ecclesiastical system, and at the
same time disclosed to them so many new opinions upon reli-
gious subjects, that, as a natural result, many were prejudiced
against Christianity itself, accustomed as they were to regard it
as identical with the prevailing dogmatic system. The aver-
sion which they entertained to the scholastic Aristotelian philos-
ophy passed over to the scholastic theology, and from it to the
Christian religion; and the theologians themselves gave them
some cause for this feeling by contending as zealously for schol-
asticism as for Christianity. And, lastly, the newly awakened
partiality for antiquity very naturally came to embrace all the
sentiments of the great men of antiquity, including many of their religious opinions. So exaggerated was the estimation in which the really valuable materials found in the ancient writers were held, that all their opinions and utterances were regarded as incapable of improvement, and there now arose in many quarters a servile adherence to the ancients as blind as the devotion of the masses to the Church. This manifested itself as early as the fifteenth century, and to a still greater degree in the sixteenth century in Italy and even at the Papal Court; and most of the friends of ancient learning either held very lax views respecting religious subjects, or were opponents of Christianity, if not secret atheists. Owing to the severity of the Inquisition, these opinions were seldom expressed in public, and were entirely withheld from the knowledge of the people. The enemies of Christianity were compelled to keep quiet, and outwardly to adhere strictly to the Catholic Church. Nevertheless, there were individuals who, in their writings, gave utterance to novel and remarkable opinions.

Among these was Petrus Pomponatius (d. 1526), a teacher of philosophy at Padua and Bologna, who employed the skepticism of the academicians to assail the truths of religion, the immortality of the soul, the providence of God, and other principles of Christianity. He escaped the persecution of the Inquisition only by distinguishing between philosophical and religious truths, and declared that he submitted entirely to the teaching of the Church, although they could not be demonstrated by reason. From his school proceeded many other philosophers, who taught equally dangerous doctrines.

Nicolas Macchiavelli (d. 1530), secretary of the Florentine Republic, in his Principles of the Art of Government (Il Principe), which laid down the principles of a complete despotism, had the hardihood to make both the religion and the faith of the subject wholly dependent upon the will of the sovereign.

John Bodinus (d. 1596), a doctor of laws at Toulouse, left a manuscript work which was extensively circulated, containing a colloquy between a Jew, a Mohammedan, a heathen, a Catholic, a Lutheran, a Reformed Protestant, and a naturalist (Colloquium Heptaplomeres), in which Christianity was ranked below all the other religions.¹

¹ Heptaplomeres des Joh. Bodinus von Guhrauer, Berl. 1841.
§ 2.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY, AND ITS RELATION TO THEOLOGY.

Similar manifestations of secret hostility to Christianity, connected in some instances with various superstitions of a different character, particularly astrology and magic, appear in the seventeenth century in Catholic countries, and especially in Italy.

In the seventeenth century it was customary for princes and other dignitaries to maintain their private court-astrologers. Most of these men based their astrology upon the theory that the world is a mechanism which operates according to certain laws, without the interposition of the Deity.

But these opinions were exceptional, and exercised no influence at all upon the theology or the popular belief of the age. The theologians, both Catholic and Evangelical, adhered to the philosophy of Aristotle, which was interwoven with the whole theological system, and regarded every contradiction of it and every attempt to found an independent philosophy as a deviation from the orthodoxy of the Church, and an act of hostility to Christianity. As early as the sixteenth century this was the fate of several philosophers, and in the seventeenth century of the most distinguished philosopher of that age, Renatus Cartesi-us (René Descartes). He was born in the province of Touraine, served as a soldier in several campaigns, then lived for a considerable time in Holland, where he published most of his philosophical and mathematical works, and finally repaired to the court of Queen Christina of Sweden, dying soon after at Stockholm in the year 1650.

Dissatisfied with the existing philosophies, particularly because they invariably started with principles which seemed to him themselves to require demonstration, he began by calling in question all external reality. He accepted nothing as certain but his own thinking, and took this as the only proof of his existence (cogito, ergo sum). But this thinking must have a cause, and he accordingly inferred an absolute cause, the source of all the reality of our ideas, viz., God. He next reached the idea of
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the most perfect being, and, inasmuch as this includes the veracity of God, he inferred from it also the reality of things external to us, since God would deceive us by our ideas if they had no objective reality. This system was still further developed, especially by the followers of Descartes, to the extent of asserting an activity of God in his works so absolute as to reduce the whole world to a machine dependent for its operation upon God alone, thereby subverting all moral freedom on the part of men.

In France and Holland Cartesius gained many followers, especially among the Jansenists, whose theory of predestination found a support in this philosophy, while the Jesuits were its bitter enemies. In the Reformed Church of Holland Descartes also found many adherents, who were for this reason assailed by the other Reformed theologians.

Far more dangerous to religion and Christianity was the philosophy of Benedict Spinoza (born at Amsterdam, 1632). He was a Jew by birth, but was afterward excommunicated by the Jews on account of his opinions, and thereafter lived entirely among Christians, without, however, receiving baptism. He died at the Hague in 1677. His system is a perfect pantheism. Refusing to admit that one substance can create another, he holds that there is but one substance, and that this is God. All individual entities are only modifications of the one divine essence. All human freedom is thus destroyed, for in all individual beings it is the Deity alone that acts; they have no personal independence or freedom of will. But inasmuch as God himself acts according to the laws of his nature, he also has no free-will. Thus the whole universe is transformed into a mere machine, which operates according to certain laws. Spinoza's system was long decried as pure atheism. Although it does not deserve to be thus stigmatized, it is undeniable that it rests upon very arbitrary principles, and may be made practically quite as dangerous as atheism.
PART I.—§ 3. OPPONENTS OF CHRISTIANITY IN ENGLAND.

§ 3.

THE OPPONENTS OF CHRISTIANITY IN ENGLAND.


These philosophers had as yet ventured to make no direct attacks upon Christianity. However much the results of their systems might seem to contradict it, they had not judged Christianity from the standpoint of their philosophy. The first open assailants of Christianity made their appearance in England during the reign of Charles I., at a period when the parties in the National Church were engaged in most bitter controversy and new religious denominations were constantly coming into existence. The evil influence of this state of affairs upon the political condition of England led many to adopt opinions unfavorable to Christianity in general. Having extricated themselves from the partisan conflict and begun to regard the points of controversy between the sections of the Church as insignificant, they not unfrequently fell into the error of renouncing all that is positive in Christianity itself, and of looking upon natural religion as alone certain and satisfactory. Their aversion to positive Christianity was the greater because they considered it the source of the disturbances and factions which had so long distracted England.

They assumed the name of Deists, because they acknowledged one God, but were also called Naturalists, inasmuch as they admitted only a natural knowledge of God and repudiated all revelation. As early as the Long Parliament individual voices were raised, demanding that pure deism be declared the national religion, and an end thus made to all the unhappy controversies which had so long agitated Church and State. These views were especially popular in England at the court of Charles II., the most luxurious and corrupt of its age, where the grossest vices were associated with disregard and contempt for all religion. The effect of this deism was, therefore, in many instances, to produce a flippant atheism. Owing to the freedom of the press and of individual thought in England, these forms of hostility to Christianity maintained themselves till far into the
eighteenth century. Among the great number of English deists the following deserve particular mention:

Edward Herbert, Lord Cherbury, a public officer at the court of James I., but afterward on the side of the Parliament against Charles I. (d. 1648). In his writings he reduces the essence of all religions to five propositions: "There is a God; he is to be worshiped; his best worship is a virtuous life; sins are expiated by repentance; after this life there are rewards and punishments." He wishes to determine the relative value of all existing religions according to the degree of distinctness with which they enunciate these truths. All the other doctrines of those religions, including Christianity, which are founded upon a special revelation, he regards as uncertain; but he values Christianity in so far as it contains these principles.

Herbert was in other respects a religious and upright man, and therefore does not properly deserve to be called an enemy of Christianity. On the contrary, he always treated it with great respect, although he declared himself unable to assent to all the teachings of the Christianity of that day.

Thomas Hobbes, however, deserves the name of a genuine enemy of Christianity. Born at Malmesbury in 1588, he devoted himself at Oxford especially to the study of philosophy, physics, and mathematics. During the Civil War he was a zealous Royalist, for which reason he resided for a long time abroad, and was the instructor of the exiled son of Charles I. in Paris. Afterward, during the reign of Charles II., he lived in retirement and acquired great reputation as a philosophical writer. His philosophy is a mixture of skepticism and materialism. He doubted every thing, trusted nothing but the senses, and held that the material was the only reality. According to his view, religion is based solely upon subjective conceptions, for the objective ground of religion lies at an inaccessible distance beyond the sphere of the human mind. Consequently, the respect which he pretended to have for the existing religion could not have been very profound. This is especially evident from the fact that he made religion wholly dependent upon the will of the sovereign. Hobbes was led, under the influence of the political disturbances in England, to regard an absolute monarchy as the best form of government. He therefore subordinated religion

1 Herder, x. 121.
also to the control of the sovereign, and conceded to him the right to determine the form of public worship at his own pleasure. The skepticism respecting religion in general and Christianity in particular, and the consequent disregard for both which prevailed particularly among the higher classes in England, were largely due to Hobbes, whose influence as a scholar and philosopher was very great. At the court of Charles II., not only could the Earl of Rochester openly deride religion, but the Earl of Shaftesbury (d. 1713), notwithstanding his greater philosophical culture, had the audacity to excuse his sneers at Christianity by the assertion that ridicule is the touchstone of the truth, and that all things which can be made ridiculous are false. Nor was there subsequently any lack of scholars and philosophers to maintain this opposition to Christianity. While it had previously been assailed only on philosophical principles, its historical grounds were now subjected to criticism. The first to attempt this was John Toland. By birth an Irish Catholic, he early went over to the Reformed Church, and then published a series of writings which were intended to exalt natural religion in opposition to Christianity (d. 1722). He began by calling in question the authenticity of the books of the New Testament, and then in his work Nazarenus, 1718, set forth a Gospel of the Apostle Barnabas, which was current among the Mohammedans, as the authentic Gospel of Jesus, containing the doctrines of the most ancient Christians—the Nazarenes and Ebionites. Under his leadership there now began a long series of assaults upon the historical character of Christianity, which had for their object the defense of pure deism. It went so far in England that a London printer, named John Hive, even left in his will an endowment for annual sermons against Christianity.

Anthony Collins, treasurer of the county of Essex (d. 1729), followed with an attack principally aimed at the argument for Christianity derived from the prophecies of the Old Testament.

Thomas Woolston lived at Cambridge and died in the debtor's prison in 1733. He attacked the miracles of Jesus, and argued...
that they were both improbable and inadequate to prove the truth of doctrines.

Matthew Tindal, a barrister (d. 1733), saw in Christianity only a new promulgation of natural religion, and asserted that all the so-called supernatural truths are mere inventions of priestcraft. He therefore deCLAIMed against all hierarchy in the Church, and sought to have it considered a merely civil institution.

Thomas Morgan, once the minister of a Presbyterian church (d. 1743), Thomas Chubb, a chandler of Salisbury (d. 1747), and Lord Bolingbroke (d. 1751) subsequently distinguished themselves among the deists by reproducing in new forms the old arguments against immediate revelation and Christianity.

Among recent opponents, the most important is the celebrated historian of England, David Hume, a Scotchman by birth (d. 1776). From the standpoint of skepticism he assailed the certainty of all human knowledge, not excepting natural religion. But he combatE particularly the credibility of miracles and the argument for the truth of a religion derived from them.

England was also the first country where an organized attempt was made to introduce a purely deistical form of worship, and so to renounce Christianity entirely. In 1776, David Williams started a naturalistic service of this sort, but it was soon abandoned. When such a form of worship was afterward introduced in France during the Revolution, it was imitated in England also, but did not long maintain itself. The last Englishman who attained notoriety as a deist was Thomas Paine. He went to France during the Revolution, became a member of the National Assembly, and composed at this period a series of works against Christianity, which, although betraying the most surprising lack of historical knowledge and great philosophical shallowness, nevertheless, by their peremptory assertions, exerted in those days an extensive influence.

§ 4.

FREETHINKERS IN FRANCE.

The tendency to skepticism, which became increasingly characteristic of philosophy in the seventeenth century—this ques-
tioning of all knowledge acquired by experience and even by reasoning—could not be otherwise than very injurious to religion. It necessarily destroyed all religious belief. Yet the distinguished French bishop Peter Daniel Huetius (d. 1721), who fell gradually into the most decided skepticism, believed that he could best subserve the interests of the Catholic doctrine by the propagation of this skeptical spirit. He held that the more men became convinced that all the conclusions of the reason are uncertain, the more ready they would be to embrace the faith of the Church without even venturing to subject it to the tests of reason. With the same object, the French Jesuit John Harduin (d. 1729) carried historical skepticism to the most preposterous conclusions. He took the ground that all the writings of antiquity, with the exception of those of Cicero, Pliny, Virgil, and Horace, were spurious, and the work of impostors in the thirteenth century. He held the same of the works of most of the Church Fathers. Finally, he declared that the Latin Vulgate was the original text of the New Testament, and the Greek text only a poorly executed translation from the Latin. Thus he tried to dispose of all the historical sources from which arguments against the Catholic Church could be obtained, that, upon the ruins of all historical belief, belief in the Church might be more firmly grounded.

All these attempts, however, to represent the conclusions of reason and historical belief as alike uncertain could not but be injurious to the belief in the Church; for the Catholic Church itself is not willing to base its authority merely upon its present condition, but appeals to certain historical principles, which must be proved by the historical method. If all history is rendered uncertain, it follows naturally that no greater certainty can be ascribed to this historical argument for the Church. If, on the other hand, all knowledge through the reason is called in question, the result is to render any proof of a divine revelation impossible; for every revelation must start with the assumption that some conclusions of reason are certain, particular-

---


2 Cf. Bibliothèque Raisonnée des Ouvrages de l’Europe, t. i. art. vi. p. 71. (Deyling, Observatt. Miscellan. t. i. p. 388.)
ly the conviction of God's existence. This could not have been first imparted by revelation, because unless man already possessed it in himself, he would be compelled to doubt every revelation and regard it as a possible deception.

Although this use of skepticism in the interests of revelation and of the Church faith has been frequently made, especially in the Catholic Church, it is nevertheless evident that it must be unfavorable to faith when carried out to its legitimate consequences. It was of service only in the case of those who, perplexed with doubts as to the certainty of all their knowledge, in a kind of desperation cast about for something sure, and accepted the Church without subjecting it to the test of their own principles. Happy to find peace at last, they willingly deceived themselves with this semblance of certainty and immutability.

The dangerous tendency of skepticism which manifested itself among these Catholic authors was still more apparent in the celebrated Peter Bayle. He was a member of the French Reformed Church, and in his youth was induced by the Jesuits to become a Catholic, but soon afterward returned to the Reformed Church; was for a time professor of philosophy at Sedan, until the abolition of the university by Louis XIV., and then received the chair of philosophy and history in the gymnasium at Rotterdam. This position was, however, taken from him (1693) on account of the dangerous opinions advanced in his writings, and he died in retirement (1706). In his earlier works, Bayle attacked particularly two prevalent evils of the times, superstition and compulsion in religion. The appearance of a comet, which at the time excited universal terror, afforded an occasion for attacking the former, and the sad fate of the Protestants in France the latter. But by these writings he incurred the charge of skepticism and atheism. He endeavored to prove that superstition is worse than atheism, and that in general the arguments for the existence of a God are not tenable. On the same grounds he condemned all compulsion in religion, because true and false convictions can not be distinguished by any certain criteria, and, further, because they can not render those who hold them either meritorious or culpable. His principal work was

---

his Dictionnaire Historique et Critique,* a collection of treatises on historical celebrities, which, although containing much valuable information, is equally distinguished for its excessive skepticism in matters of philosophy and history. Moreover, while pretending to be of the opinion that where reason and faith come into collision, the former must humbly submit to the latter, he was unquestionably insincere, and really intended to expose the irrationality of the dogmatic system.

§ 5.

CONTINUATION.

The corruption of morals which prevailed at the magnificent and luxurious court of Louis XIV. produced a corresponding disregard for religion. The numerous wits and so-called men of letters who were in the pay of the court would certainly have made the Church itself the especial object of their ridicule had not Louis XIV., with all his vices, cherished a scrupulous and superstitious reverence for it, so that the court was compelled at least to feign a similar respect. Already, however, the educated classes in France were beginning to manifest that aversion to the Christian Church which afterward resulted in the most pronounced atheism. The Jansenist controversies also tended to increase the distrust toward the Church. By their agency the ethics of the Jesuits, the party then in favor, were exposed in their deformity. The Jesuits parried this attack by demanding the general recognition of the fact that Jansenius had taught certain doctrines which the Pope had condemned. A similar effect was produced by the controversies with the Mystics. All these religious disputes had the effect to produce distrust of the Church in general. Then the very secrecy with which, particularly at first, more liberal opinions had to be expressed, and the necessity of disguising them under the form of humorous and entertaining tales, in order to introduce them without detection, gained for them the most enthusiastic applause in France, where wit has always had all the force of cogent argument.

The opposition of the government and the clergy only aug-

* First published in 1695. 5 editions, Amst. 1740, 4 vols. fol.
mented the hostility to the Church. This was the greater from
the fact that in France no other kind of Christianity was known
than the Catholic ecclesiasticism, which by its dogmas and usages
is so offensive to the reason. The French deists, consequently,
always confounded Christianity and Catholicism, and therefore
their bitterness against Christianity was aggravated, judging it, as
they did, by the peculiar characteristics of the Catholic Church.¹
For this reason, there is a striking difference between the En-
glish and French opponents of Christianity. The English went
to work with much greater earnestness, and carried on the con-
test with arguments. Most of them went no further than deism,
and really had a high respect for natural religion. The French,
on the contrary, confined themselves almost exclusively to the
weapons of wit and ridicule. Their philosophical treatises are
of very little value in themselves, and borrowed at that, for the
most part, from the English. Some of them fell into the baldest
atheism as well as the grossest materialism, and even into the
defense of all immorality. In England, the very openness and
zeal with which the contest was carried on prevented it from
producing much injury. Skillful advocates of Christianity ap-
peared, and, although some were led astray by the deists, among
the masses of the people the zeal for Christianity was only
strengthened and increased. In France, however, the deistical
writings were circulated with more secrecy; but, owing to the
degeneracy of morals and the lack of religious knowledge, their
witty and entertaining style and their palliation of all vices won
for them the greater acceptance among the higher classes and
the young. As no adequate efforts were made by the Church to
counteract their influence, their circulation steadily increased, and
toward the middle of the eighteenth century things had reached
such a state in France that the idea of a philosopher and en-
lightened man had become synonymous with that of an enemy
of religion and Christianity. During the reign of Louis XV.,
this evil tendency was fostered by the all-powerful Marquise de
Pompadour. She herself laid claim to wit, and wished to be re-
garded as a patroness of the philosophers. Consequently, those
who desired to recommend themselves to her favor were the
more forward to assume the easily acquired character of a phi-
losopher.

¹ Voltaire, Œuvr. t. xl. p. 208.
Soon after the death of Louis XIV., when the government conceded greater freedom to the press, the first works against Christianity appeared, although the attacks were covert, and, properly speaking, only against Catholic Christianity. The earliest publication of this character was the Lettres Persanes (1716) of the afterward so famous Baron Montesquieu, in which he attributed to the Persians a most admirable system of ethics, but at the same time made them utter very bitter sentiments concerning some of the institutions and dogmas of the Christian Church. This work was followed by a great number of similar fictions, reaching into the middle of the eighteenth century, in some of which the religions of other countries were compared with Christianity to the disadvantage of the latter, while in others Christianity was held up to ridicule by allegorical representations, the scene of which was laid in foreign lands. But the most influential writer of this class, who led the opinion of almost the whole of his century, and did more than any other man to increase the contempt for Christianity, was François Marie Arout et de Voltaire. Born in 1695, he was educated in a Jesuit school in Paris, and while yet a youth showed such extraordinary abilities that public attention was immediately attracted by his first tragedy, Oedipus. All Europe soon rang with his fame. The greatest sovereign of the age, Frederic II., showed his respect by inviting him to his court. The latter part of his life was passed at his country-seat, Ferney, near Geneva, where he died in 1778. It can not be denied that Voltaire was possessed of extraordinary wit, a graceful and attractive style, and rare powers of persuasion; but his philosophy was superficial, and his historical acquirements meagre. Love of fame and avarice were the ruling passions of his whole life: for their sake he courted in his works the applause of the age. He had no higher aims, and therefore was as ready to attract better natures by beautiful and pious sentiments as to seek the applause of his more frivolous readers by maxims of lax morality, and by indelicate, often grossly obscene language. Imperfectly acquainted with Christianity, he consid-

---


ered it a mere texture of superstitions. His sarcasm did not spare even the truths of natural religion, although he declared himself by no means an enemy of all religion. The most detestable feature of Voltaire's writings is his corrupt system of morals. He often seemed to ignore all distinction between virtue and vice, and even exhibited vice in the most charming and alluring forms. By these means he inclined his age to irreligion; for men morally corrupt gladly have recourse to atheism, and are satisfied with the shallowest arguments, because they find them practically useful. The direct arguments with which Voltaire assailed Christianity were, for the most part, borrowed by him from the English deists; but were very superficially presented, and not unfrequently interspersed with gross historical blunders. In all his writings, scattered passages of this character are found. Contemporaneous with Voltaire, and laboring with a similar object in view, were the Encyclopedists, a society of scholars who associated themselves for the purpose of publishing an encyclopedia of all the sciences and arts. Their chief object was to promote the interests of free thought and the universal rights of mankind in France; but they regarded the positive religions as the chief enemies of the rights of reason, and therefore attacked Christianity in a more or less open manner, at the same time, however, zealously advocating natural religion. The leading spirits in the Encyclopaedia were D'Alembert (d. 1783), who betrayed the greatest hostility to Christianity in his private utterances, as well as in his correspondence with Frederic II., who for that reason named him his Diagoras; and Diderot, a noted poet and skeptical philosopher (d. 1784). The Encyclopedists acquired an especially unenviable notoriety from one of their chief contributors, Helvetius (d. 1771), who, in his work De l'Esprit, openly taught materialism, and tried to annihilate both morality and religion. His book was burned, and he was compelled to sign a recantation; but it was evident that he was not sincere in it. The same principles were afterward again maintained in

---

* Those in which he directly assailed Christianity are, Dictionnaire Philosophique, 1764; Théologie Portative, 1768; La Philosophie de l'Histoire, 1768; Évangile du Jour, 1769; La Bible enfin Expliquée par Plusieurs Aumoniers de sa Majesté le Roi de Prusse, 1776.


PART I.—§ 5. FREETHINKERS IN FRANCE.

a most dangerous work, the anonymous Système de la Nature, 1770. In the title, De Mirabeau, who had died shortly before, was named as the author; but this was certainly false. The true author has never been discovered. In this work, all religion and morality were openly repudiated as superstition and the fruit of human imagination; and, on the other hand, atheism, materialism, and fatalism recommended as the highest wisdom. Even Voltaire and Frederic II. regarded this book, in which effrontery was carried to its highest pitch, with indignation.

A man much worthier of respect than these is Jean Jacques Rousseau, a native of Geneva (d. 1778). A skeptic in matters of positive Christianity, he is usually counted among its enemies; yet by his moral earnestness, which was in many respects of an exalted character, and the regard for religion and morality everywhere apparent in his writings, he was at that time instrumental, in part at least, in weakening the impression which the scoffers at religion had produced upon an enervated age. Rousseau was profoundly conscious of the many defects from which humanity suffers, and attributed them wholly to the departure from nature. In all his writings, he aimed to restore men to a state of conformity to nature. He applied this principle to politics in his Contrat Social, in which he unfolded the natural rights and obligations of a citizen; and to education in his Émile, in which he portrayed the progress of an education according to the laws of nature. Rousseau's sentiments respecting Christianity he has, in Émile, put into the mouth of a Savoyard vicar. He praised its exalted moral character in the most enthusiastic and feeling manner, and, while confessing that he could not convince himself of its supernatural origin, expressed the hope that God would not condemn him for this involuntary fault. But he gave his most cordial assent to the fundamental truths of Christianity, the doctrines of God's existence, of the freedom and immortality of the soul, and of retribution after death. He would not even allow those in his commonwealth who denied such a religion.

And yet Rousseau was most violently assailed, while Voltaire, who boldly scoffed at all virtue, was admired by the majority of

* P. T. von Holbach was also represented as the author. A German adaptation of this work with annotations appeared in Leipsic, 1841.

his contemporaries. Both in Paris and Geneva, the Émile was burned, and the author was even driven from his native town. He died in misanthropic retirement in the principality of Neuchâtel, where he had found a refuge under the Prussian government.

§ 6.

OPPONENTS OF CHRISTIANITY IN GERMANY.

The first opponent of Christianity who appeared in Germany was Johann Christian Edelmann. He studied theology in Jena, became afterward a Moravian, withdrew from that communion, wandered about in Germany, and in 1735 began to publish works against Christianity, e.g., Innocent Truths, Moses with Uncovered Face, Christ and Belial, etc. Although his reading had been extensive, his knowledge was very superficial. His religious opinions were all borrowed from earlier philosophers, and only the abusiveness and assurance with which he expressed them were his own. He was a pantheist, and regarded as probable a transmigration of souls. He held positive Christianity to be superstition, although he approved of several of its doctrines. He asserted that the Old Testament was composed by Ezra, the New Testament in the time of Constantine the Great. His last residence was at Berlin, where he died in 1767.

Edelmann's assaults had little effect, except to bring him into contempt and arouse wide-spread indignation against him. Far greater injury was done to the cause of Christianity by the example of many of the German sovereigns, who tolerated at their courts the light-minded ridicule of religion which had been imported from France. In this respect Frederic II. exerted an exceedingly unfortunate influence. Like most of the princes of his day, he had received an exclusively French education; for after the time of Louis XIV. the courts, with few exceptions, had adopted the French language and manners. He was, in consequence, almost totally ignorant of German literature, though all the more familiar with that of France, and in it the writings of

1 His Life by Klose, in Niedner's Zeitschr. 1846, p. 443. Edelmann's Selbstbiographie, written 1753, published by Dr. C. R. W. Klose, Berlin, 1849.

the popular philosophers of the day, particularly Voltaire. His acquaintance with Christianity was equally defective. He had learned to know it only in the form of the prevalent dogmatic system, and this, naturally, could not protect him against the insinuating eloquence and attractive character of the French philosophy. Frederic became its ardent supporter, gathered at his court many French savants who held its principles, and carried on a diligent correspondence with others, as, e.g., with D'Alembert. Chief among his intimates was the Marquis D'Argens, likewise an opponent of all positive Christianity, although an admirer of natural religion. The most detestable of these was the notorious Julien Offroy de la Mettrie, who resided for a time at the court of Frederic, whose satire was only equaled by his ignorance, and who sought to attract attention by the most preposterous assertions. On account of the gross materialism advanced in his work L'Homme Machine, he was banished from France and Holland, and found protection and support in Berlin from 1748 until his death, in 1751. Voltaire himself resided for several years in Berlin, until he had offended the king by his ingratitude and insolence and was forced to leave. Men of this sort were the king's favorite companions on account of their witty and intellectual conversation. Their wit and sarcasm were usually directed against religion, so that the court became infected with their principles. Through the influence of the latter, disregard and contempt for religion were the more readily diffused, especially among the higher classes of the Prussian state, because there was here no powerful clergy to check the progress of the evil. Frederic's example was soon imitated at several other German courts. In these also it became the fashion to ridicule religion, Church, and clergy; and thus this spirit of the French philosophers, with its frivolity and superficiality as well as its hostility to religion, became increasingly prevalent, especially among the higher classes. The false opinion that the Church was only an institution for the masses and unnecessary for enlightened men rapidly gained ground, and church-going became consequently less and less common in the higher ranks of society.

To this period of Frederic II. also belong two other assaults upon Christianity, by which the hostile sentiments were still more widely diffused. First the attacks of the author of the
so-called Wolfenbüttel Fragments. The celebrated Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, librarian at Wolfenbüttel, published several valuable treatises under the title Zur Geschichte und Literatur, aus den Schätzen der herzogl. Bibliothek zu Wolfenbüttel (Contributions to History and Literature from the Treasures of the Ducal Library at Wolfenbüttel). The fourth Contribution (Brunswick, 1777) contained five Fragments from a large manuscript work against Christianity which was said to be preserved in that library. But a far greater sensation was produced by a new Fragment, which Lessing published by itself in 1778, on the Aim of Jesus and his Disciples. In this, Jesus and his disciples were openly charged with deception. Jesus, it was said, wished to found an earthly kingdom; but when this scheme had failed, the disciples put another construction upon his designs, viz., that he intended a spiritual kingdom. After Lessing's death, C. A. E. Schmidt published in 1787 the remainder of the still unprinted works of the Wolfenbüttel fragmentist, in which the Old Testament, the Jewish nation, and, in particular, David, were treated in an exceedingly disparaging manner. It came to light subsequently that the author of these Fragments was Johann Albrecht Heinrich Reimarus, professor in the Gymnasium at Hamburg. They are only parts of a larger work which remains in manuscript in the libraries of Hamburg and Göttingen.

These attacks exerted little influence beyond the higher circles of the reading public. Far greater injury, however, was done to the religious character of the people by Carl Friedrich Bahrdt, a man of varied accomplishments, of wit and eloquence, but wholly lacking in the profounder philosophical spirit, in whose character frivolity and indiscretion were the prominent traits.

3 Viz., 1. On the decrying of reason from the pulpit; 2. The impossibility of a revelation which all men can believe with certainty; 3. The incredibility of the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea; 4. That the Old Testament was not written for the purpose of revealing a religion; 5. Against the history of the resurrection of Christ. On the character of the Fragments, vid. Rienäcker, Theol. Stud. und Krit. 1844, iv. 991.


5 Die Apologie des vernünftigen Christenthums, herausgegeben von Klose, in Niedner's Zeitschrift, 1850, p. 519; 1851, p. 513.
He was professor of theology in Leipsic, Erfurt, and Giessen, then director of a philanthropin at Heidesheim, in the county of Leiningen, but was displaced by the Council of State on account of his loose opinions, and spent his last years in Halle (d. 1792). Attention was first drawn to him by his translation of the New Testament (Die neuen Offenbarungen Gottes in Briefen und Erzählungen, 1773, 4 vols. 8.), which was not so much a translation as a paraphrase, into the text of which he incorporated all his strange notions and conjectures. This was the occasion of his losing his position at Heidesheim. But his next attempt to explain Christianity was even more absurd. He wrote his Briefe über die Bibel im Volkston, 12 vols. 1783–91. In order to furnish a natural explanation of the origin of Christianity, he gave in these letters an elaborate fictitious account of the youth of Jesus. This story represented Jesus as having been educated for the Messiahship by an association of men in accordance with a deliberate plan, and furnished with occult medicaments for the purpose of performing miracles. The society which Jesus gathered about him he represented as a religious order consisting of different grades, the secrets being communicated only to the higher grades. Although this was all pure invention, Bahrdt asserted it with as much assurance as if there could be no question as to its certainty. As his work was written with great clearness and in a pleasing style, he found many readers among the middle classes in Germany, and consequently did more than any other German author to injure Christianity.

In Catholic Germany the Illuminati attracted much attention about this time, and were there decried as the worst enemies of Christianity. While the Jesuits in Bavaria were in power at court and repressed all manifestations of free thought, two professors, Baader at Münich and Weishaupt at Ingolstadt, conceived the idea of founding a secret order after the model of the Order of Jesuits, for the purpose of promoting enlightenment and true morality. It was actually established in 1776 under the name of the Order of Illuminati, and gradually became widely extended. It had several degrees. The direction of the whole was intrusted to the highest degree alone, and the other members were obliged to yield implicit obedience to their superiors. The Order sought to gain influence in the appointments to public office in order to promote its schemes through
the government, and the plan was in this way to gradually obtain control of the whole management of the state. Through these agencies the founders undoubtedly proposed to accomplish very noble results; they wished to promote the progress of the human race by the diffusion of intelligence, to foster virtue everywhere, and to repress vice. But it can not be denied that the society, dependent as it was upon the disposition of a few men who exercised the entire control, would have acquired a power dangerous to the state had it long maintained itself. The league, however, was discovered as early as 1785, compelled to give up all its records, and strictly prohibited. The founder, Weishaupt, found a refuge in Gotha. This league endeavored also to promote religious enlightenment, and to combat the priestcraft and superstition which were then prevalent in Bavaria. It declared, indeed, that it was not directly opposed to Christianity, but it nevertheless regarded the positive doctrines as wholly unessential, and made no distinction at all between Catholics and Protestants. Many of the members were undeniably deists, who undoubtedly only sought to secure the prevalence of deism in the place of Christianity. The Illuminati, however, in a quiet way, did much to overcome the power of the gloomy superstition which prevailed. It was chiefly due to them that, even in the next succeeding reign, Bavaria presented an aspect so different from its former condition, and, although in the days of Carl Theodor reckoned one of the most benighted of Catholic countries, ranked then among the most enlightened.

After Bahrdt, no German author who wrote against Christianity found particular favor. Among the most prolific of this class was Christian Ludwig Paalzow, military counselor at Marienwerder, afterward criminal counselor at Berlin, who, after 1785, wrote many works against Christianity, but without attracting much notice.  

It sought also to promote scientific enterprise by combining all its members who were engaged in the same department for mutual support.

Perthes, *Das deutsche Staatsleben*, p. 262, says that according to entirely reliable MS. records, the Order counted among its members the reigning Duke of Weimar, the hereditary prince of Gotha, the Counts of Seefeld, Seinsheim, Costanza, the imperial ambassador Count Metternich, the canon Count Kesselstadt, the Baron of Montgelas, Baron of Meppenhoffen, etc.; in Göttingen, Professors Koppe, Feder, Martens; in Weimar, Goethe, Herder, Musäus, the minister Fritsch, Kästner, Governor of the Pages; in Bavaria and the ecclesiastical territories, many canons and priests.

Under the titles, Hierocles, Gewissheit der Beweise des Apollonismus, Porphy-
§ 7.

THE RISE OF A BETTER PHILOSOPHY AMONG THE PROTESTANTS.

Erdmann, Versuch einer wissenschaftlichen Darstellung der Geschichte der neueren Philosophie, Leipzig, Riga, and Dorpat, 1836 sq.

At the close of the seventeenth century the Aristotelian philosophy still maintained its supremacy in almost all the universities, and all the later systems had invariably to contend against the prejudice that they were unfavorable to Christianity, which prejudice was partially justified by the fact that the skepticism which was a prominent feature in them had furnished the opponents of Christianity with their weapons. Now, however, philosophers appeared who sought to avoid both the defects of the Aristotelian philosophy and also the offensive features of the later systems. Among these, the first place belongs to John Locke, an English physician, who, after having occupied several positions of distinction, lived in literary retirement, and died 1704. He perceived the necessity, in all philosophical investigation, of beginning with an accurate examination of the powers of the human understanding, so that the limits to which it can go might be determined at the outset. To satisfy this requirement, he wrote his Essay on the Human Understanding. In this treatise he denied the existence of innate ideas, and endeavored to prove that experience is the source of all our knowledge. Although in this he went too far, there was at least this underlying truth, that all our ideas are developed only through the agency of experience; and at that time it was a good thing for the one-sidedness of skepticism, which called in question all experience, to be thus opposed. Locke also did good service by several popular philosophical treatises, particularly by his work on the Reasonableness of Christianity, and by his letters on Religious Toleration.

In Germany, the authority which the Aristotelian philosophy
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had so long held among the Protestants was overthrown by Chris-
tian Thomasius. He was born at Leipsic, where he studied phi-
losophy and jurisprudence, and was professor until, on account of
many controversies, he was forced to leave the city in 1690. He
repaired to Halle, and was there instrumental in founding the
university, of which he became a professor (d. 1728). Thomasius
attacked all slavish sectarian philosophy, both the Aristotelian and
the Cartesian, and endeavored to expose and remove old preju-
dices, and to promote freedom of thought. He thereby rendered
valuable service, although he did not himself enrich the sciences
by any remarkable discoveries. From him dates the greater
freedom in philosophical investigation which afterward pre-
vailed among German philosophers, and of which the University
of Halle was from the first the centre. He also was the first to
employ the German language in the lecture-room and in his
philosophical writings. From his time onward there were al-
ways many eclectics among the German philosophers, who,
without confining themselves exclusively to any single school,
availed themselves of the good which they found in all the phi-
losophers, and constructed systems of their own. Contempor-
eous with these was a series of distinguished philosophers, who
opened up new methods in philosophy.2

The most eminent was Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz. Born at
Leipsic, he studied jurisprudence, as well as philosophy, mathe-
matics, and history, and became counselor and librarian of the
Duke of Brunswick-Lüneburg at Hanover. He was instrumental
in establishing the Royal Academy of Sciences at Berlin, became
its first president, and was raised by the Emperor to the rank of
baron (d. 1716). In history, as well as in mathematics and phi-
losophy, Leibnitz made very important discoveries, and gave a
new impulse to the spirit of investigation in all these sciences.
He did not, it is true, elaborate any complete philosophical sys-
tem; but nevertheless, by free, independent philosophical investi-
gation, and by his own remarkable theories, he did much to pro-
mote the tendency of German philosophy to emancipate itself
from authority.3 A peculiar feature of his system was the hy-

2 Thomasius wrote against the belief in witches: De Origine et Progressu Proc.
Inquis. contra Sagas (Wald Progr. 1821, p. 5). In Prussia the death penalty for
witchcraft was abolished in 1714 (ib. p. 3).

3 Herder's Werke, ix. 399. Systematis Leibnitiani Expositio quaedam Ratione im-
primis habita Quaestionis num alia Esoterica, alia Exoterica habuerit Vir ille Dog-
pothesis of Monads, i.e., simple substances as the elements of all things. He regarded God himself as an uncreated monad, and all other things as created monads. Every monad has the faculty of perception; but the human soul alone, which is also a monad, possesses intelligent perceptions and memory. Connected with this theory was his doctrine of "pre-established harmony" (*harmonia praestabilita*), by which he explained the influence of the soul upon the body. Every soul has a certain sequence of thoughts and desires; every body, a sequence of motions. Now, the Deity has united that soul and that body whose motions are entirely correspondent to each other. Consequently, each acts, properly speaking, independently of the other; but it seems as if the body were directed by the soul.

The principal work of Leibnitz on the philosophy of religion is his *Essais de Theodicée* (Amst. 1710, 2 parts, 12mo), in which, at the instance of Queen Sophia Charlotte of Prussia, he endeavored to refute Bayle, who believed that he had found in the misfortunes of this world a contradiction of the goodness and wisdom of God. He sought, on the contrary, to prove that, as the world was intended to be the abode of finite creatures, it must of necessity itself have certain imperfections; but that, among all possible worlds, God has selected the best. This theory of the best world has been designated by the name Optimism.

Although Leibnitz was engaged only in certain departments of philosophy, and consequently elaborated no comprehensive philosophical system, this work was performed in his spirit, yet independently, by Christian Wolf, born at Breslau, 1679. He, like Leibnitz, combined the study of philosophy with that of mathematics, and became, in 1707, professor of mathematics in Halle. But he there incurred the suspicions of the theologians by his advocacy of the opinions of Leibnitz. They discovered in the *harmonia praestabilita* open fatalism, and even accused Wolf of atheism, because he rejected the usual arguments for
the existence of God. They therefore brought such influences to bear upon Frederic William I. that Wolf was deposed in 1723, and banished from the country. He then became professor at Marburg, but was very honorably recalled by Frederic II. to the chancellorship of the university (1740), was afterward raised to the rank of baron, and died in 1754. Although Wolf started with the philosophy of Leibnitz, he elaborated it in a thoroughly independent manner. He deviated in some respects from Leibnitz, supplied many of the portions which the latter had left incomplete, and thus produced a perfect philosophical system. It is distinguished particularly for its rigidly mathematical form, both in the arrangement of the whole and in the disposition of the single arguments. Wolf was the first to employ mathematics in philosophy, and his philosophy is consequently remarkable for its systematic coherence, the strictness of the argumentation, and its extraordinary clearness and conciseness. Wolf made valuable contributions to theology, not only by the new arguments which he advanced in support of the truths of natural theology, but also by his rigid separation of the departments of natural and revealed religion. Among the German Protestants, Wolf completely destroyed all vestiges of the Aristotelian scholastic philosophy. To him also belongs the great distinction of having cultivated the German language so as to adapt it to the purposes of speculative philosophy, whereas Thomasius had written in German only upon popular philosophy.

Wolf, however, was not without opponents. The most important was Christian August Crusius, professor of theology and philosophy at Leipsic (d. 1775). He opposed the philosophy of Leibnitz and Wolf with another system, which commended itself especially to theologians by conforming as strictly as possible to the system of the Church, and even seeking to prove some of the positive doctrines of the latter—e.g. the doctrine of the Trinity—by philosophical methods. There was, however, so much in his system that was arbitrary and manifestly derived rather from the imagination than the understanding, that his school soon disappeared.

After the defects of the Wolfian philosophy had become more generally recognized, eclecticism became prevalent among the German philosophers, and there was also a tendency to give up speculation and to develop the practical truths of sound reason
in a universally intelligible manner. This course was taken by several philosophers of distinction—Garve, Plattner, and others; but the general effect of the Popular Philosophy was to impair the accuracy of philosophical statement and argumentation, and to foster such superficiality as prevailed among the Encyclopedists. This was the case with Basedow.

§ 8.

CONTINUATION.

An entirely new epoch in German philosophy dates from the appearance of critical philosophy, with Immanuel Kant, professor of philosophy at Königsberg (d. 1804). The earlier systems had either a dogmatic character, inasmuch as they laid down a few principles as of immediate certainty, and did no more than deduce conclusions from them; or else they had a skeptical character, and called in question the certainty of all human knowledge. Kant, however, began by more rigidly separating the two classes of our cognitions, the purely rational from the empirical, and defining more accurately the limits of each. His first work was the Kritik der reinen Vernunft (1781), which was followed by the Kritik der praktischen Vernunft (1788) and others.

The appearance of Kant not only marked an epoch in philosophy, but had an important influence upon theology. By his efforts the superficial French naturalism was overthrown in Germany. He showed that pure reason certainly can not demonstrate the truths of religion, but proved the latter to be postulates of the practical reason, and consequently objects of a rational faith. At the same time, he pointed out the limits of rational cognition, and thus precluded all dogmatizing upon matters which transcend its sphere. Accordingly, the philosophy of Kant did not directly impugn the doctrine of a higher revelation, although it was pre-eminently the occasion of that
revolution in Protestant theology which resulted in rationalism.¹

After the time of Kant, philosophy entirely abandoned its hostile attitude toward theology; there was rather an increasing tendency on the part of the latter to assimilate itself to the former. No philosophical system arose without the attempt being made to remodel the dogmatic system according to its principles. Consequently, the history of philosophy forms the basis of the history of the later theology.

In the footsteps of Kant came Johann Gottlieb Fichte, who, in his Wissenschaftslehre, 1794, endeavored to erect upon the foundation laid by Kant a philosophical system developed from a single self-evident proposition. He too deduced from the requirements of the practical reason the necessity of a moral system of the universe, which he called God. This was construed as atheism, and he was consequently compelled to resign his professorship at Jena in 1799. He afterward became professor in the then recently founded university of Berlin (d. 1814).

An entirely different method was followed by Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling, at first professor at Jena, then at Würzburg, academician at Munich, finally professor at Berlin. He was the founder of the Philosophy of Nature,² which assumed an identity of the Deity and the world, the ideal and the real, the body and the soul, and, by the aid of a so-called inward intuition, sought to develop the laws of things. Although this philosophy was favorable to the natural sciences, inasmuch as it gave them a new impulse, its general effects were not beneficial. It awakened the imagination and emotions at the expense of the understanding, and also gave rise to many subsequent errors in the sphere of theology. Moreover, Schelling occupied a wholly different attitude toward theology from Kant and Fichte.

These critical philosophers made it a principle to subject all, even the positive, doctrines of theology to the tests of reason; and, while they thus found a certain kernel of religious truth in the doctrines of Christianity, taught that the rest was to be regarded as temporary and local opinions, which were valuable only so far as they were the necessary forms by which alone, under those external conditions, religious truth could find acceptance among

¹ Kant's Religion Innerhalb der Gränzen der blossen Vernunft, 1793. 8.
² First in the works, Ideen zur Naturphilosophie, 1797; Ueber die Weltseele, 1796.
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men. Schelling, on the contrary, found in these positive doctrines of Christianity the expression of eternal ideas of reason, and accordingly endeavor to deduce them from the principles of reason and to combine them with his philosophy. To attain this end, it must be confessed that he was often compelled to give these doctrines a different interpretation from that which is usual in the Church. This was also the case with Hegel's philosophy, which came into notice at the close of this period, and soon after acquired a predominant influence.
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THE JANSENIST CONTROVERSIES.

Pfaff, Diss. de Gratia et Praedest. 21 ss.—Marheineke, Symbolik, iii. 87.

During this period the weakness of the Papal hierarchy became increasingly manifest. In the Church the Jesuits had made themselves so powerful and formidable that the popes were compelled to submit to their guidance. The Papal decrees, which did not please the Jesuits, were disregarded by them. In their relations with temporal sovereigns, the popes also became more and more sensible that the nimbus of majesty and dignity which once surrounded them had disappeared, and were compelled to submit to indignities, especially from France, which had been formerly unknown. Nevertheless, they did not abandon their old pretensions, notwithstanding that they were so decidedly rejected, but concealed them only when it seemed to be necessary. When they thought they could venture it, they still acted in the spirit of Hildebrand, as is manifest from the series of controversies which were carried on in France during the first half of this period, and which began with the Jansenist controversies.

The Bajian controversy respecting the Augustinian system, in which particularly the Franciscans and the Jesuits had taken ground against the genuine Augustinian doctrine, had remained a mere theological dispute, without causing any schism in the Church. But the revival of the same dispute by Cornelius Jansenius was more serious. He was a Holländer by birth, studied

1 On the Papacy after the Peace of Westphalia, see Wessenberg's Geschichte der Concillen, iv. 263.
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Theology in Louvain, there adopted the system of Augustine, and in consequence became one of the most active opponents of the Jesuits. At first professor of theology in Louvain, he became bishop of Ypres, where he died soon after, in 1638. Shortly before his death he completed a work upon which he had labored twenty-two years, an exposition of the true Augustinian system derived from the writings of Augustine himself. It was published by his friends, and appeared in 1640: Augustinus, seu Doctrina S. Augustini de Humanae Naturae Sanitate, Aegritudine et Medicina adversus Pelagianos et Massilienses. This work attracted universal attention. The Jesuits, who had always been the enemies of Jansen, attacked it with violence, while it was defended by his friends, among whom were all the theologians of Louvain and a great part of the higher clergy of the Netherlands. Soon afterward the work was prohibited by the Inquisition, and in the year 1643 Urban VIII. repeated this prohibition in his bull In Eminenti, on the general grounds that, according to a Papal decree, nothing ought to have been printed on the doctrine De Aua'iliis, and that the book of Jansen contained several errors. At first this bull was generally resisted in the Netherlands, not only at the University of Louvain, but also among the Flemish clergy. The Spanish government, however, interposed, and they were obliged to accept the bull, but were excused from subscribing it (1651). Nevertheless, the attachment to Jansen and the aversion to the Papal bull were long cherished secretly in the Netherlands.

More open and violent were the disturbances produced by the Papal bull in France. The work of Jansen had there been received with approval by many theologians even in the Sorbonne, when the demand was made upon the latter to accept the Papal bull (1644). This was declined, and shortly after Antoine Arnauld, Doctor of the Sorbonne, went so far as to write two works in defense of Jansen; and so began the Jansenist controversy, which so long distracted the French Church. The Jesuits, with a numerous following in the Sorbonne, took the lead in the attack upon the adherents of Jansenius, and gave them the name of Jansenists. They in turn called their opponents Molinists.

* By the abbot of St. Cyran, Jean du Verger de Hauranne.
* Comp. C. Jansenii Tetratenchus in Evangg. Aveoni, 1853. 12.
* Vater's Archiv, 1834, i. 101.
although they did not all accept the principles of Molina. The Jansenists, true to the system of Augustine, who, to show the insufficiency of human powers to attain to holiness, advanced the most rigid moral principles, were the most deadly enemies of the Jesuitical perversions of morality and of all merely external sanctity. They laid great stress upon inward holiness, and taught that the sacraments themselves, when only outwardly received without proper spiritual preparation, were unavailing. Moreover, contrary to the prevailing principles of the Church, they recommended in general, with great earnestness, the reading of the Holy Scriptures. It is to be regretted that the new spiritual life awakened by such principles was too much tinctured, in the Jansenists, with a gloomy mysticism, and that they attached so great importance to penances and self-mortification as to lead even to the disregard of health and life. Their most noted leaders were Antoine Arnauld, Blaise Pascal, Pierre Nicole, and Martin de Barcos, Abbot of St. Cyran (d. 1678). Their principal seat was the nunnery of Port Royal, in a suburb of Paris, of which the abbess was the sister of Antoine Arnauld, who had restored the strict conventual discipline. Most of the leaders of the Jansenists resided in the vicinity of this convent in the exercise of rigid austerity, and for this reason they were also called Messieurs de Port Royal.

As the Papal bull had not condemned any particular doctrines of Jansen as heretical, the first concern of the Jesuit party in the Sorbonne, after the appearance of Arnauld's apologies, was to extract such propositions from the work of Jansen, and have them expressly condemned by the Pope. They obtained their wish from Innocent X., who condemned (1653, in the bull *Cum Occasione Impressionis Libri*) five doctrines ostensibly Jansen's, particularly the following: That many Papal decrees could not possibly be observed by the faithful; that the divine grace is irresistible; and that Christ did not die for all men.

When this bull appeared, the Jesuits had already gained the
majority, and counted in their party the most eminent of the clergy; and even Cardinal Mazarin, who then stood at the head of the government, in connection with many other French bishops, thanked the Pope for this decision. But the Jansenists did not yield. They asserted that the propositions condemned by the Pope were not to be found in the writings of Jansen, in the sense in which he had taken them. They therefore declared that, while the decision of the Pope respecting the orthodoxy of the doctrines must of course be obeyed, in order to condemn Jansen, the fact must be settled in what sense he intended his expressions. This question also (question de fait) awakened a lively controversy. The Jansenists complained that they were treated like a sect separated from the Church, and on their part continued to expose the disgraceful moral principles and policy of the Jesuits. And as it soon became evident they were now the most powerful party arrayed against the Jesuits, many honest men espoused their cause from hatred to the latter. Particularly influential in this respect were the Lettres Provinciales of Pascal (1656), which, in an elegant and attractive style, laid bare the true character of the Jesuits.

In the meantime Alexander VII. became Pope (1655–1667). To put an end to the dispute in France, he issued a new constitution anathematizing those who asserted that the five propositions had not been condemned according to the sense of Jansen (1656). In vain the Jansenists remonstrated that this was a purely historical question, upon which the Church itself could not decide, much less the Pope. The French bishops all accepted the Papal decree, and drew up a formula which was to be subscribed by all the clergy, and in which they were to declare their submission to the Papal constitutions and reject the five propositions of Jansen. All who should decline to subscribe were to be regarded and prosecuted as heretics. After the king had given his sanction to this decree (1661), the subscription was to be required. The leaders of the Jansenists concealed themselves, since they were in the greatest danger. The nuns

---

8 Pascal's Leben, von Reuchlin, Stuttgart. 1840.
10 Lannol Opp. iv. ii. 88.
of Port Royal resolutely refused to subscribe, and consequently were subjected to very harsh treatment. But in addition to these there were many ecclesiastics and even four bishops who would not subscribe the formula, while many other bishops openly condemned the policy of compulsory subscription, inasmuch as the point at issue was not a doctrine, but a fact. The whole French Church was thrown into the greatest confusion.

At this juncture Clement IX. became Pope (1667–1669), and induced the four bishops to subscribe the formula (1668) by conceding the omission of the expression *unconditionally* (*pure-ment*), so that the declaration was thus less distinctly made that Jansen had actually taught these doctrines in an heretical sense. By these means quiet was outwardly restored in the French Church, and the persecution of the Jansenists ceased. But the discord between the two parties still continued to exist, and waited only for an opportunity to break forth afresh and with greater violence.

§ 10.

THE DISPUTES OF LOUIS XIV. WITH THE POPES.

Although Louis XIV. had sided with the Jesuits in the Jansenist controversy,1 uniformly sustaining the Papal decisions and persecuting the refractory Jansenists, he was yet extremely jealous of the preservation of his royal prerogatives, resented the slightest encroachment upon them on the part of the popes, and endeavored rather to enlarge them. He was thus brought into collision with Innocent XI., a very estimable Pope, who with earnestness and rigor attempted to reform the many abuses which were prevalent at Rome (1676–1689). The French kings had exercised a right over most of the bishoprics under the name of *La régale*, by which, in case of a vacancy, they received the revenues and filled the ecclesiastical offices in the gift of the bishop until the new bishop had taken the oath of allegiance to the King. Louis XIV. wished to extend this right to all the bishoprics, and required this oath of fealty from the bishops on their appointment. As many declined to comply with this re-

---

1 The Mémoires de Daniel de Cosnac, Archevêque d'Aix, publiés par le Comte Jules de Cosnac, Paris, 1852, 2 vols., show how the bishops were involved in the intrigues of the court.
quirement, the King gave orders that their sees be considered for the time being vacant, and had them administered by vicars. The bishops appealed to the Pope, who took their part and went so far as to excommunicate the ecclesiastics appointed by the King. In order to punish the Pope for this action, Louis convoked a council of the French clergy at Paris in 1682 to secure the rights of the French Church. These rights were recapitulated by the council in a solemn declaration consisting of four propositions (Quatuor Propositiones Cleri Gallicani). In the first, the clergy declared that the Pope’s jurisdiction was confined to spiritual matters, and did not extend to secular affairs and to kings and princes. The second proposition maintained the authority of an oecumenical council over the Pope. The third declared that the Pope was bound by the laws of the Church, and also by the particular regulations and usages of the French Church. And, lastly, the fourth asserted that the decisions of the Pope without the ratification of the Church were not unalterable. The King ordered these Propositions to be published every where and publicly read in the universities. In Rome, however, they were received with the greatest indignation. Innocent had them immediately burned by the public executioner, and notified the French clergy of his extreme displeasure at their action. In order to compel the revocation of these Propositions, Innocent withheld from the newly appointed bishops in France their bulls of ratification, so that a large number of the French sees soon stood vacant. Louis XIV., on the other hand, devised a new method of retaliation.

Innocent had determined to abolish the right of asylum which was attached to the residences of the foreign embassadors at Rome. This privilege protected even the worst criminals from arrest when they had found refuge in the district where the foreign embassador resided. Inasmuch as all police regulations were thereby rendered inoperative, all the sovereigns except Louis XIV. agreed to relinquish this privilege. He, however, persistently refused. When the Pope gave orders to the magistrates to respect the right of asylum no longer, Louis XIV. (1687) sent an embassador with a retinue of a thousand soldiers to maintain it by force. In vain the Pope excommunicated the

---

3 Wessenberg, iv. 371.
envoy. Louis retaliated by seizing Avignon. Neither Innocent XI. nor his successor Alexander VIII. (1689–1691), who solemnly condemned the Four Propositions in a bull, lived to see the end of this struggle. It was not until the time of Innocent XII. (1691–1700) that it was terminated by a mutual compromise. Louis, indeed, continued to maintain the right of the régale in all the sees of his kingdom, but he relinquished the right of asylum and restored Avignon to the Pope.

A far more important concession, however, was made when he allowed the bishops elect, in order to obtain the Papal ratification, to humbly address the Pope, disowning the Four Propositions, and promising to treat them as if they had never been passed by the council (1692).^4^ It is true that the French Church did not on this account relinquish these principles, but the court withdrew its support from their defenders, that the good understanding which once more existed with the Pope might not be disturbed. During the controversy the King had commissioned the celebrated Bishop of Meaux, Jacques Benigne Bossuet, then the most distinguished of all the French theologians, who had himself been present at the council of the French clergy, to write a defense of the Four Propositions. But now Louis would not allow this work to be printed, and it remained in manuscript until it was finally published in Geneva.\(^5\)

§ 11.

QUIETISM.

The ethical system of the Jesuits made Christian virtue a matter of comparatively small importance, and attached a disproportionate value to the external exercises of worship. It is not, therefore, surprising that more deeply religious natures were painfully wounded and repelled by it, and consequently driven to the opposite extreme of contemplative mysticism.

---


For this reason the seventeenth century abounded in mystics, many of whom were to be found among the Jansenists. The Jesuits were well aware that this tendency was unfavorable to their interests, and therefore exerted themselves to the utmost to repress it. The most remarkable example of the kind is presented by the history of the Quietists, a class of mystics who appeared toward the close of the seventeenth century, so called because they endeavored by inward contemplation and devotion to attain to holiness and the true rest of the soul. The name was taken from that of a fanatical party in the Greek Church in the fourteenth century called Hesychiasts.¹

The first who was persecuted under this name was Michael Molinos, a Spanish priest who lived at Rome, and was there held in very high esteem as a preacher and confessor. He wrote in 1675 the Guida Spirituale (Spiritual Guide), which was everywhere received with the greatest favor and translated into many languages. This work was intended to be a guide to contemplation. It particularly recommended inward prayer and meditation, but attached little value to external exercises. For a long time the work was eagerly read in Rome, being highly esteemed by Innocent XI. himself, when suddenly, at the instigation of Louis XIV., who acted under the influence of his confessor, the celebrated Jesuit La Chaise, Molinos was imprisoned at Rome and his book subjected to a searching examination. In the year 1687 Molinos was compelled to abjure his errors, and was condemned to perpetual imprisonment. Undoubtedly the main reason for this cruelty was the fear that his doctrines would be detrimental to the external worship of the Church.

Nevertheless, quietism found not a few adherents and apologists in France. The most noted was a lady of rank, Madame Guyon, who by her persuasive eloquence gained many followers, and, with truly devout although extravagant sentiments, aimed always at inward purification through contemplation, and mourned over the prevalence of a merely external and mechanical worship in the Church. After having been driven from several cities at the instigation of the bishops, she came at last to Paris, and there gained many adherents at the court itself.

Her most distinguished friend was the pious abbot François de Salignac de la Motte Fénélon, then instructor of the royal princes, who was attracted by the devout sensibility and fervor of Madame Guyon. On the other hand, the not less famous Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, who was regarded as the oracle of orthodoxy in France, took ground against quietism. He also was a truly pious man, but possessed too keen a mind to overlook the dangerous tendency of this mysticism, and was too firmly grounded in the orthodox faith to be deceived by the errors contained in many of the tenets of these mystics, who, influenced by their feelings, were not always careful to observe the limits of orthodoxy. Consequently, Madame Guyon came into bad repute and lost favor at court. She was even imprisoned for a time, but was afterward released (d. 1717).

After Fénélon had become Archbishop of Cambray, in 1694, Bossuet was desirous that he should now also condemn the opinions of Madame Guyon. But Fénélon had too much respect for the pious purpose of that lady to consent. He believed that the mystics had not always comprehended their own obscure ideas, and that their deviations from orthodoxy were only misapprehensions, while their fundamental principles (especially that which made pure love to God the source of all Christian perfection) were, when rightly developed, wholly orthodox, and consistent with the Church doctrine. He therefore endeavored to reconcile quietism with orthodoxy, and to this end wrote his Explication des Maximes des Saints. Scarcely had this work appeared before he was violently assailed by several of the bishops, particularly by Bossuet. Louis XIV. also was prejudiced against Fénélon by the latter. The matter was referred to the decision of the Pope, and Innocent XII. condemned twenty-three propositions in Fénélon’s work as offensive, injurious, and false (1699). Fénélon had the humility to submit immediately to this decision, and even read it himself from the pulpit to his congregation. So the contest ended, and Fénélon secured by his course the respect of all.

---

2. He had a particular spite against Fénélon on account of the Télémaque, which was supposed to be a satire against his government. On this subject, and especially on the course of Mme. de Maintenon, see Bredow in the Minerva, annual for the year 1814, p. 287 ss.
§ 12.
CONTINUATION OF THE Jansenist Controversies.

The peace which Clement IX. had restored in the French Church by allowing the Jansenists to subscribe the formula conditionally (1668) was not of long duration. The Jesuit party soon resumed the persecution of the Jansenists, and compelled the leaders, among them Arnauld, to seek refuge in the Netherlands, where they found many secret friends and adherents of Jansen, and where they ended their lives in concealment. In order to obliterate every trace of Jansenism, the Jesuits began to assert that it was not enough to subscribe the formula, but that it was necessary to believe that the Pope and the Church could not err even in matters of fact.

Clement XI. (1700–1721) came to their aid with a bull (Vineam Domini), in which he went so far as to insist upon the unconditional belief that Jansen had taught the mooted propositions in an heretical sense (1705), thereby completely abrogating the compromise of Clement IX. The nuns of Port Royal were also directed to subscribe this bull, and when they refused were subjected to all sorts of persecution, until the hatred of the Jesuits finally procured the total suppression of the convent, and even the destruction of the building itself (1710).

Simultaneously with these events the efforts of the Jesuits were particularly directed against a work which, till then unnoticed, had gained the Jansenists many friends—the New Testament of Paschasius Quesnel. This man, who was a priest of the Oratoire at Paris, was a Jansenist, for which reason he was forced to leave France, in 1685, and for a time resided with Arnauld in the Netherlands. Persecuted there also, he fled to Holland, and died at an advanced age in Amsterdam, 1719. Subsequent to 1671, Quesnel had published a French translation of the New Testament, with practical explanations, which was received with universal favor, and passed through numerous editions. There were, it is true, traces of Jansenism in this work, and the Jesuits, therefore, sought to cast suspicion upon it. It was, however, earnestly recommended by the Cardinal and Archbishop of Paris, De Noailles, who was no friend of the Jesuits. This made the latter the more anxious to procure the condemnation of the
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book; and at last Louis XIV. was persuaded by his Jesuit confessor to submit the subject to the decision of the Pope. Accordingly, in 1713, the infamous bull *Unigenitus* (Dei Filius) appeared, in which the severest condemnation was pronounced upon Quesnel's New Testament, and one hundred and one propositions were particularly designated as false and heretical. Among these propositions were many very distinctly contained in the Holy Scriptures, while others had been taken verbatim from Augustine and other Fathers; but no explanations were added in the bull to show in what sense they were wrong, and therefore to be condemned in Quesnel. For this reason the bull caused the greatest commotion in France, and a number of bishops, with the Cardinal de Noailles at their head, as well as many doctors of the Sorbonne, refused their assent to it. Louis XIV. did all in his power, even using force, to compel them to submit; but in 1715 he died, leaving the French Church in the greatest confusion, divided between the Acceptants, or Constitutionists, and the Anti-Conventionists. The Duke of Orleans, who administered the government as Regent, was an enemy of the Jesuits, and for this reason at first favored the opponents of the constitution *Unigenitus*. This emboldened a number of ecclesiastics, who had been hitherto restrained by fear, to declare against the bull; and, when the Pope still refused to yield and would give no explanation, in the year 1717 some twenty bishops, with the Archbishop de Noailles at their head, the University of Paris, the congregation of St. Maur, and a great number of other ecclesiastics, appealed from the Pope to a universal council. This step only widened the breach. The Appellants were now still more loudly accused by the Acceptants of Jansenism, although most of them declared themselves decidedly against it. The Regent was much embarrassed. All the attempts which were made, under his direction, to induce the Pope to compromise were ineffectual, and Clement XI. insisted upon obedience to his bull. At this juncture, the Regent, probably fearing a schism, altered his policy, and had the bull accepted by the Parliament (1720). De Noailles also assented to it with certain explanations, which he at the same time made public. The other Appellants were at least reduced to silence, and several who continued, notwithstanding, to

declaim against the bull were banished. When Louis XV. came to the throne, and Cardinal Fleury, a friend of the Jesuits, exercised, from the year 1726, the entire control of the government, the position of the Appellants became still more desperate. They were now subjected to rigorous persecution. De Noailles himself was compelled to subscribe the bull unconditionally, and many fled to the United Netherlands, particularly to Utrecht, to avoid the persecution, and joined the Jansenists who still remained there.

Among the most resolute Appellants were the congregation of St. Maur, of whom more than five hundred became Re-appellants, and refused to accept the bull, in spite of the displeasure of the Pope, who threatened to dissolve the congregation, and of the King, who, by encroachments upon the liberty of their general chapter, prevented the election of Re-appellants as superiors. At last the superiors were persuaded to join the Constitutionists; and, by banishment and imprisonment of the most determined Re-appellants, the general resolution was so far broken that the bull was accepted without reservation. But from that time the congregation declined in intelligence and vigor, and never afterward was of much account.

Benedict XIII., a Dominican (1724–1730), in his bull Pretiosus in Conspectu Domini, enjoined upon the Dominican Order, to which he was extremely partial, to preach the whole doctrine of St. Augustine and St. Thomas, and especially the doctrine of the operation of grace and election without reference to good works. The Jesuits resisted the publication of the bull, and employed all their arts to destroy its efficiency. The Pope published it notwithstanding; but at last, weary of the dispute, imposed silence upon both parties.

All at once a report was circulated of miracles performed in behalf of the oppressed Appellants. Among the Appellants, the deacon François de Paris was revered as a kind of saint. He had lived, according to Jansenist principles, in miserable hovels, performing continual penances. His extreme asceticism caused

---

2 Cf. Histoire de la Constitution Unigenitus en ce qui regarde la Congrég. de St. Maur, Utrecht, 1736, 8.

his premature death in 1727, and he was buried in the cemetery of St. Médard, in one of the suburbs of Paris. When his admirers now made their pilgrimages to his grave, they soon discovered that wonderful cures were wrought there. The result was, that invalids of every sort streamed incessantly to this grave, and all Paris was soon filled with stories of wonderful cures, which passed among the people for so many divine declarations against the bull *Unigenitus*. A remarkable incident in connection with this excitement was the conversion of the Member of Parliament Montgeron, who had previously led a very dissipated life and despised all religion. He went to the cemetery of St. Médard from curiosity, and was so deeply affected by the appearance of fervor and rapture with which the great multitudes were praying at the grave of St. Paris that he fell down and besought God for light, and from that time led a life of rigid penitence. He subsequently published a description of eight miracles said to have been wrought at the grave of St. Paris and supported by sworn testimony, and endeavored to prove by them both the innocence of the Appellants and the pernicious intentions of the Pope and the Jesuits. But when he presented this work to the King, he was sent to the Bastille, where he remained until his death. As regards these miracles at the grave of St. Paris, it is difficult, in the absence of unprejudiced and careful investigations made at the time, to determine the true state of the case. This much is certain, that a great number of the sick were not cured, and then the fault was attributed to their own lack of the inward grace. Other reputed cures were either only partial or of short duration, while in some instances it was shown even at that time, by the investigations which were instituted, 


that falsehood and deception had been employed. The Jesuits, however, were greatly embarrassed by these miracles, since they could not disprove them without impugning by their arguments the other miracles of the Church. They therefore sometimes refused to give an opinion, sometimes attributed them to the Devil, or else tried to make out that they were simple benefactions, which had nothing to do with the doctrines of the recipients.

But from the year 1731, when the party of the Appellants, and still more the populace in Paris, had become thoroughly excited by these miracles, there began to be new developments. There were many who for a long time previous had undertaken all sorts of fanatical vows and penances in honor of St. Paris. They now began to have ecstatic experiences at the grave of the saint. They fell into convulsions and sang, or preached and prophesied, generally against the bull _Unigenitus_. To check this disorder, the King had the cemetery of St. Médard walled up and occupied by a military guard. But this only made the mischief worse; for all the relics of the saint, of which great numbers were preserved, and every handful of earth from his grave, now sufficed to cure all diseases and to produce ecstasies, so that the only result of this measure was to multiply the places where the miracles were wrought. The number of the Convulsionnaires constantly increased, and the mad frenzy which had taken possession of the Parisian populace in particular grew more violent.

Before long the Convulsionnaires began to require forcible means (_secours violents_) to intensify their ecstasies. Among them were bodily tortures of all kinds, which were practiced by many of the Convulsionnaires to a fearful extent. They caused themselves to be beaten upon the breast with iron bars, rolled themselves about in or near a great fire, and boasted afterward that during this time they had been in a peculiarly blissful state. All the royal commands and penalties were ineffectual; but at last these very excesses brought the whole thing to an end. The most reputable Appellants condemned these _secours violents_ as sins against the Sixth Commandment, and thus their party divided into Secouristes and Anti-Secouristes. The former were almost exclusively confined to the populace, and the miracles continued among them only, but gradually decreased when the charm of novelty
had worn off and the movement had ceased to be supported by men of intelligence. Afterward the Appellants continued to exist secretly in France. They had their own priests, who confessed them and administered the communion, but no measures were taken against them except that the clergy frequently warned the people against them as heretics and Jansenists. But from the year 1752 new disorders began. The Appellants were always compelled to apply to the regular priest for the sacrament of extreme unction as a condition of burial in consecrated ground. This induced the Archbishop of Paris, Christophe de Beaumont, at the instigation of the Jesuits, to forbid the administration of the sacraments to those about to die unless they could prove by a certificate that they had formerly confessed to the priest of their parish. But the Parliament immediately took the matter in hand and declared that the sacraments could not be refused on this ground, since the bull Unigenitus was not a rule of faith. The Archbishop was supported by the King, but the Parliament persistend in their determination, and, when such a case of refusal occurred, had the revenues of the Archbishop confiscated. The King forbade the Parliament to interfere in spiritual affairs, and followed this action by banishing all its members to foreign parts; but it was to no purpose. He was finally compelled to yield, since most of the other French bishops declared that the presentation of a certificate of confession was not necessary for the administration of the sacraments. The Pope, Benedict XIV., was asked to decide the matter, which he did in a very mild form (1756). He called, it is true, the bull Unigenitus an apostolic constitution to which obedience was due, but required that the sacraments should only be refused to those who were open and notorious opponents of the bull.

This action immediately put an end to the Jansenist disputes in France, and after the fall of the Jesuits the bull Unigenitus lost its authority completely.  

---

* Tanta est profecta in Ecclesia Dei auctoritas apostolicae constitutionis, quae incipit Unigenitus, ut nemo fidellum poscit absque salutis aeternae discrimine a debita erga ipsam subjectione sese subducere.  
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This dispute was one great cause of the deterioration of the French clergy. For zeal in behalf of the bull *Unigenitus* was one of the chief recommendations for promotion to the higher offices of the Church. In this way Dubois, Laffitteau, Tencin, Rohan, even became cardinals.⁹

§ 13.

THE JANSENIST CHURCH IN THE NETHERLANDS.

The Jansenists and Appellants found nowhere a safer residence than in the Republic of the United Netherlands, and consequently many repaired thither on account of the persecutions in France and the Spanish Netherlands. After the Reformation only a few Catholics were left in this republic. They were under the spiritual direction of a bishop in *partibus*, who had his residence in Utrecht. The Flemish Catholics were for the most part favorable to Quesnel’s writings, and the higher clergy had been won over to the cause of Jansenism by Arnauld, who, about the year 1689, resided in Delft.¹ They were therefore denounced by the Jesuits as Jansenists, although they always refused to accept this name. The Jesuits now attempted to force their way into these regions as missionaries for the purpose of alienating the Catholic population from their pastors, while at the same time they accused the latter at Rome, and finally succeeded in procuring from the Pope the removal of the Archbishop of Utrecht (1704). These measures incensed the Flemish Catholics still more against the Papacy. The government came soon after to their rescue and forbade all foreign priests, particularly the Jesuits, to labor within its bounds. The bull *Unigenitus*, which excited universal indignation in Holland among the Catholics, and the immigration of the persecuted French Appellants, completed the rupture of this Church with Rome. When the Pope obstinately refused to confirm a newly elected bishop of Utrecht, the chapter of that place had him consecrated in 1723

---

² Mémoires touchant le Progrès du Jansenisme en Hollande, 1698.
by a bishop who belonged to the Appellants. In order that the episcopal succession might not be broken, these Appellants also had bishops appointed for Haarlem and Deventer, and thus the Church of Utrecht has maintained itself separate from Rome to the present time. They are indeed called Jansenists by the Roman Catholics, but have always refused to acknowledge that name, and have preserved the strictest orthodoxy. Yet they have always been distinguished for their opposition to the ethics of the Jesuits, the strictness of their Church discipline, and their subjection to the temporal government. This Church has continued to recognize the primacy of the Roman See, but has made a distinction between the Roman See and the Roman Curia, upon which it laid the blame of the separation. With reference to the Pope, it taught very emphatically that he was liable to err, and had actually given utterance in the bull *Unigenitus* to heretical doctrines; that he was therefore inferior in authority to the councils and bound to respect appeals to the same; and that he had not the right to violate the Church laws and the privileges of individual churches, as he had done in the case of the Church of Utrecht. The blame of this error on the part of the Pope was charged to the Roman Curia and its ambition. This Church of Utrecht has consequently always shown itself very favorably disposed to reunion with the Church of Rome if the latter would only acknowledge its principles. Accordingly, they are accustomed to present the names of their newly elected bishops to the Pope for confirmation, and, when this is refused, to repeat the solemn appeal to an oecumenical council. Likewise at the election of a new Pope this *Ecclesia Ultrajectina* has solemn masses celebrated, the *Te Deum* sung, and a letter of congratulation sent to the new Pope; but in return it has received upon each occasion a kind of bull of excommunication.2

2 Gabriel du Pac de Bellegarde, born 1717, accompanied the Doctor of the Sorbonne D’Eltemare (for whom, as his theological instructor, he had a strong attachment) in 1751 to Holland, was for a time prebendary in Lyons, and died at Utrecht, 1789. His writings are distinguished for thorough acquaintance with ecclesiastical antiquities and canon law: Collection Générale des Œuvres d’Ant. Arnauld, Lausanne, 1772–83, 49 vols. 4. Supplem. ad Varias Collectiones Operum Z. B. v. Espen, 1763. Mémoires sur l’Histoire de la Bulle Unigenitus dans les Pays-Bas depuis 1713 jusqu’en 1730, Utrecht, 1755, 4 vols. 12. He was one of the most active members of the convocation at Utrecht in 1763, and wrote the important preface to the Recueil des Témoignages rendus à l’Église d’Utrecht. This work was followed by L’Histoire Abrégée de l’Église Métropolitaine d’Utrecht, 1765, 12. éd. Sième, Utr. 1852. He used his connection with the celebrated Van Swieten to circulate writings
SECOND CHAPTER.
HISTORY OF THE ORDER OF JESUS TO THE TIME OF ITS ABOLISHMENT.

§ 14.
CONDITION OF THE ORDER IN EUROPE DURING THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.


About the middle of the seventeenth century the Order was in an exceedingly flourishing condition. It numbered about twenty thousand members, who, scattered throughout the known world, possessed establishments every where, in some cases with very considerable property, and in many countries unbounded influence. Moreover, they were closely united among themselves and strictly subordinated to the commands of the General, so that the latter could often control by his will whole states and kingdoms. The education of the young was in many countries almost entirely in their hands, and several universities, e.g., Vienna and Prague, were exclusively supplied with instructors from their number. In most of the Catholic kingdoms the Jesuits possessed unlimited influence over the sovereigns and men of high rank (as they were accustomed to select their confessors from the Order), and made use of it to further the schemes of the popes, and especially the interests of their Order, as well as to oppress their opponents, particularly the Protestant churches. Even in France, where the Order had previously met with so much opposition, it obtained under Louis XIV. the greatest power, and that potent prince yielded himself almost completely to the control of his confessors, the Jesuits La Chaise and Le...
Tellier. They were the chief instigators of the persecution of the Jansenists, in the course of which they expressed with impunity the most extravagant assertions respecting the authority of the Papal decisions in the very country which had once been so liberal.

But, on the other hand, the general reputation of the Order received in its controversy with the Jansenists some serious blows. The loose moral principles of the Jesuits gave their adversaries a most important advantage, of which they did not hesitate to avail themselves in their controversial writings. No work did more to injure the cause of the Order in this respect than the Lettres Provinciales of Blaise Pascal. Pascal was one of the most extraordinary and learned men of his age. In his youth he engaged in the study of physics and mathematics with great success, and made several important discoveries in these sciences, although he ceased to occupy himself with them after his twenty-fourth year. From that time he devoted himself entirely to religious meditations and strict ascetic discipline, and died at the age of thirty-nine in Paris (1662). His Lettres Provinciales, which he published under the assumed name of Louis de Montalte, 1656. 4., were addressed to a Provincial (friend in the provinces), and consist of colloquies between Montalte and a Jesuit, in which the former propounds questions upon moral subjects and the latter answers them according to the principles of his Order. They are masterpieces of satire as well as of pure classic style, and were consequently circulated with the greatest rapidity throughout all Europe, passed through a large number of editions, and were translated into many languages. For a long time Pascal's Letters were the favorite reading of the nation. The Jesuits were held up to ridicule, which did more to injure their cause, especially in France, than if their principles had been exhibited in ever so contemptible a light in serious language. This work was most strictly prohibited by the King, but to no purpose. The prohibition only stimulated curiosity. Quite as fruitless were the refutations of the Jesuits, which appeared in great

number, for they lacked Pascal's wit and satire. It was not until 1696 that a Jesuit, Gabriel Daniel, appeared with a Réponse aux Lettres Provinciales, which attempted, with some success, to turn the weapons of wit and ridicule against Pascal, although it was still far from equaling his famous work. After the appearance of the Provincial Letters, other frequent and severe attacks were made upon the ethics of the Jesuits, not only by Jansenists, but also by other distinguished Catholic theologians. The most important work of this class is that of Nicole Ferrault, Doctor of the Sorbonne. With wonderful pains he has collected all the pernicious doctrines of the Jesuits from the writings of all their moralists, with accurate references to each work, and refuted them. The contest became so violent as even to require the intervention of the popes, who condemned certain of the immoral principles of the Order. Of these several were condemned by Innocent XI., who was in general no friend of the Jesuits (1679), and his successor, Alexander VIII., in 1690 also condemned in particular the doctrine of the "philosophical sin," which was represented by the Jesuits themselves as comparatively unimportant.

All these events had the effect of making the Jesuits in general more cautious in their utterances upon questions of casuistry, and even induced some of them to take open ground against certain ethical principles which had been previously maintained in the Order, e. g., against the doctrine of moral probabilism. Nevertheless, the Order has never entirely renounced these doctrines.

§ 15.
MISSIONARY CONTROVERSIES OF THE ORDER IN CHINA AND MALABAR.

While the Order in Europe was seeking to confirm the authority of the Pope by the most extravagant assertions of his power, especially in the Jansenist controversies, it manifested elsewhere a remarkable insubordination toward the Papal decrees and even the Papal legates, employing against them the
same arguments which it had condemned in the Jansenists, so that it became evident that the real object of its activity and zeal was not the advancement of the Pope, but of the Order. Wherever the authority of the Pope was needed for their own advancement, the Jesuits sought to exalt it in every conceivable manner. But where they found that they could hold the reins of power without his help, they ignored and disobeyed him as soon as he attempted to interfere to the disadvantage of the Order.

Already during the previous period the Jesuit missionaries in China\(^1\) and Madura had been charged by the missionaries of other orders with having made undue concessions to the opinions and customs of those nations, and even with having not only permitted, but also complied with, unchristian and heathenish practices. As long previous as 1632 an order had been issued by Gregory XV. with regard to the so-called Malabar usages, in which a few were allowed under certain restrictions, but the rest strictly prohibited. The Jesuits, however, were never very exact about observing these limitations. As to the Chinese practices, although there were at first some condemnatory decrees issued from Rome against them, Alexander VII. in 1656 decided again in favor of the Jesuits, declaring that the questionable practices were merely of a civil nature, and did not need to be forbidden upon religious grounds. After these decisions there was a season of quiet, but toward the end of the seventeenth century the old controversies were reopened. About this time several Lazarists came to China as missionaries, who forthwith insisted that the honors which the Chinese were accustomed to pay to their ancestors and to Confucius should not be rendered by the new converts, and immediately began to revive the charges against the Jesuits at Rome. At the same time, the complaints against the Jesuit mission in Madura and its compliance with the Malabar usages were revived. In order to investigate and decide upon both of these accusations, the Pope dispatched to Asia the Patriarch of Antioch, De Tournon. He went first to Malabar (1703) and there decided entirely against the Jesuits, condemning the Malabar usages, which they permitted and even observed themselves. But when De Tournon in 1705 crossed to China, the Jesuits there put a melancholy end to his work. By their mathemat-

\(^1\) Vater's Anbau, ii. 125.
ical, mechanical, and astronomical knowledge they had managed to secure the favor of the emperors in a high degree, and as court mathematicians occupied positions of considerable influence. Accordingly, when De Tournon as Papal legate forbade the converts to observe the Chinese practices, the Jesuits obtained an imperial decree for his imprisonment, and after much ill-treatment the legate died in prison (1710).²

The Jesuits in Madura also entirely disregarded the directions of De Tournon, and persistently declared that they had received the permission of the Pope for the Malabar usages. The Capuchins at Pondicherry on this account suspended all ecclesiastical intercourse with the Jesuits. But the latter managed to hold their own in this French colony by the assistance of influential members of the Order in France. Although the Capuchins induced Clement XII. to issue a new decree against the Malabar usages (1734), the Jesuits nevertheless succeeded in preventing it from attracting much notice. They published it in Latin, made the same distinction between facts and right which they had condemned so strenuously in the Jansenists, asserted that the Pope had been deceived in the facts and the like. The Capuchins accordingly sent Father Norbert to Rome to press their charges with greater energy. Benedict XIV. now issued a stringent prohibition of the Malabar usages in the bull Omnium Sollicitudinum; and as the Jesuits had to govern their course with reference to the European states in whose colonies they were residing, they were forced to obey. This only increased their hatred of Father Norbert.

He had published at Avignon in 1742 his Mémoires Historiques sur les Affaires des Jésuites avec le Saint Siége, in which he gave a detailed account of the quarrels in the Chinese and Malabar missions, a work which (especially in the second greatly enlarged edition)³ is the principal authority for the history of these controversies. For this reason he was so bitterly pursued by the Jesuits that even the Pope, Benedict XIV., gave him notice that he could not protect him in Rome, and allowed him to reside wherever he might choose in secular dress. He accordingly took refuge in Protestant countries—in England, Berlin, and Brunswick. But when his enemies thereupon circulated

² Unschuld. Nachr. 1714, p. 441.
³ Lisbon, 7 vols. 4. 1766.
the report that he had become a Lutheran, he returned to the Catholic states. He was, however, still unable to find a place of security, until he at last settled in Portugal after the Jesuits had been expelled from that country.

The Jesuits in China showed themselves still more contumacious. Clement XI. issued in 1715 the bull *Ex illa Die* against the Chinese practices, in which their observance was most strictly forbidden under penalty of the greater excommunication. But when a Franciscan published this bull, the Jesuits accused him of disseminating a foreign edict against domestic customs and regulations. The Franciscan was imprisoned and for seventeen months subjected to the greatest cruelties. Thereupon Clement XI. sent to China in 1720 a new legate, Mezzabarba, the Patriarch of Alexandria, and, seeing plainly that nothing was to be accomplished by severity, gave him private instructions in case of necessity to concede certain modifications of the former decrees. This legate also had to suffer much from the Chinese Jesuits. They tried to prevent him from obtaining an audience with the Emperor. He was heard instead by mandarins in the name of the Emperor, and among these was a Jesuit, dressed as a mandarin, who particularly questioned him upon many subjects and spoke very slightly of the Pope, while the legate, according to Chinese usage, was compelled to answer the questions kneeling. Mezzabarba's mission was likewise ineffectual, but when the Jesuits learned that he was authorized to make certain modifications in the Papal order, they succeeded in inducing him, while on his return, to make them known in a pastoral letter to the Catholic clergy in China. He permitted a number of the practices, but only as civil, not as religious acts, thereby giving the Jesuits an excuse for entirely disregarding the former Papal bull. Nevertheless, the old contest with the other missionaries continued, since they did not acknowledge the concessions of Mezzabarba. Benedict XIV. therefore finally issued a new bull (*Ex quo Singulare*) in 1741, in which he solemnly reaffirmed the bull of Clement XI., and strictly prohibited the concessions of Mezzabarba on the ground that they had been only extorted from that legate. The Jesuits in China were at last forced to obey these decrees, as were the Jesuits of Madura soon after, by virtue of a similar bull. From that time Chris-

tianity met with varying fortunes in China, being several times violently persecuted and then again tolerated. After the abolishment of the Order of Jesus the Jesuits continued, it is true, to maintain themselves in China without further regard to the Papal bull, and managed to survive even under persecution; but the missions suffered severely after the abolishment and during the French Revolution, since no new missionaries were sent to them from Europe. It was not till the spring of 1817, after the re-establishment of the Order of Jesus, that twelve Jesuits were again sent to China. Meanwhile an imperial decree had already been issued on Jan. 30, 1815, forbidding the propagation of Christianity under severe penalties, and permitting only those Europeans to remain in the empire who were employed as mathematicians in Peking. This decree is only now relaxed owing to the Revolution in China, and up to the present time has hindered the further extension of Christianity in that country.

§ 16.

THE JESUIT STATE IN PARAGUAY. EXPULSION OF THE JESUITS FROM SEVERAL COUNTRIES.

Meanwhile the establishments of the Jesuits in Paraguay had developed unobserved into a regular state. The Jesuits, under the pretext that the cruelty and loose morals of the Spaniards prevented the Indians from embracing Christianity, had

It must be remembered that this was written some time previous to 1854, the year of Gieseler's death.—Tr.

The principal work on the Jesuit missions in other parts of the world is the Lettres Édifiantes et Curieuses écrites des Missions Étrangères, par quelques Missionnaires de la Compagnie de Jésus, Paris, 1699–1774, 32 vols. 12. It is full, indeed, of exaggerated statements of the success of the missions, but replete with valuable information respecting the natural and social condition of these countries. We are especially indebted to the Jesuits for accurate information about China, which was previously quite unknown to Europe. As a rule, only the most talented Jesuits, who had received a special preparation for the work, were sent to China, particularly those who had made great attainments in physics and mathematics. They sent back during the course of the eighteenth century many treatises on China and translations of Chinese writings, which are collected in the Mémoires concernant les Chinois, Paris, 1777–1814, 16 vols. (the 16th vol. under the supervision of Sacy).

already obtained a decree from Philip III. forbidding the Spaniards to enter these colonies. They now stationed guards along the frontiers with stringent orders to turn back all strangers, and, that the Spaniards might be the less able to gain any advantage from their establishments in these colonies, the use of the Spanish language was entirely prohibited in them. They promised the King of Spain an annual per capita tribute, and in case of war a certain contingent of troops.

In this seclusion the Jesuits now gradually built up a remarkable state with a constitution wholly unique. The number of their Reducciones by degrees increased to thirty, with a population of considerably more than 100,000 souls. They taught the Indians all the arts and trades, and provision was thus made for all the necessities and conveniences of life. The subjects together formed a kind of family, of which the Jesuits were the fathers. Each individual inhabitant had his daily task definitely assigned him, and his finished work was deposited in the public store-houses, from which each in return received what he needed. With the goodly surplus of wares and natural products, the Jesuits carried on a considerable commerce, which brought them in immense profits. The religious as well as the secular government were administered by the Jesuits, who were teachers, physicians, judges, stewards, legislators, and priests, and managed as embassadors of God to secure the most unlimited confidence and obedience from the Indians. In this they were greatly assisted by the confessional, through which they could learn all the secrets of their subjects. The Jesuits, in their descriptions of this state, give paradisaical pictures of the tranquillity and happiness which there prevailed. But it must not be forgotten that in order to secure from the Indians that unconditional obedience which was requisite for the maintenance of these institutions, they had perforce to keep them in a state of permanent pupilage. The instruction which they received from the Jesuits was exceedingly meagre, and for the most part confined to outward proficiency in the arts. But all independence of mind was forcibly suppressed, so that there could be no purely human development. The whole country was like a great monastery, where everything was done according to the will of the superior, but individual thought and action wholly excluded. The Indians were well broken in, but nothing higher was attained.
That this new state might be properly defended, the Jesuits also established an army upon a European footing, built forts, and organized an artillery; in this likewise acting in the double capacity of instructors and commanders.²

The condition of this realm remained for a long time a secret to the world, until at last, in 1750, a boundary treaty between Portugal and Spain was the occasion of disclosing it. By its terms the boundary line passed transversely across the mission territory, and several Reducciones fell in consequence to Brazil. When the treaty was about to be carried into effect, the Jesuits resisted with their army, although they protested that they were not to blame, and that they could not control the fury of the Indians. The Spanish and Portuguese forces were compelled to unite in a regular war against Paraguay, which ended in the total overthrow of the latter (1758).

This event, which created a generally unfavorable feeling toward the Jesuits, worked especially to their disadvantage at the Court of Portugal; and the King, Joseph Emanuel, and particularly his minister, Pombal, became extremely hostile to them. In Brazil, likewise, complaints had long been made that the Jesuits of that country held the Indians in unnatural subjection, and so monopolized the trade in their productions as to ruin all commercial enterprises on the part of others. The consequence was that they were deprived of their positions as confessors at the court, and the King urged the Pope to forbid the Order to interfere in political affairs or to engage in commerce (1757).

At that time the Pope was Benedict XIV. (1740–1758), a very learned, amiable, and moderate man, who otherwise had reason to dislike the Jesuits for the insubordination they had manifested in the missionary controversies in China and Madura. Shortly before his death he issued a decree for the reformation of the Order, but too late for it to prove effectual, for his successor, Clement XIII. (1758–1769), had been elected chiefly through the influence of the Jesuits, and was therefore their friend and protector. But this very partiality only served to augment the general antipathy to the Jesuits; and as the Pope

² False descriptions are given, f. i. in Muratori Il Cristianesimo Felice, 1743, in Le Bret, Magasin, ii. 364, 499; Das Reich der Jesuiten in Paraguay, von P. Ibagnez, in Le Bret, ii. 339 sq. For other opinions, see Brasilianische Zustände, von F. Tietz, Berlin, 1839. 8. Die Jesuiten und ihre Mission Chiquitos in Südamerika, Moritz Bach. Edited by Kriegk, Leipzig, 1843. 8.
would not agree to any radical reformation of the Order, his course was the means of bringing about its fall, for in a short time it was expelled from most of the European states. This happened first in Portugal, where the government had already long been hostile to it. The immediate occasion was afforded by the attempt to assassinate the King (Sept. 1758), which was attributed to the instigation of the Jesuits and used for their destruction. They were consequently soon after imprisoned and their property confiscated. The Pope tried in vain to pacify the King. By a royal edict of Sept. 3, 1759, the Order of Jesus was totally abolished in all Portuguese countries.

The Order soon after met with a similar fate in France. Although in the days of Louis XIV. it had there exerted the greatest influence through the royal confessors, it afterward gradually lost its power, and its numerous enemies turned public opinion more and more against it. Just at this time the most influential persons in France were its enemies, viz., the Marquise de Pompadour, the mistress of Louis XV., and the Duc de Choiseul, the prime minister. The Jesuits afforded the immediate occasion for their overthrow in France by their colonial commerce. It was already a complaint of long standing that wherever they established missions they carried on trade, and by various expedients so managed that all other commerce except their own was destroyed. This was done nowhere on a larger scale than in the French islands in the West Indies—Martinique and St. Domingo—after the shrewd Père La Valette had become solicitor-general of the missions in those islands (1747). This man erected in Martinique a whole street of magazines and factories, and carried on an immense traffic with all the seaports of Europe. His credit was quite unlimited, and he accordingly drew large sums on exchange from eminent commercial houses in Marseilles which he repaid in colonial products. He had just drawn in this manner

---

* J. F. M. v. Olfers Ueber den Mordversuch gegen den König Johann von Portugal den 3. Sept. 1758, eine historische Untersuchung, Berlin, 1839, is exhaustive. The instigator of this attempt was the Duke of Aveiro, who bribed two murderers to do the deed on account of personal insults. The investigation was conducted in a very irregular manner. The Jesuits were, it is true, in close relations to the malcontent nobles, but there is no trace of all of their participation in the conspiracy.


several million livres from a house in Marseilles and sent out in return several ships laden with colonial products, when the war between France and England broke out and the ships were captured (1755). By this misfortune La Valette's business was ruined. The merchants of Marseilles demanded compensation from Ricci, the General of the Order, but without success. The matter finally came before the Parliament, and it was decided that as the Order had none but common property, it was bound to pay the amount demanded with interest (1761). Taking advantage of this opportunity, and undoubtedly incited by the course of events in Portugal, the Parliament had the constitutions of the Order brought before it, declared that the unlimited power which they gave the General was prejudicial to the authority both of the Church and the sovereigns, ordered a great number of Jesuitical writings containing immoral teachings to be burned by the executioner, and forbade the Order in France to receive new members. The King now tried in vain to bring about a reformation of the Order in France. Both the General, Ricci, and Clement XIII., who was wholly subservient to the Jesuits, declined to agree to it, and so at last Louis XV. determined to put an end to the Order in his realm (1764). All its grades and establishments were abolished, although the Jesuits were permitted to remain as French citizens so long as they faithfully observed all their duties as subjects.

These humiliations, which announced the approaching fall of the Order, induced Pope Clement XIII., in order to rescue the oppressed society, to issue the bull *Apostolicum (pascendi Dominici gregis munus)*, 1765, in which he praised it in extravagant language, defended it from all accusations, and gave it his solemn sanction. But the Papal authority itself had already declined too far for this bull to alter public opinion. The gross falsehoods which it contained only excited disgust, and brought Jesuits and Pope into still greater contempt. It was immediately suppressed in France by an act of Parliament. Spain soon after followed the example of Portugal and France. In the year 1767 the Order in Spain was suddenly declared dissolved, and all the Jes-

---

* His declaration with reference to the banishment of the Jesuits from Portugal see in History of the Bull In Coena, ii. 125: the Order could not be abolished because the Pope was infallible in the establishment of a regular order. Cf. ib. p. 127.
uits, some five thousand in number, were taken into custody and transported in ships to the Papal States, where they were required to live upon royal pensions and never to leave that country. All the remonstrances of the Pope were ineffectual; in the same year the Jesuits were expelled from the kingdom of Naples and the island of Malta, and finally, in 1768, also from the duchy of Parma.

§ 17.

TOTAL ABOLISHMENT OF THE ORDER AND ITS FURTHER FORTUNES.

These events were in themselves sufficient to prepare the way for the complete overthrow of the Order, which the favor of the Pope could only for a time delay, but not prevent. After the death of Clement XIII., every thing depended upon the choice of the new Pope. The conclave was long continued, for two parties contended in it—the one in the interests of the courts of Bourbon and Portugal, the other of the Jesuits. At length the former was victorious, and Cardinal Ganganelli became Pope under the name of Clement XIV. (1769–1774), one of the most excellent popes that ever held the office. Although a Franciscan, he had little of the monkish spirit, was prudent in affairs of state, mild and amiably disposed in ecclesiastical matters, kind and benevolent, though strict in maintaining the laws. He was no friend of the Jesuits, but although the Bourbon courts were always urging him to abolish that Order entirely, he nevertheless found it very difficult to destroy this still extremely powerful organization. At length the celebrated bull *Dominus ac Redemptor Noster* of July 21, 1773, was issued, by which the
PART II.—CHAP. II.—§ 17. ABOLISHMENT OF THE ORDER.

Order was abolished. At the same time all the establishments of the Jesuits were seized, and the General, Lorenzo Ricci, brought to the Castle of San Angelo. The Pope was well aware how much his own person was endangered by this measure, and is said to have declared when he signed the bull that he was signing his own death-warrant. He actually died on the 22d of September, 1774, from the effects of poison, which it is extremely probable was administered by the Jesuits.¹

Notwithstanding the Papal abolition, the Order still continued to exist in the non-Catholic states. Frederic II. forbade the publication of the bull, and permitted the Jesuits to remain in his states (Silesia and Cleves), as he had nothing to fear from them, and did not recognize the Papal decrees. He jestingly declared that he had promised in the Peace of Breslau to leave the ecclesiastical status in Silesia unchanged; and, since he was a heretic, the Pope could not give him a dispensation to release him from the obligation of his word and the duties of an honorable man. But soon afterward the King made the Jesuits in his realm adopt another constitution, and Frederic William II. abolished them entirely.²

They maintained themselves permanently, however, in a part of Russia. Peter I. had, it is true, already ordered, in the year 1719, that they should leave all the Russian states without delay; but when, in the partition of Poland in 1772, White Russia fell to the share of Russia, it contained several establishments of Jesuits.³ As these had taken the oath of allegiance to the Empress Catherine II., they succeeded, by the aid of some of the influential men at court, in preventing the publication of the Papal bull in Russia. The successor of Clement XIV., Pius VI., was really a secret friend of the Jesuits, but was compelled through the solicitations of the Bourbon courts to make every effort to bring the Order in Russia to terms. But it was all in vain; the society only increased, being re-enforced by refugees from other Eu-


² Gesch. des Preuss. Staats, Frankf. a. M. 1819, i. 146.

European countries. They received permission to choose a vicar-general, obtained (in 1800) control of the service in the Roman Catholic Church at St. Petersburg, and acquired no little influence. The Emperor Paul I. likewise favored them, and recommended them to Pope Pius VII., who finally, by the rescript *Catholicae* in 1801, consented to their re-establishment in Russia.

In other countries the Jesuits were compelled to submit to the bull of abolition; but they every where made it appear that they were only yielding to unjust compulsion, condemned without a hearing, and that the Pope's bull was consequently legally inoperative. Numerous defenses of the Order, which expressed extreme animosity and bitterness, appeared, particularly in Augsburg. There was soon ground for believing that the Jesuits, especially in Germany and Italy, in spite of the destruction of their external organization, were nevertheless continuing to exist as a secret, compactly united society, and were even seeking to propagate themselves. When the Order was abolished, so little property was found that there was good reason to suppose that the officers, who had foreseen the catastrophe for years, had removed it to a place of safety and also made away with the documents relating to it. In some of the German countries they were allowed to assume the ordinary dress of secular priests, and were retained in the educational institutions. This was the case in the dioceses of Augsburg, Freising, and Ratisbon, under the bigoted Bishop Clement Wenceslaus, Elector of Treves (d. 1812). They were not removed thence till 1807. The suspicion of a permanent secret organization and activity on the part of the Jesuits was awakened and fostered, chiefly by some Berlin scholars—Gedicke, Biester, and Nicolai—in the year 1780 and afterward. They brought forward many arguments for their belief in the Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek and the Berliner Monatsschrift, some of which were very remarkable, e. g., a charter of the Assistentia Germaniae, as it existed at that very time, comprising more than 9000 Jesuits. About this time a still greater sensation was produced by a series of papers in the Berliner Monatsschrift, in which it was attempted to prove that

---


the Jesuits, under various pretexts, had insinuated themselves into other secret societies, particularly into certain lodges of the Freemasons, where they were trying to obtain a predominate influence, and to make use of it in converting Protestants to Catholicism and committing them to the cause of the Order of Jesus.6

Among others, J. A. Stark, chief court-chaplain at Darmstadt, was accused of having thus secretly become a Catholic priest and Jesuit. The controversy on this subject could not be definitely settled at the time, but an anonymously published panegyric on Catholicism, *Theodulus Gastmahl,* 7 which emanated from Stark, afterward confirmed the old suspicion; and when he died (in 1815), his remains were interred in a Catholic cemetery with cowl and tonsure.

Pius VII. was always partial to the Jesuits; he not only sanctioned the continuance of the Order in Russia, but also attempted in 1804 to restore it in Naples, where, however, it only continued for a year, and was then again abolished by King Joseph Napoleon in 1805, as it had been before in Venice, Naples, and Parma.8

The Order of Jesus was re-established9 on the 7th of August, 1814, by the bull *Sollicitudo Omnium,* under the false impression that by its aid throne and altar could be most securely defended against all revolutionary assaults. The Order was received by the various nations with aversion and distrust, especially in France, where it could only appear under a new name. What it accomplished has been unfortunately shown by the events of the 27th of July, 1830.

6 With regard to the influence of the Jesuits on Freemasonry, see the necrologue of Bode in Schlichtegroll's *Supplement-Band des Necrologs für die Jahre 1790-1793,* Div. I. p. 376 sq.
7 Frankf. a. M. 1800, and frequently.
8 *Fehron,* 228.
THIRD CHAPTER.

HISTORY OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL REFORMS IN GERMANY UNDER JOSEPH II.

§ 18.

PREPARATORY WORK OF FEBRONIUS.

Until the time of Joseph II., Catholic Germany was always one of the Pope's most obedient countries. This was due, in the first place, to the divided condition of the land, and then also to the great influence which the Jesuits had managed to acquire at most of the courts. It is true that even at an earlier date the German princes had begun here and there to assert their sovereign rights in ecclesiastical affairs; and the popes, seeing their authority so much restricted in other countries by the secular governments, had been gradually compelled to moderate their high pretensions in Germany also; nevertheless, the Pope still continued to maintain most of his rights in this country. However, more liberal opinions as to the relation of the ecclesiastical to the secular authority, emanating chiefly from France, were disseminated in Germany also. But the first impulse was given to the general circulation and propagation of such opinions by a very remarkable work published under a fictitious name—Justini Febroni de Statu Ecclesiae et Legitima Potestate Romani Pontificis Liber Singularis, Bullioni (Bouillon, properly Frankfurta. M.), 1763–1774, 5 parts, 4. The author maintains that the extravagant views which prevailed with reference to the authority of the Pope were the chief obstacle to the union of the separated religious parties, and that these exaggerations were the source of many disorders in the Church itself. Accordingly, he


\[2\] Marheineke, Symb. ii. 388. Rechts- u. geschichtsmässige Erörterung einiger die Concordata Nationis Germanicae, und die von der deutschen Nation dieserhalb zu führende gerechte Beschwerde betreffenden Fragen, Frankfurt, 1770 (Febron. 304).
proposes to confine the Papal authority within its original limits, and lays down the following principles upon the subject:

The Church does not properly possess a monarchical form of government. The power of the keys was committed by Christ to the Church in general, and is to be exercised in an equal degree by all the bishops; for the bishops are successors of the apostles, and the episcopal dignity is of divine institution. But the Pope is not, as the Curialists assert, the universal bishop of the Church, and the bishops only his functionaries, who have received their authority from him and exercise it in his name. Just as all the apostles were equal in power in the Church, irrespective of the primacy of Peter, so all the bishops are equal. True, the Pope possesses the primacy, but it is only intrusted to him by Peter and the Church, and consequently, if the Church so decides, can be attached to another see than that of Rome. The object of the primacy is the preservation of the unity of the Church; the Pope, as the chief bishop, is to see to the preservation of this unity in the faith and the observance of the laws of the Church, but he is to do this only by counsels and admonitions, not by commands to the other dioceses. Accordingly, he has no jurisdiction over them, no right to confirm the bishops or even to fill the offices in foreign dioceses, to reserve certain cases for his own decision, or to exempt the monasteries. He can not make laws of universal authority either in matters of faith or of Church discipline, but every bishop must have the sole charge of the regulation of these matters in his own diocese; while universal laws can only proceed from a universal synod, which alone possesses infallibility in matters of faith. Moreover, the latter does not need to be convoked by the Pope, and its determinations do not require the Papal ratification. All the other kinds of influence which the popes obtained over the Church during the Middle Ages, particularly by the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, must be surrendered; the people also must be thoroughly instructed in these matters, and the temporal sovereigns keep a better watch over their rights.

All these assertions were carefully presented and argued with profound historical learning, while the doctrinal system of the Church was allowed to stand entirely unmolested.

The Pope at that time was Clement XIII., who was always so anxious to restore the assumptions of the ancient popes, and oft-
en used a style of speech such as had not for a long time proceeded from Rome. Accordingly, the first volume of this work had scarcely appeared before it was condemned in Rome, and every effort was made by the Pope to suppress it. But this only caused it to be read more generally, and intensified the impression which it produced. New editions soon appeared, and German, French, and Italian translations. Even in Spain and Portugal the book was read with great approval. And, although numerous opponents soon came forward, especially from among the monks, they were not able to destroy the impression which had already been made.

At length, after protracted efforts, the Papal party succeeded in ascertaining the author. He was John Nicolas Von Hortheim, suffragan bishop of the Elector of Treves, Clement Wenceslaus, a man long respected for his character and learning, and at that time already far advanced in years. The Elector employed every means to induce him to recant, and finally, for the sake of peace, the old man consented to a retractio, in which he briefly, and without assigning reasons, retracted all his assertions, and excused himself on the ground that he had gone too far in an inconsiderate zeal to reunite the Protestants with the Church. They were glad enough at Rome to accomplish even as much as this, and readily bestowed the Papal pardon without further punishment. But when they triumphantly hastened to publish this retraction every where, Von Hontheim followed it with an explanation, in which, with many important limitations, he more accurately defined the principles he had yielded. He also resigned his office immediately afterward, retired to his estates in Luxembourg, and died in his ninetieth year, 1790.3

§ 19.

THE REFORMS OF JOSEPH II.

The very policy which Febronius had prescribed for the sovereigns was not long afterward adopted by the Emperor Joseph II.1 As long as he was only co-regent with his bigoted mother, Maria Theresa, he was unable to accomplish any thing in this

3 Walch, Neueste Religionsgeschichte, vols. i. vi. vii. viii.
direction, but had the better opportunity to become accurately acquainted with the condition of the Church and of religion in his states, and to mature his plans for the necessary reforms. In this work he found a very sagacious coadjutor in his minister Prince Von Kaunitz, who entered into his plans with zeal and prudence. Yet undoubtedly the majority of the nation were as yet unprepared for such changes; they followed in too quick succession not to produce great agitation in the public mind, while, on the other hand, Joseph II. was lacking in the requisite perseverance. In the execution of his radical measures, difficulties, greater or less, arose, for which he was not prepared. These he attempted to obviate by restrictive decrees, but only succeeded thereby in inspiring the powerful party of the opposition with greater courage; and new objections were constantly raised, until his zeal became exhausted.

Joseph succeeded his mother as sovereign of the Austrian hereditary dominions in 1780. His ecclesiastical regulations had a double purpose. He wished, in the first place, to secure to his non-Catholic subjects, by legal guarantees, the exercise of their religious rights, and then to eradicate the numerous abuses which had crept into the Catholic Church.

With reference to the first point, he issued his Edict of Tolerance in October, 1781. He thereby left all his subjects free to attach themselves to the Catholic or to the Greek Church, or to either of the two Protestant confessions. He gave the non-Catholics the right, where there was a certain number of them together, to build churches, only requiring that service should not be held in them publicly. In the Austrian dominions many secret Protestants had maintained themselves since the time of the Reformation, who, under the pressure of the former governments, had outwardly professed the Catholic faith. These now came out in greater numbers than had been expected, and, accordingly, the Catholic clergy succeeded in securing many other restrictions of the freedom of religious profession. All who had previously been regarded as Catholics and now declared for another Church were compelled to receive from four to six weeks' instruction in the monasteries respecting the truth of the Catholic religion. It is true that the imperial command prescribed

Correspondence between Joseph II. and Clement Wenceslaus, Elector of Treves, in Illgens Zeitschr. ii. 1, 241. On Maria Theresa, see Marheineke, Symb. ii. 317, Note n.
moderation and gentleness in their treatment, but only too often threats and ill usage were employed. Then permission was given to the Catholic clergymen in case of sickness to pay a single visit to those who had withdrawn from the Church, and to make a final attempt to convert them. Several other restrictions of the same sort, in the interest of the Catholic Church, followed; but, notwithstanding, the clergy put forth every effort to curtail even this measure of liberty accorded to the non-Catholics. In spite of all these obstacles, and the fact that the new congregations had to bear the whole expense of building their churches and supporting the pastors and teachers, and, moreover, were still compelled to pay many fees to the Catholic Church, after the Edict of Toleration numerous Protestant congregations were formed in all the Austrian dominions, and even in Vienna itself.\(^2\)

Of still greater importance were Joseph's regulations with respect to the Catholic Church. He not only asserted the right of the sovereign to restrict the spiritual jurisdiction, in so far as it could endanger the secular power, but also assumed sovereign rights which no ruler before him had ever thought of. Following the principles of Febronius, he wished the Pope to be regarded only as the centre of the unity of the Church for the preservation of uniformity and purity in doctrine, but to possess no other authority and jurisdiction over it. All that was directly connected with the public exercise of worship, and the external management of the Church, belonged to the sovereign; but purely spiritual matters were under the control of the bishops, who had the final decision in them, each in his own diocese. In accordance with these principles, the Emperor issued, after the close of the year 1780, a series of very remarkable statutes. He restricted the amount of donations to ecclesiastical institutions to the sum of 1500 florins. He prohibited the connection of the monks with foreign superiors, abolished their exemption, and placed them under the control of the bishops. He issued the strictest orders that no Papal document should be published until it had received the \textit{placetum regium}. He restored to the bishops the full power of absolution, and the exclusive decision in matrimonial causes without further recognition of re-

served cases or permitting recourse to Rome; he prohibited the bulls *In Coena Domini* and *Unigenitus*, and ordered their removal from all the ritual-books, under a heavy penalty. He also forbade his subjects to accept titles or dignities from Rome without the consent of the sovereign, prohibited their studying at Rome, and ordered the examination of all priests connected with the religious orders. He soon after abolished all the orders not engaged in pastoral, educational, or eleemosynary work, but leading a life of idleness, and put their property together into a great religious and educational fund, with which he founded a large number of new parishes and schools, and established general seminaries for the proper education of those destined for the priesthood. At the same time, candidates desirous of being installed in the parishes in the gift of the sovereign were required to undergo rigorous examinations. Joseph, also, caused the suppression of many customs connected with the public worship which fostered superstition; reduced the number of altars; had the numerous tablets and gifts which were attached to the statues of the saints in memory of their supposed assistance removed; restricted the processions and pilgrimages; abolished many of the abuses connected with the indulgences by requiring that all Papal indulgences should receive the sanction of the government; prohibited various customs relating to the exhibition of relics; and forbade the priests to traffic in consecrated articles, such as crosses, amulets, and the like. Finally he went so far as to require that the whole service of the Church should be conducted in the vernacular.

All these regulations were made without consulting the bishops of the realm, or making any especial effort to gain their approval. It was therefore inevitable that many of them, faithful to their early-imbibed conceptions of the independence of the Papal authority, took ground against the measures of Joseph, and, more or less covertly, endeavored to hinder their execution. Their most active opponent was the Cardinal and Archbishop Migazzi, of Vienna, who, at the very beginning, urgently remonstrated with the Emperor, but without producing any impression upon him.

These new measures naturally caused the greatest excitement at Rome, where it was absolutely impossible to remain indifferent when so considerable a part of the Catholic Church was re-
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nouncing its ancient subjection. The Pope at that time was Pius VI. (1774–1799), the successor of Clement XIV., but quite unlike that great pontiff. Thoroughly kind-hearted, indefatigably active, and of spotless reputation, he was, nevertheless, deficient in the shrewdness which was just then so indispensable for a Pope. His chief fault was excessive vanity and self-complacency. He was one of the most handsome men of his time, and captivated every one by his looks, his attractive manners, and his eloquence. But he attached too much value to these external qualities, and sought to enhance them by artificial means. He paid the most scrupulous attention to his personal appearance, dress, and deportment, especially in his official ceremonies, which were generally carefully rehearsed beforehand. He had withal a great degree of ecclesiastical pride, and was quite partial to the principles of the old popes in their relations to the temporal princes. When the news of Joseph's rapid reforms reached Rome, following each other in quick succession, Pius VI. suddenly formed the resolution to go himself to Vienna and visit the Emperor. In doing this, he undoubtedly counted principally upon his attractive personal qualities and powers of persuasion. In March, 1782, the Pope, under the escort of the Emperor, made his brilliant entry into Vienna, where he was treated with the greatest respect and honored with numerous ceremonies. But more than this he did not accomplish by the journey. Joseph himself declined to enter into any discussion of his course, but referred the Pope entirely to his minister, Prince Kaunitz, and all attempts to change the sentiments of the latter were ineffectual. At the same time, the Pope was most carefully watched, and all petitions to him in person were forbidden. Pius perceived that his personal presence with the Emperor was useless; for even during his visit the ecclesiastical reforms were continued, and, in particular, several monasteries were abolished. Accordingly, he soon took his departure, but on the way back had the satisfaction of binding the Bavarian court at Munich more firmly to his interests.

When this attempt had failed, Pius endeavored by written representations to influence Joseph, who still persevered in the policy he had inaugurated. The language of the Pope grew increasingly urgent, and finally he went so far as to demand the repeal of several innovations, in a rescript (September, 1783) that
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had almost the tone of command. The Emperor returned this rescript unanswered, and was now on the point of making the spiritual affairs of the realm entirely independent of the Pope. But while deliberating upon this course, he suddenly resolved to visit Rome, under the pretext of settling his differences with the Pope, but really for the purpose of consulting, with reference to his plans, two experienced statesmen, the French envoy at Rome, Cardinal Bernis, and the Spanish envoy, Chevalier Azara. These two statesmen prevented the threatened rupture with the Pope by pointing out to the Emperor the danger he incurred by such a course of producing dangerous political disturbances, inasmuch as there was not any adequate education of the people to prepare the way for it. Accordingly, from this time, the Emperor began to yield to the Pope in various particulars, and returned to Vienna in March, 1784, with materially altered plans. It is true, the laws already published still continued in force, and the Emperor persistently asserted his sovereign authority in Church matters; but the opposing clergy were no longer held to a strict observance of the laws, and a rupture with Rome was avoided. The result was a vacillating course, which increased the courage of the Papal party in the Austrian states, while it destroyed the confidence of the Emperor's true supporters.

Nowhere were these reforms of Joseph II. received with greater dissatisfaction than in the Austrian Netherlands, where a fanatical, ignorant clergy, among whom there was still a large number of ex-Jesuits, controlled the minds of the people. Accordingly, most of Joseph's regulations were never fully carried out in that country, and the abolition of several monasteries only served to exasperate the people still more against him. In view of the deficiency of proper institutions in the Netherlands for the education of capable clergymen, the Emperor resolved to abolish all the existing episcopal seminaries, and in their place to establish a general seminary at Louvain, under the charge of learned theologians, and a branch seminary at Luxembourg, in which alone the prospective clergymen should henceforth be educated. This measure met with general opposition. The clergy, with the Primate of the Netherlands and Archbishop of Mechlin, Cardinal Von Frankenberg, at their head, resisted it, and

* Forster's Ansichten vom Niederrhein, ii. 20 sq.
endeavored to bring the new seminaries, their professors, and
text-books, under the reproach of heresy. Moreover, the Estates
of the Netherlands remonstrated against the changes in Church
affairs, and at last began to withhold the revenues, on the ground
that the Emperor had violated the constitution of the state.
This action led Joseph to forcible measures, which gave only
the greater opportunity to the priests, and especially the ex-Jes-
uits, to stir up the people. In 1789 a general insurrection broke
out in the Netherlands, and the Estates solemnly renounced all
obedience to the Emperor. It was in vain that he now attempt-
ed to restore the episcopal seminaries. Quite as ineffectual were
his efforts to obtain a settlement through the interposition of the
Pope. Joseph died in the midst of these negotiations (Feb. 20,
1790), before the Netherlands had returned to their allegiance.¹

§ 20.

GRIEVANCES OF THE GERMAN ARCHBISHOPS AGAINST THE POPE,
AND THEIR PUNCTATION AT EMS.

Marheineke, Symb. ii. 385.—E. v. Münch, Gesch. des Emser Congresses und seiner
Punctate, Karlsruhe, 1840.—Deutsche Blätter, v. 1; vi. 1.

The reforms of Joseph II., and their good effects in his Aus-
trian dominions, stirred up the other Catholic states in Germany,
and called their attention to the many abuses which had found
their way into the Church. But the German archbishops were
especially affected by the declaration of the Emperor, which re-
stored to the bishops, in his hereditary dominions, the entire right
of dispensation and absolution, and prohibited all recourse to
Rome in such matters. They could not but feel how much, on
the contrary, their own original episcopal prerogatives had be-
come restricted by Papal usurpations. Thus, in particular, since
the close of the sixteenth century, the custom had grown up for
the Pope to grant the archbishops *indults* for five years to give
dispensations in the case of certain obstacles to marriage (*facul-
tates quinquenales*).¹ But he had reserved to himself all other

¹ Der Abfall der belgischen Provinzen von Oesterreich, von Louis Lax, Aachen,
¹ Deutsche Blätter, ii. 82. Origination of these *facultates* in 1645. See Kölni-
sche Gegenbemerkungen, p. 218 sq.
cases; and, since even the dispensations in question were granted only in virtue of the Papal indulgences, the implication was that the whole right of dispensation belonged exclusively to the Pope. But since the sixteenth century the Pope also kept a nuncio at Cologne, who had the fullest authority to exercise the assumed Papal rights in the adjoining sees, and in reserved cases to dispense and absolve, as well as to decide in ecclesiastical cases in the third instance. This nuncio, however, was never satisfied with resting here, but trespassed also upon the episcopal rights; and all complaints hitherto made had been ineffectual. Now, however, more was to be expected from the German archbishops, especially since they could be certain of the support of the Emperor. The Archbishop of Salzburg, Jerome, Count of Colloredo, had shown himself, at the very commencement of Joseph's reforms, an enlightened prelate, who clearly recognized the imperfections of the Church, as was evidenced by a remarkable pastoral letter of 1782, in which he freely censured the empty outward display of the worship, and urged that it be made more edifying, giving pertinent directions to this end; for which reason Joseph II. had the letter reprinted and circulated in his states. The Elector and Archbishop at Cologne, at this time, was the Emperor's brother Maximilian, who was, for the most part, in sympathy with his brother's views respecting the condition of the Church; and although less was to be expected from the Electors of Mayence and Treves, a new encroachment of the Pope upon the rights of all the German archbishops aroused them also to take part in the common defense.

At the court of the Bavarian Palatinate, under Carl Theodor, the ex-Jesuits had acquired a very considerable influence, and, chiefly through their efforts, that court had been brought into the blindest subjection to the Roman See, which had been greatly increased by the personal visit of Pius VI. The Bavarian territories had no provincial bishops of their own, but were distributed among the dioceses of the neighboring bishops, so that the sees of the four German archbishops extended over parts of the Bavarian territories. Acting undoubtedly at the instigation of the ex-Jesuits, who were never partial to the jurisdiction of the bishops, Carl Theodor now applied for a nuncio who should have the supreme jurisdiction over the combined provinces of

*Thus nine instances became possible. Gegenbemerkungen, p. 44.*
the Bavarian Palatinate, with powers similar to those accorded to the Rhenish nuncio at Cologne. The archbishops could not treat this action with indifference; for experience had taught them that the nuncios did not confine themselves merely to the cases of reservation, but were wont also to encroach upon the episcopal rights. They accordingly appealed to the Emperor to defend their official rights, and Joseph II. replied that the Papal nuncios in Germany were to be regarded simply as envoys in political affairs and such matters as immediately concerned the Pope, but that no jurisdiction was to be accorded them. At the same time, he called upon the archbishops to assert their episcopal rights to their legitimate extent, and promised to protect them in so doing.

Accordingly, when the Papal nuncio made his appearance at Munich, and immediately defined his policy by invading the episcopal rights, the archbishops, through their delegates, instituted a Congress at Ems, and there agreed upon certain propositions touching the episcopal rights and their relation to the Papal See. This was the origin of the memorable Punctation of Ems of August 25, 1786. The archbishops declared that they would honor the Pope as the Primate of the Church and the centre of its unity, but that they would not recognize the other asserted prerogatives of the Papal See which were derived from the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals; that the bishops possessed exclusive authority in their own dioceses to bind and loose, and consequently all reservations, the facultates quinquennales and the nunciatures, must be discontinued. In like manner, they endeavored to restrict the exercise of Roman patronage in appointments to ecclesiastical office and the large sums of money which flowed into the Roman treasury; and, finally, they determined that, in all ecclesiastical causes, the bishops' court should be uniformly regarded as the first instance, and that of the archbishops as the second, without the interposition of Papal nuncios; while for the third instance the Pope must appoint judges in Germany, and these must be themselves Germans.

The Emperor assured the archbishops that he would protect them in the maintenance of the rights thus asserted. Accordingly, they did not renew their application for the ratification of the facultates quinquennales, but began to exercise their rights to the extent to which they had declared them. True, the Pa-
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pal nuncio at Cologne, Bartholomew Pacca, a young and high-spirited man, declared all the dispensations of the archbishops void, and the marriages contracted in virtue of them between relatives as incestuous and invalid; but his circular letter was prohibited in all the three Rhenish archbishoprics, and all the priests were compelled to send the copies which they had received to the governments.3

But Roman persistency and cunning conquered. The archbishops had already injured their cause by entering into this agreement without consulting the German bishops. Although the latter would have gained greatly by the restoration of their episcopal rights, most of them feared that the archbishops were only trying to curtail the powers of the Pope in order to restore their old metropolitan rights, and so to exercise over the bishops a control more oppressive than it was possible for the Papal power to be. The Roman Curia endeavored in every way to foster these apprehensions, and the result was that the German bishops took the part of the Pope and the nuncios. But the Papal See received still greater support from the court of the Bavarian Palatinate, which not only forbade its subjects to accept dispensations from the archbishops, since they had not renewed their facultates, but permitted the nuncio to exercise many functions manifestly episcopal, and, when the Emperor remonstrated, threatened to separate its territories from the archiepiscopal dioceses, and to appoint provincial bishops of its own.

Unfortunately, an election of co-bishops was now approaching at Mayence, in which that court needed the aid of the Pope. Accordingly, in 1787, the Elector of Mayence intimated to the Pope that he desired an amicable settlement of the difficulties arising from the Punctation of Ems, entered immediately into his former relations with the Roman Court, and had new indults granted him. True, the matter was discussed in the Imperial Diet (1788);4 but there, also, nothing was accomplished, since the Bavarian Palatinate insisted that the sovereign possessed the right to receive Papal nuncios. The archbishops perceived that

3 For documents relating to the Congress of Ems, see Paulus, Die neuesten Grundlagen der deutsch-katholischen Kirchenverfassung, p. 1, Stuttgart, 1821.
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they would not succeed by force, and therefore negotiated with the Pope for a compromise. But this they also failed to obtain. They received instead a diffuse reply, in which all the Papal pretensions were reasserted in their most extreme form.  

This ended the matter; for the Revolution, which began immediately afterward in France, occupied the attention of the neighboring states to the fullest extent, and the Punctations of Ems were soon forgotten.

§ 21.

REFORMS IN TUSCANY.

Münch, Denkwürdigkeiten, p. 303.

Peter Leopold, Grand-duke of Tuscany, entered upon the reform of his country with greater prudence and caution than his brother, Joseph II. But the greatest prudence was indeed necessary, for the Tuscan Church was at that time in a state of profound decay. The clergy were extremely numerous; but also, for the most part, completely ignorant. The secular priests had, to a great extent, lost their influence over the people; all the schools and most of the confessionals were occupied by monks; and, as these were all independent of the bishops, the episcopal authority was at a very low ebb. On the other hand, the country was completely under the control of Rome, which, by means of the monks, had fostered there the greatest reverence for all the measures of the Roman Court. Every liberal movement was suppressed by the stringent Inquisition, which was under the management of the Dominicans. Peter Leopold assumed the government of this country, at a very early age, in the year 1765; but it was not until 1780 that he began, simultaneously with his brother Joseph, to introduce several ecclesiastical reforms. His great aim was first of all to increase the authority of the bishops and the national clergy, and to promote among them a more thorough theological education; and, on the other hand, to curtail the excessive influence of the Papal Court and the monks. To this end, stricter examinations of the candidates for vacant parishes were instituted, and the bishops were induced to estab-

*Sanctissimi Domini nostri Pii Papae VI. Responsio ad Metropolitanos Moguntinum, Trevirensen, Coloniensem et Salisburgensem super Nuntiatura, Romae, 1789. 4. (35 sheets).*
lish academies for the prospective clergymen. The priests were directed to explain the mass and the Gospel to the people every Sunday, and to give the young suitable instruction in religious truth. On the other hand, the exemptions and privileges of the monastic orders were repealed, and they were put under the control of the bishops, the influence of Rome was restricted, and the rights of the sovereign once more enforced. After much had been done by these measures for the education of the clergy and the people, the Grand-duke was desirous that the inner reformation of the Church should proceed from the national bishops themselves, and accordingly, in 1786, laid before them a plan of reform. The most important points which were here proposed were, that synods be held in each diocese at least every two years, and that the reforms should be prosecuted by these synods. The principal reforms were as follows: The emendation of the liturgical books, suitable regulation and improvement of the divine service, the restoration of the original episcopal rights in opposition to the Papal usurpations, the introduction of suitable text-books into the schools, and restriction of the influence of the monasteries over the people.

Unfortunately, the great majority of the national bishops were opposed to the purposes of the government. They were, in general, averse to allowing any interference of the secular authority in ecclesiastical affairs; and, moreover, the government had incurred the suspicion of Jansenist proclivities by proposing the doctrines of St. Augustine as the rule of faith, and recommending several Jansenist works, among them even Quesnel's Observations on the New Testament. Accordingly, most of the opinions on the propositions of the government proved to be extremely unfavorable; some declaring the reforms unnecessary and inexpedient; some requiring that they should proceed from the Pope, but not from the secular government or the bishops. Only three bishops were for the government, and among these the most zealous was Scipio Ricci, Bishop of Pistoja, and also an advocate of Jansenism. He not only approved all the proposals of the government in his opinion, but on some points went still further, and immediately afterward (still in 1786) convoked his clergy to a synod at Pistoja, for the purpose of at once inaugurating the necessary reforms in his diocese by their aid. In direct opposition to previous usage, he not only communicated to
his priests the opinions of the bishops, but allowed them free discussion and decision upon the matters laid before them; and yet the result of this Synod certainly exceeded all the expectations of the government. In respect to the Papal authority, the Synod formally adopted the four propositions of the Gallican Church of the year 1682, and decided upon some very important reforms for the removal of abuses in public worship and in the monastic system. At the same time, however, it can not be denied that Ricci and his clergy were unmistakably devoted to the Jansenist system, and that many of the utterances of the Synod with reference to the doctrines of grace were thoroughly Jansenistic. It is true, the court at that time sympathized with this tendency, and supported the Bishop of Pistoja; but even then it could be plainly foreseen that it would be only the easier in future for the Roman Court to turn back the tide of reform in Tuscany, because they would be able to trace it to the Jansenist heresy.

It was manifestly inopportune that the Grand-duke, soon after the Synod of Pistoja, convoked all the bishops of his realm to a general synod at Florence (1787). For the irritation of the majority of the bishops, who in their formal opinions had already declared against all reforms, had been only increased by the Synod of Pistoja, so that the result of the General Synod was directly contrary to the former, and opposed to all innovations. Although the government remained true to its convictions respecting the necessity of an ecclesiastical reformation, and continued as before to exercise its sovereign rights, it did not, however, venture to make any changes in the internal affairs of the Church, but left each bishop free to regulate such matters in his own diocese. It likewise supported Ricci in his reforms; and, during the reign of Leopold, he was not disturbed by the Roman authorities. But Leopold could not prevent the other clergy from giving vent to their hatred of Ricci in the most spiteful calumnies, and thus exciting the people more and more against him.

After the death of Joseph II., Leopold succeeded him in the imperial office, and was compelled to resign the government of Tuscany to his son; for, according to earlier stipulations, that country was never to be united with Austria under the same ruler. The new government thought it necessary to yield to the
discontent of the people at certain of the innovations, and made a compromise with the three national archbishops. Ricci was now cast off entirely, and even the resignation of his episcopal office did not put an end to the persecutions against him. A Papal bull soon appeared (Auctorem Fidei, August 28, 1794), in which eighty-five declarations of the Synod of Pistoja, and particularly the four propositions of the Gallican Church approved by it, were rejected and condemned. The political disturbances, especially the invasion of Italy by the French, at first secured Ricci from personal persecutions; but as soon as the French had been expelled from Italy by Suwarow, Ricci was thrown into prison (1799) at Florence by his enemies. During the French War, the opponents of the republican constitution, the Roman party and the clergy, had already begun to attribute to the same source the aspirations after civil liberty and the efforts to secure ecclesiastical liberty and to restrict the power of the Pope. Similar views were now disseminated among the people. The Synod of Pistoja was represented as the cause of the revolutionary disturbances, and placed in the same category with the Newfranks. Ricci allowed himself, while in prison, to be persuaded to a conditional subscription of the Papal bull, but received from the newly elected Pope, Pius VII., the answer that he must accept the bull unconditionally. Although the battle of Marengo soon brought about the release of Ricci (1800), nevertheless, for the sake of peace, he finally entered into negotiations with the Papal Court. For this purpose he availed himself of the occasion when Pius VII. was passing through Florence on his return to Rome after the coronation of Napoleon at Paris (early in 1805). He agreed to subscribe the Papal condemnation of the Synod of Pistoja on condition that he should be allowed to append a special treatise in defense of his course and principles. The Pope received him very kindly, and accepted his retraction, but gave him back his defense as unnecessary; and the Curia made every effort to give the utmost publicity to his recantation in all Catholic countries.

While the results of Leopold's reforms in Tuscany were thus

1 The Bishop of Noli was also persecuted. Vater's Archiv, 1823, iii. 128.
3 Vater's Anban, l. 35.
4 Vie de Scipion de Ricci, Évêque de Pistoie, par L. I. de Potter (d. 1859), Bruxelles, 1835, 3 tomes.
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quickly dissipated, those of Joseph in Austria soon met with a similar fate. His brother, Leopold II., already was compelled to revoke several of the regulations; and, after his death, in 1792, under his son and successor, Francis II., all the affairs of the Church were by degrees restored to the condition in which they were before the time of Joseph.

FOURTH CHAPTER.

PERIOD OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

During the course of the eighteenth century, the condition of affairs in France had gradually become extremely critical. Ever since the time of Louis XIV., a heavy burden of debt had rested upon the state, which had been enormously increased under Louis XV., and under Louis XVI. rendered the government so desperate that it was compelled to convocate the Estates, which had not for a long time been assembled.

The taxes were at that time increased to an excessive degree, but the pressure came almost exclusively upon the citizen class; the nobility, with their immense estates, were exempt from most of the taxes, and consequently reveled in abundance, while poverty everywhere prevailed in the third estate. A great part of the national wealth was in the possession of the Church, and of

§ 22.

ITS BEGINNING. DECREES OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY.
this comparatively little was contributed to the state. The use of this Church property, however, was very unequally distributed. The prelates had immense revenues, while the parish priests were so scantily paid as to be scarcely secured from starvation.

These circumstances were well calculated to increase the influence of the so-called philosophers, who, since the middle of the eighteenth century, had been making more and more noise in France—sometimes attacking the existing Church, and again energetically proclaiming the equality of human rights. They first found access to the higher classes, among whom luxury had, at that time, reached its highest pitch. Their teachings were welcome here because they subverted all the principles of morality. Under the pretense of philosophy, all religion was now discarded. It began to be a mark of good-breeding to ridicule the Church and religion, and to openly advocate infidelity and atheism. This made it all the easier to deride the restraints of morality which interfered with licentiousness. The superior clergy participated in this corruption of the higher classes. The bishoprics had for a long time been obtained by all sorts of low intrigues at court, and in the appointments to them respect was had rather to birth, rank, and connections than to the fitness of the candidates. They had thus become mere benefices; and the occupants, for the most part, spent their great revenues at court, leaving the management of the dioceses to vicar-generals. Under Louis XV., the higher French clergy were terribly demoralized. Many sees were for years unvisited by their bishops, who led a luxurious life at court, and did not hesitate to adopt, at least in practice, all the principles of the philosophers, while they assumed their ecclesiastical dignities only when it was necessary for the sake of appearance.¹

Meanwhile, these principles of the philosophers had gradually found their way among the oppressed lower classes, causing them to feel more keenly the injustice with which they were treated. They had begun to talk of inalienable human rights, which were restricted, and that fermentation was already at work which burst all bonds in the Revolution.

Unfortunately, religion did not possess sufficient power among

the lower classes to oppose a barrier to their excited passions, and so to prevent them from breaking away from all restraints. The higher clergy, wholly through their own fault, were almost universally hated and despised. The entire work of religious instruction, and the management of ecclesiastical affairs, had been left to the lower clergy, who were paid with extreme meagreness, and, as has been remarked, scarcely secured from starvation. The training of the priests in the seminaries was, for the most part, pitifully insufficient, as these institutions were poorly endowed by the bishops and subjected to no adequate supervision. Accordingly, the majority of the priests possessed little intellectual culture and very slight influence with the educated classes, and consequently the religious instruction of the people was in a most wretched state. And in this we shall find the true cause of the dreadful crimes and outrages which followed in the train of the French Revolution. The religion of the French populace was at best a gloomy fear founded upon the grossest superstitions and an habitual respect for the rites of the Church. All this was easily dispelled by the universal diffusion of the so-called philosophical ideas, and was succeeded by the most fearful irreligion and atheism, which could not but produce terrible consequences among a people naturally so excitable as the French.

Under these circumstances, when the financial difficulties of the government had reached the highest point, Louis XVI. convoked the Estates. The government purposely contrived to have the representatives of the third estate and the lower clergy far superior in number to those of the nobility and the higher clergy. On June 17, 1789, the National Assembly was opened, and its very first measures indicated the dangers which threatened the existing organization of the Church. In order to relieve the disordered finances, their first thought was of the possessions of the Church, and in quick succession law after law was enacted with reference to them. At first they were merely subjected to the general tax, which was thereafter to bear uniformly upon all property; then, to relieve the people, the tithes were abolished; finally, at the proposal of De Talleyrand, Bishop of Autun, all the possessions of the Church were declared national property. It was decided to sell them, and in lieu of them to

2 Tschirner's Archiv, i. 2, 306.
gave the ecclesiastics salaries which were set at a much lower rate for the bishops and a much higher for the parish priests than their former incomes. Soon afterward the convents were abolished, and the vows of all the orders declared no longer binding.

Now, however, the National Assembly, regardless of the remonstrances and protests of the clergy, went still farther, and began to interfere, also, with the internal affairs of the Church. It decreed that the episcopal dioceses should be co-extensive with the boundaries of the new departments; that each department should have but a single bishop; and that the authority of a foreign bishop should nowhere be recognized. This, however, was not to work any detriment to the unity of faith and fellowship which were to be maintained with the Pope as the visible head of the Church. Still greater excitement, however, was caused by the decision that in future all bishoprics and curacies were to be filled by election of the people. In vain the Pope remonstrated against these decrees, in vain the French clergy warned against the danger of a schism; the National Assembly was not to be deterred, and finally (November 22, 1790) demanded from the clergy an oath of allegiance to the new constitution. Those who would not take the oath were to be forthwith regarded as deposed, and their places to be filled by others. Many priests took the oath, but more refused. Of these, many, it is true, were deposed; but many kept their places, notwithstanding, partly because there was a lack of priests, partly because the confusion was too great to carry these measures immediately into execution, especially in places where the congregations were attached to their pastors. After the Pope had exhausted every expedient to prevent the requirement of the oath, in July, 1791, he pronounced the ban upon all the priests who had taken it (prêtres assermentés). This bull, however, was not allowed to be published anywhere in France, and was entirely disregarded. In consequence, the clergy who would not take the oath now began to emigrate en masse, as had already been the case with the nobility.3

3 Necker's History of the French Revolution, 4 vols. 1797.
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§ 23.

PROGRESS OF THE REVOLUTION. THE NATIONAL CONVENTION AND THE DIRECTORY.

A time of horror now began in France. Various parties alternately gained possession of the government, spent their rage upon their opponents, and in turn fell, supplanted by other parties. On the 1st of October, 1791, the National Assembly was superseded by the Corps Législatif. On the 21st of September, 1792, this yielded to the National Convention, which proclaimed the Republic in France, and caused the condemnation of the King (January, 1793). During this reign of terror, the fearful lack of religious principle among the French people was disclosed. No concealment was made of the purpose to destroy every vestige of the Catholic religion, which was regarded as the enemy of the Republic. A new republican calendar was introduced, according to which the reckoning of time began with the 21st of September, 1792. Decades were observed instead of Sundays; most of the churches were plundered and closed; the priests were deprived of their stipends; and in November, 1793, began the celebration of Feasts of Reason in the church of Notre Dame at Paris, instead of the priestly service, at which a Goddess of Reason was set up for worship. At this time, the universal madness was shared even by ecclesiastics. Bishop Gobet, of Paris, appeared with his vicar-generals at the bar of the Convention with the declaration that they had hitherto deceived the people; but now renounced their priestly functions, and would take part in no other worship than that of liberty and equality.1 But soon after (in May, 1794) Robespierre himself caused the National Convention to declare that the French nation acknowledged a Supreme Being and the immortality of the soul; and when, not long afterward, Robespierre fell (July, 1794), quieter times began. By the third constitution, a Directory, consisting of five directors (September 23, 1795), received the executive power. This government did not concern itself at all with ecclesiastical affairs, but permitted every form of worship as soon as its priests declared their allegiance to the nation. A singular phenomenon, characteristic of the times, was the society

1 Hist. du Clergé, iii. 293.
of Theophilanthropists, which was originated in Paris (1797) by one of the directors, Lareveillière Lepaux (d. March 28, 1824). They openly professed the religion of reason alone, and adopted a form of worship consisting of addresses and hymns, as well as of certain symbolical rites, which took the place of Christian baptism, confirmation, and marriage. Their number increased in Paris to some 10,000, and they there occupied ten churches for their worship. In many other French cities, also, Theophilanthropism was introduced, and at first very zealously propagated, even to the persecution of the Catholics, who were beginning to reappear. But this zeal soon subsided, and the new worship quickly disappeared in the provinces. In Paris, it maintained itself till, in 1802, the consuls, in consequence of the concordat which had been concluded, determined no longer to permit the Theophilanthropists to meet in national buildings.²

§ 24. POLITICAL RELATIONS OF THE POPE WITH THE FRENCH REPUBLIC.

Meanwhile, the Pope also had fallen into political disputes with the French Republic. As early as 1790, the National Assembly had annexed the Papal counties of Avignon and Venaissin to the French dominion. The Pope had protested in vain against this step, and afterward joined the princes allied against France, although he still declared that he wished to remain neutral. When he thereupon openly took part in the war against France, he was forthwith severely punished for it by Bonaparte, who conquered the greater part of the territory of the Church, and constrained the Pope to agree to the Peace of Tolentino (February 19, 1797). He was thereby compelled to renounce forever all claim to Avignon and Venaissin, to cede the three legations of Bologna, Ferrara, and Romagna (about a third of the States of the Church) to the new Cisalpine Republic, and to

pay thirty million livres for war expenses. At the same time, he was obliged to allow the French to carry off the most important works of art and the most valuable manuscripts from the Papal collections. But soon afterward a still greater misfortune befell the Pope. The republican sentiments which the French had disseminated found their way from the Cisalpine Republic into the States of the Church. The discontent with the Papal government had been increased by the French war contributions, which had exhausted all the monetary resources of the States of the Church, and had even made it necessary to have recourse to the jewels of the Papal crown to meet the emergency. As early as December, 1797, an insurrection broke out in Rome. While the Papal soldiers were fighting the insurrectionists, the French general Duphot mingled with the combatants and lost his life. This accident gave the French Directory a pretext for causing General Berthier to take possession of Rome and the States of the Church. A Roman Republic was proclaimed, and the government confided to five consuls (February, 1798). Pius VI. was compelled to relinquish the government, and was carried off a prisoner from Rome. At first, he was taken to several cities in Upper Italy, and then to the town of Valence, in France, where he died August 29, 1799.

In the meantime, the war of Austria and Russia against France had been already recommenced; and, while Bonaparte was in Egypt, Suwarrow, with an allied army, reconquered the whole of Italy (1799). This enabled thirty-five cardinals to assemble at Venice for the election of a new Pope, and on the 21st of March, 1800, their choice fell upon Cardinal Chiaramonti, Pius VII. He was born in 1742 at Cesena, of a noble family, entered the Benedictine Order, taught theology and philosophy at Parma and Rome, and afterward became Bishop of Tivoli and then of

1 A picture of the religious and political disturbances which arose in the little Catholic cantons of Switzerland, 1798, is given in a masterly manner by Zschokke in his history of the insurrection in that year.


Imola. As Bishop of Imola, he conducted himself so discreetly at the time of the French invasion of Italy that he was almost the only one of all the cardinals who secured the favor of the French generals. This he did especially by a Christmas homily, in which he endeavored to show that the democratic form of government then introduced into Italy was not at variance with the Catholic faith, but rather encouraged genuine Christian virtues. At the time of his election to the Papacy, this partiality for the French was adduced against him by several of the cardinals; but afterward this very circumstance was turned to good account in the negotiations with France. On the 3d of July, 1800, Pius VII. made his solemn entry into Rome. He found there universal poverty and an entire exhaustion of resources, and put forth every effort to remedy by personal retrenchments this unfortunate state of affairs.

§ 25.

RESTORATION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN FRANCE.

During this time the political condition of France had undergone great changes, which soon occasioned a corresponding alteration in the ecclesiastical affairs of that country. Bonaparte had returned from Egypt in October, 1799, and had immediately afterward overthrown the Directory. The administration was now confided to three consuls, of whom Bonaparte was the first; and from this time he exercised almost absolute power. He endeavored to restore the affairs of the country, which had fallen into the most pitiable confusion during the Revolution, to a state of permanent order; and thereby, undeniably, did good service to France, although the course of events proved that he had only wished by these efforts to prepare the nation for a monarchy, which
afterward became a most unmitigated tyranny. Accordingly, he soon turned his attention to the restoration of the ecclesiastical affairs of France. The Catholic worship had not, it is true, at that time entirely ceased in France, and the service was still conducted in many of the churches by priests who had taken the oath. But a large part of the nation had already separated themselves completely from the Church; and the number threatened to steadily increase as the older generation, which was still attached to the Church through principle or habit, died off, and the younger, which had been trained during these years of revolution, grew up. It was not to be expected that a nation destitute of religion would have any morality, and without this any fidelity toward the constitution and government. These considerations made it urgently important for Bonaparte to make every possible effort to prevent the total ruin of the Church. He therefore speedily entered into negotiations with the Pope, and the result was the Concordat of July 15, 1801. The Pope could not but rejoice that the French Church, which he had already regarded as lost, was now returning to its allegiance, and consequently Bonaparte was able to obtain conditions such as the popes had never before granted to any government. By this treaty the protection of the state was guaranteed to the Catholic religion, not as the exclusive religion, but only as that of the great majority of the people. Its public worship, however, was to be subject to such police regulations of the government as might be necessary for the peace of the community. The French priests who had emigrated were to relinquish their offices. In order to remove the distinction between the sworn and unsworn clergy, and so to terminate the schism, all were compelled to resign and receive new appointments. The government obtained the power to nominate the archbishops and bishops of the realm unconditionally, and the Pope was to do no more than bestow the canonical investiture. The number of sees was still further diminished, so that now some of them comprised from two to three departments. The former civil oath for the clergy was, it is true, abolished; but it was agreed that they should swear fealty and obedience to the now existing government. The sale already made of the property of the Church was expressly recognized as valid, and the government engaged to grant the clergy a suitable support out of the public treasury. Finally, the same rights and privileges
which the French kings had maintained in their relations to the Holy See were conceded to the First Consul.  

Obviously certain matters were here passed over in silence respecting which both parties had intentionally refrained from asking definite statements, because both hoped in the sequel to obtain more favorable terms. But the First Consul published, simultaneously with the Concordat, organic laws touching the new circumstances of the Church (1802), in which he made the necessary regulations regarding these undecided points. Among these the following were especially annoying to the Roman Curia:

1. All Papal bulls must have the placet of the government before their publication, and no Papal legate or nuncio might enter France without the consent of the same. In like manner, no decrees of foreign synods, not even of the universal councils, could be published till they had been officially examined.—Inasmuch, however, as these principles had always been maintained in the earlier Gallican Church, the present refusal of the Curia to acknowledge them was the more surprising.

2. In case of the abuse of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, recourse might be had to the Council of State.—This was only a transfer of the right which the Parliament had exercised before, and therefore, also, nothing new.

3. The monastic orders were to be forever dissolved in France, and every exemption from the jurisdiction of the bishops remain abolished.

4. But the Curia took the greatest offense at the 24th Article, which provided that all who taught in the seminaries should be obliged to subscribe the declaration of the French clergy of 1682, and to teach the doctrine of the Four Articles.

1 Persecution of the sworn priests as early as 1807. Niemeyer, Reise, vol. iv., first half, p. 235. Consalvi was then ready to abolish celibacy. Kirchenzeit. 1887, p. 1582.

2 Ph. Chr. Reinhard, Neue Organisation des Religionswesens in Frankreich, Köln, 1802.

3 Marheineke, Symb. ii. 317, Note m.
RELATIONS OF THE POPE TO THE NEW EMPEROR, NAPOLEON I.

The Pope immediately condemned these laws in a secret consistory, and from that time onward exerted himself incessantly to secure their alteration. The desired opportunity seemed to offer itself when Bonaparte, after his proclamation as Emperor, invited the Pope to Paris to anoint him to that dignity (1804). He there endeavored to secure both the repeal of the obnoxious laws and the restoration of the Romagna to the States of the Church. But so far from accomplishing his purpose, he found Napoleon desirous of obtaining still further concessions from him. They parted, each exceedingly dissatisfied with the other; and, from that time, the coolness between the two steadily increased. After Napoleon had conquered the whole of Upper Italy and Naples, and had thereby acquired the supreme control of all Italy, he approached the Pope, in 1808, with still greater demands. The latter was to recognize a practically independent Patriarch of France, to be appointed by the Emperor; to introduce the Neapolitan Code into the States of the Church; to grant liberty to all forms of worship; to abolish monasteries and celibacy; and, finally, to join the alliance against England and Sicily, and close his sea-ports to those powers. The Pope resolutely refused; and, on the contrary, met the proposal with complaints against the French legislation. In particular, he charged it with criminal indifference, in that it gave the preference to no religion, thereby contradicting the spirit of the Roman Church, which could no more associate with any other Church than Christ with Belial. Moreover, he censured the marriage laws of the French Code, because they recognized the civil marriage as the only valid ceremony in the eyes of the law; and, also, because they removed several of the canonical obstacles to marriage, and conferred upon the civil magistrates the right of decision in matrimonial causes.

1 Theol. Studienordnung in Tzschirner's Archiv, i. 2, 209. In 1811, Napoleon prohibited the teaching of anything except reading, writing, and arithmetic in elementary schools: Pflanz, Relig. Leben in Frankreich, p. 66.

2 As to the recent marriage laws of France, see Jahresschrift für Theologie und Kirchenrecht der Katholiken, vol. i. pt. i. p. 59.
The rupture with Sicily, and the closing of his sea-ports to English and Sicilian vessels, he declined on the ground that he could not separate himself from a portion of his flock nor engage in war against them. Thereupon the French general Miolis entered Rome, February 2, 1808, and took military possession of the States of the Church. When, however, the Pope, notwithstanding, resolutely persisted in the declarations he had made, the entire States of the Church, by an imperial decree of May 17, 1809, were incorporated with the French Empire. Upon this the Pope issued a bull (June 10), in which he pronounced the ban upon all who had assailed the prerogatives of the Holy See; and, in a communication of June 11, he explicitly announced to the Emperor that he had been excommunicated. Nevertheless, the Pope sanctioned the decision of a congregation that those excommunicated by this bull were not such as needed to be shunned, since they were not expressly named in it. The bull itself was only circulated in a private manner, as the government endeavored in every way to prevent its publication. After Pius VII. had protested against all the measures of the Emperor, and had refused to accept the pension which the latter offered him, he was forcibly removed (July 6) from the Quirinal Palace—the entrances to which he had had walled up—and was carried off to France, where a residence was assigned him in Savona.

But there, also, the Pope persevered in the course he had already adopted. He particularly embarrassed the Emperor by persistently refusing to grant the canonical investiture to the bishops whom Napoleon had appointed to the vacant sees. In this way twenty-seven sees were one after another vacated. The result was to create considerable dissatisfaction among the people, which was nourished by the secret emissaries of the Papal party, and the bull of excommunication obtained a steadily increasing, though private, circulation. Here and there a sect of so-called True Catholics withdrew from the control of the bishops, and carried on their worship in secret under the direction of apos-

---

* Marheineke, Symb. ii. 399.
* Given in Vater's Anbaut, ii. 17.
* J. H. Kessler, Authentische Correspondenz des römischen Hofes mit der französischen Regierung seit dem Einfalle in den römischen Staat bis zur gewaltsamen Abführung des Papstes, Tübingen, 1814. Archives Historiques et Politiques, ou Recueil de Pièces Officielles, etc. par F. Schoell, 1818, t. ii. iii.
Napoleon made ineffectual attempts to humble the Pope by harsh measures. All his cardinals and court attendants, and even his secretary, were taken from him; he was forbidden to carry on any correspondence, and was supplied with only the most scanty maintenance. But he made this a new reason for persevering in his course, and now replied to all propositions that he could do nothing without the advice of his cardinals.

Since the close of the year 1809, the Emperor had already assembled an ecclesiastical council composed of a number of bishops, and had caused them to prepare several opinions as to the best course to be pursued with reference to the Pope. At length Napoleon called together a national synod to meet in June, 1811. But a short time previous, in May, he sent a deputation of bishops to the Pope, correctly surmising that the latter, in order to prevent the Synod from acting independently of him, would concede as much as possible. The deputations were made to propose to the Pope that he should receive palaces at Rome, Paris, and several other places in the Empire, with two million francs yearly revenues, and the enjoyment of sovereign honors: On the other hand, the promise was required from him that he would take no action against the Four Propositions of 1682. If he wished to reside in Rome, he was to take the oath prescribed in the concordat. Above all, he must agree immediately to grant the bishops elect the canonical investiture, and to concede, in future cases, that, if the same were not given within three months, it might be granted by the metropolitan or the senior bishop of the province. The Pope, who had reason to fear that the approaching national council would make a permanently different arrangement for the canonical investiture of the bishops, gave the deputation an oral promise that he would bestow upon the bishops elect the desired investiture, and that in future, after a delay of six months, the power should rest with the metropolitan. But as to all other points he declared himself unwilling to negotiate until his liberty and his advisers were restored.

The National Council was opened on the 17th of June, 1811, immediately after the return of the deputations. Inasmuch as the deputation had not settled all the points at issue between the Emperor and the Pope, and, moreover, the declaration of the late-

---

4 De Pradt, iii. 369 ss. Ranke, Hist.-polit. Zeitschrift, i. 638.
5 De Pradt, ii. 466.
ter respecting the canonical investiture had been given in an unsatisfactory form, Napoleon desired that the Council itself should adopt the method of procedure in case of investiture to which the Pope had already given his assent, and submit it to the Emperor for his approval, in order that its provisions might be incorporated into the laws of the state. By so doing, the Gallican Church would have taken an important step in the direction of independence, and the Pope would have had the stronger motives for compliance. Napoleon hoped that the Council would adopt these measures the more readily because the point had been already conceded by the Pope. But not a few voices were immediately raised in the Council insisting that the Pope must first be set entirely at liberty; and it was the unanimous opinion that, inasmuch as the consent of the Pope was not in the proper form, nothing could be done until the decisions of the Council had received his approval. Incensed at this action, Napoleon dissolved the Council on the 11th of July, and caused the arrest of the three bishops who had been most decided in their opposition to the adoption of the decree in the form prescribed by the Emperor. The government, however, perceiving that nothing was to be gained by this despotic measure, entered into new negotiations with the individual bishops, which resulted in the reassembling of the National Council on the 5th of August. The Papal concessions were now put into the form of a decree, but with the stipulation that the sanction of the Pope must be obtained. The Council was then dissolved, and a deputation of the same proceeded to Savona to obtain the Papal ratification of their decisions.\(^8\)

This ratification was actually granted in a rescript of the 20th of September, in which the Pope, singularly enough, called the excommunicated Napoleon his beloved son, and himself showed as little regard for the previous excommunication as the other ecclesiastics had hitherto done.

Nevertheless, the bishops elect did not even yet obtain the actual canonical investiture. It is probable that Napoleon, presuming upon the yielding disposition which the Pope had manifested, believed that it would now be easy to come to a full

---

agreement with him upon all the points at issue. He therefore withheld the Papal answer, and now tried to obtain a comprehensive concordat by which all difficulties should be settled. In the summer of 1812, while Napoleon himself was in Russia, the Pope was removed, not without some hardships, to Fontainebleau, where negotiations were begun with him for a new concordat. After his return from the unfortunate Russian campaign, the Emperor prosecuted this matter in person, treating the Pope, according to his custom, with rude severity, while the latter resolutely insisted that he could not negotiate until he had his liberty and his cardinals once more around him. At last, however, he gave his consent to a provisional agreement which was, in general, quite satisfactory to the Emperor. The regulations of the Council respecting the investiture of the bishops were ratified anew; the Pope accepted the pension of two million francs, which had been previously offered to him; the right was secured to him to send envoys to, and receive them from, foreign powers; and the Emperor promised to restore to favor the bishops and priests who had fallen under his displeasure. This provisional agreement, which was signed by both parties at Fontainebleau on the 25th of January, 1813, was to be kept secret, and simply to form the basis of a definitive settlement, in which the college of cardinals was to be consulted. Nevertheless, Napoleon hastened to publish this treaty as a new concordat by which all the differences with the Pope were arranged. He certainly had reason to regard it as of the greatest importance, for it contained an indirect relinquishment by the Pope of the States of the Church; but he was not willing to wait for a conference with the cardinals, because he was well aware that many of them would object to the proposed conditions. For this reason, he did not allow those cardinals from whom he expected opposition to meet with the Pope, but only those upon whose favorable disposition he thought that he could count. Under these circumstances, the Pope certainly had a right to regard the agreement as broken. It had been made public contrary to the promise of the Emperor, and the Pope was still de-

*Tzschirner's Archiv, ii. 224.


‡ See Manuscrit de 1813, par le Baron Fain, Paris, 1834. German Transl. Stuttg. and Tüb. vol. i. p. 44 sq.
prived of his most faithful cardinals. Pius accordingly warned the archbishops not to believe the false report that a concordat had been actually concluded. The Emperor, on the other hand, issued a menacing decree against all who violated the concluded concordat. The Pope was again treated with greater severity, and kept in closer confinement. But the hour of his release was now approaching. When the allies entered France, he was at first removed from Fontainebleau to the western part of the country; but the fall of Napoleon set him free, and he returned immediately to Rome, making his entry into the city on May 24, 1814.12

§ 27.

HISTORY OF THE GERMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH DURING THIS PERIOD.

During the unsuccessful wars of the German Empire against the French Republic, the whole left bank of the Rhine had fallen into French hands, and at first secretly, by the Treaty of Campo Formio (1797), but afterward again by the Treaty of Luneville (1801), had been ceded to France. Not only were all the ecclesiastical states on the left bank of the Rhine secularized by France, but it was also expressly stipulated that the temporal princes who had lost provinces upon that side of the river should be indemnified by the secularization of territories belonging to the Catholic Church on the right bank of the Rhine. These secularizations were defined by the decree of the Imperial deputies (Reichsdeputations-Hauptschluss) of February 25, 1803.1 All the ecclesiastical principalities and estates, excepting only the estates of the Elector-archchancellor, were declared secular-

12 Essai Historique sur la Puissance Temporelle des Papes, et sur l'Abus qu'ils ont fait de leur Ministère Spirituel, Paris, 2 tomes, 4ième édit. 1818. The author availed himself of the archives, which were brought at that time from Rome to Paris, and from them produces many documents previously unknown. Fragmens relatifs à l'Histoire Ecclésiastique des Premières Années du 19ième Siècle, Paris, 1814—published by the Archbishop of Tours (De Barral), one of the envoys of the Council to the Pope at Savona; full of important documents. Extracts and translations from these and other French works in Beiträge zur Geschichte der katholischen Kirche im 19ten Jahrh. Heidelberg, 1818. Pius VII. d. Aug. 30, 1823; Leo XII. elected Sept. 23, 1823.

ized, and divided among the temporal princes, who were, for the most part, Protestants. Even the estates of the cathedral chapters were surrendered to the temporal rulers; and, at the same time, general permission was given to the sovereigns to secularize all the religious endowments and monasteries in their respective territories, and to have the free disposal of their property. The sovereigns gradually availed themselves of this permission; the monasteries were abolished in all the German states except Austria; the monks and nuns were pensioned; and thus by this single measure the Pope lost a great host of faithful dependents, who hitherto had been the chief support of his authority. The only obligation which was imposed upon the new sovereigns was to endow those cathedrals which were to be retained, to defray the expenses of the Catholic worship and the public instruction, and to pay the pensions of the superseded clergy. But one spiritual prince was left in Germany, the former Elector of Mayence. As Mayence had fallen to the share of France, the office of Elector-archchancellor (Churerzkanzler) and Primate of Germany was transferred to the See of Ratisbon; and the Elector-archchancellor received as his estates the principalities of Aschaffenburg and Ratisbon, with the town of Wetzlar.

All these changes, by which the German Catholic Church was deprived of almost all its possessions, were carried through without the slightest consultation with the Pope. Under the existing circumstances, he did not venture any open resistance, although he secretly did his utmost, through his nuncio in Vienna, to secure the repeal of these measures, but without success. It is remarkable that even at that time the Roman Court was still privately trying to carry out the hierarchical principles to an extent which can be matched only by the assumptions of the most arrogant popes of the Middle Ages, notwithstanding the great change in all the circumstances of the times.

For example, a letter of instruction to the nuncio at Vienna, written during this period, was found in the Papal archives while they were kept in Paris, which complains most bitterly that so many possessions of the Church had fallen into the hands of heretical princes. Attention is called to the fact that, by the canon law, the property of the heretics ought to be confiscated, and the subjects of an heretical prince absolved from all their

* Vater's Anbau, ii. 1.
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obligations. True, these "holy maxims" could not now be carried out; but this point could never be admitted, that the estates of the Catholic Church might be ceded to heretical princes. 3

But as all measures of this kind were ineffectual, the Roman Curia was content, as usual, to temporize, keeping silent for the time, and waiting for better days. By the cession of the left bank of the Rhine to France, many of the dioceses of the German bishops had been dismembered, since the French, in consequence of the concordat, had made a new ecclesiastical distribution of the recently acquired territories. It was therefore extremely important that the boundaries of the dioceses in the provinces which still remained German should be re-arranged, and the endowments of the bishops and their chapters definitively settled; for the secularized bishops only received life pensions, and no provision at all had been made for their possible successors. For this, an agreement was necessary between the Roman Court and the individual German princes, who had to provide for the endowment of the bishops and their chapters. But too great demands were made by Rome; and the negotiations themselves were carried on with very little spirit, because the Curia was constantly expecting a change for the better in political affairs, and was therefore unwilling to make any settled arrangements respecting the management of the German Church during such unfavorable times. On the other hand, the governments were not slow to avail themselves of the situation to constantly enlarge their authority in opposition to the hierarchy, and the Papal See was consequently all the more averse to enter into any agreements with them. In Bavaria, particularly, the principle that the Church was to be allowed no interference at all in civil matters was carried out with great strictness. Accordingly, the clergy in that country were deprived of jurisdiction in matrimonial causes, and the sovereign asserted that, with the secularized bishoprics, he had also received the right of patronage, because it had been exercised by the former bishops only in their sovereign capacity. The clergy were deprived of many privileges, particularly the privilegium fori; their real estate was

taxed; in many cases, instead of their former revenues, they were actually allowed only scanty stipends; and, under the name of an ecclesiastical police, a control was often exercised over the public worship and the ecclesiastical usages to a greater extent than properly belonged to the state. Moreover, the political condition of Germany was now subject to such sudden and frequent changes as to materially interfere with the regulation of the affairs of the Church. For, in 1806, the German Empire was completely dissolved, and it was immediately replaced by the Rhenish Confederation, which at first was merely a union of the South German states under the protectorate of Napoleon, but soon after extended itself also over the North German states. In consequence of this change, the former Elector-archchancellor was made Prince-primate of the Rhenish Confederation, and received, in addition to his previous domain, the free city of Frankfort, with its surrounding territory. But on the 19th of February, 1810, this, the sole remaining ecclesiastical state in Germany, was declared secularized by Napoleon, and changed into a grand-duchy. The former Prince-primate was, indeed, to remain Grand-duke, but after his death the country was to become an hereditary domain of Napoleon's stepson Eugene, the Viceroy of Italy. Thus the Catholic Church in Germany had lost its last possession, and the earnest endeavors of the Prince-primate Charles, Baron of Dalberg, to restore order to the affairs of the German Church remained ineffectual. He made public his desires upon this subject in a special work, in which he proposed that the French Concordat should also be adopted for the states of the Rhenish Confederation. Quite as unsuccessful were his efforts to induce the National Council at Paris to take steps for the benefit of the German Church. The old distribution of the dioceses still continued, although many of them, in consequence of the cessions to France, had become quite insignificant. But now, in anticipation of a new distribution and a more adequate definition of the status of the new bishops, none of the episcopal sees were refilled when they had once become vacant. The consequence was that the old German bishops and their chapters gradually died off without their places being filled again; and so, at the same time when Germany was liberated

from the yoke of Napoleon, there were only five German bishops still remaining, most of whom were far advanced in years, viz., the Archbishop of Ratisbon and Constance, and the Bishops of Eichstädtt, of Passau and Corvey, of Hildesheim and Paderborn, and of Fulda, the last of whom, however, died during the year 1814. The vacated dioceses were meanwhile governed by vicars-general—always bad substitutes, because they are invariably dependent upon Rome, and find it to their advantage to make themselves as acceptable as possible to the Curia. Besides these there were only a few suffragan bishops; and the lack of bishops was felt the more sensibly in Catholic Germany as it became increasingly difficult to obtain those sacraments which can only be administered by the bishops, viz., ordination and confirmation. It was not till after the fall of Napoleon, when the political affairs of Germany had been once more permanently settled, that the German Catholic Church could look for a restoration in conformity with the new order of things.⁶

The negotiations with Rome respecting this matter were somewhat protracted, because the princes endeavored, in the proposed concordats, to confine the Roman authority within fixed limits, while Rome would make no concessions, and, besides, was distrustful of the Protestant princes, whose subjects the majority of the German Catholics had now become.

Bavaria was the first to conclude its concordat of July 5, 1817. It received the archbishopric of Munich and Freysing, with the bishoprics of Augsburg, Passau, and Ratisbon; and the archbishopric of Bamberg, with the bishoprics of Würzburg, Eichstädtt, and Spire. Next came Prussia, by the bull De Salute Animarum of July 16, 1821, ratified by the King August 23, 1821, which established in the eastern portion the archbishoprics of Gnesen and Posen, with the bishopric of Culm and the exempt bishoprics of Breslau and Ermeland; and, in the western provinces, the archbishopric of Cologne, with the bishoprics of Treves, Münster, and Paderborn. Hanover followed, in accordance with the bull Impensa Romanorum Sollicitudo of March 26, 1824, and received the two exempt bishoprics of Osnabrück and Hildesheim, but provisionally only one bishop.

*Gottlieb Jacob Planck, Betrachtungen über die neuesten Veränderungen in dem Zustände der deutschen katholischen Kirche, und besonders über die Concordate zwischen protestantischen Souveräns und dem römischen Stuhle, welche dadurch veranlasst werden möchten, Hanover, 1808.
The South German states Württemberg, Baden, Hesse, and Nassau carried on the most protracted negotiations, because they wished to make conditions to secure the rights of the provincial bishops and to restrict the influence of the Roman Curia. But Pius VII. already designated the bishoprics August 16, 1821. The archbishopric of Freiburg received the bishoprics of Rottenburg, Mayence, Limburg, and Fulda. By a bull of April 11, 1827, the method of filling the vacant offices was settled. The Archbishop of Freiburg was consecrated and installed October 21, 1827.

§ 28.

HISTORY OF OTHER NATIONAL CHURCHES DURING THIS PERIOD.

With the exception of Germany, no nations were more involved in the fortunes of France than Italy and Spain; and, consequently, the churches of these countries also passed through manifold changes.

When Naples had been conquered by the French (March, 1806) and given to Napoleon's brother Joseph, the latter soon after abolished most of the monastic orders and confiscated their estates. The same result followed in the kingdom of Italy and in the States of the Church when Napoleon had annexed them to that kingdom (1810). The Inquisition had some time before been abolished in Rome. Otherwise, after the abduction of the Pope, the whole Italian Church shared the fortunes of the French Church, in that the canonical investiture was not granted to any of its bishops elect. For the Code Napoléon, the principles of which respecting ecclesiastical matters were displeasing to the Pope, had now been every where introduced; and the latter did not recognize the King of Naples, because the change of government in that country had been made without his consent, and he therefore regarded it as an infringement upon the rights which he claimed as feudal lord of Naples.

Similar changes followed in Spain when Napoleon, after the abdication of Charles IV., had appointed his brother Joseph King of Spain, in 1808. The new King immediately abolished the Inquisition, and in the following year (1809) decreed the dissolution of all the Spanish monasteries. Both of these measures were very beneficial to the country, for the multitude of
monasteries swallowed up a disproportionately large part of the wealth of the nation, while every Spaniard without distinction felt the grievous oppression of the Inquisition. It is true, the public *autos-da-fé* had become less frequent during the second half of the eighteenth century, and had wholly ceased under the last king; yet this secret tribunal was still terrible enough, and many were incarcerated in its prisons simply upon suspicion. An exceedingly injurious influence still continued to be exerted by the censorship of the press which it maintained, and by which it not only prohibited the introduction of all foreign books which seemed in any respect suspicious, but greatly hindered the development of native intellectual talent and the growth of Spanish literature. Joseph abolished it, and committed the archives to Juan Antonio Llorente, who had formerly been secretary of the Inquisition, for the purpose of preparing a history of it.¹

That the educated portion of the nation universally recognized the inexpediency of continuing the Inquisition is evident from the fact that the Cortes, which took the lead of the Spaniards who opposed the intruder Joseph, and had otherwise a strong aversion to all French innovations, nevertheless abolished the Inquisition (February 12, 1813), as incompatible with the civil constitution.

FIFTH CHAPTER.

HISTORY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SCIENCES IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH DURING THIS PERIOD.


§ 29. THEIR PROGRESS IN FRANCE UNTIL THE MIDDLE OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. CHURCH HISTORY.

Until the middle of the eighteenth century, France was still the principal seat of theological learning in the Catholic Church. Many circumstances contributed to this result. First, the contest between the various parties in that country—the Jesuits and Jansenists, the Ultramontanists and the advocates of the Gallican theory of Church liberty, as well as the Catholics and the Protestants—incited them to fruitful investigations. Then, also, the greater freedom of the Gallican Church and the absence of the Inquisition were conducive to literary activity. The Benedictines of the Congregation of St. Maur were distinguished, above all, for learned theological works; next to them came the Patres Oratorii, less extensively the Jesuits, but also the secular clergy and even a few learned laymen. Of all the departments of theology, none was more assiduously cultivated than Church history; and much was accomplished, particularly in the publication and critical elucidation of the older ecclesiastical writings. In this department the Benedictines of St. Maur deserve the first place, and among these the following should be particularly noticed:

Jean Mabillon (d. 1708) made valuable contributions to the history of the Benedictine Order and of the Middle Ages in his Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti and Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S.
Benedicti, and also in his edition of the Opp. S. Bernardi. The famous minister of state Colbert engaged him to travel through France, Germany, and Italy, for the purpose of collecting valuable books and manuscripts. He published a portion of the results in his Iter Germanicum and Museum Italicum. But his principal work was De Re Diplomatica, which was the first scientific treatise upon diplomacy.

Bern. de Montfaucon (d. 1741) did good service in both profane and ecclesiastical archaeology: in the former, by his sumptuous work L'Antiquité Expliquée et Représentée en Figures, 10 vols. fol.; in the latter, by his edition of the works of Athanasius and Chrysostom, and of Origen's Hexapla, as well as by a collection of the Greek Fathers (Collectio Nova PP. et Scriptorum Graecorum).

Mention should also be made of Lucas Dacherius (D'Achery, d. 1685) and his Spicilegium Veteranum Aliquot Scriptorum, 13 vols. 4to; Thierry Ruinart (d. 1709), for his Acta Sincera Primorum Martyrum; Jean Martianay (d. 1717), the editor of Hieronymi Opp., 5 vols. fol. By Edmond Martène (d. 1739) we have the Thesaurus Novus Anecdotorum, 5 vols. fol.; Vett. Scriptor. et Monumentorum Collectio Amplissima, 9 vols. fol.; De Antique Ecclesiae Ritibus, 4 vols. fol. Charles de la Rue (Ruaeus, d. 1736) edited Origenis Opp., 4 vols. fol.; and Prudentius Maranus (d. 1762), Cypriani Opp. and Justini M. Opp.

The last great works which were prepared under the supervision of this society by many of its members, and which were also important contributions to Church history, were the Histoire Littéraire de la France, Paris, 1733, 12 vols. 4to; L'Art de Véri fier les Dates des Faits Historiques; Glossarium Nov. ad Scriptores Med. Aevi Latinos et Gallicos, 4 vols. fol.¹

Although the French Jesuits accomplished less than the Congregation of St. Maur, they nevertheless, from time to time, made valuable contributions to Church history. Among them, Louis Maimbourg (d. 1686) deserves the first mention. He was a notable exception to the other Jesuits, in that he espoused the cause of the court and the Gallican Church in the controversy between Louis XIV. and the Pope, and wrote for the former: Hist. du Grand Schisme d'Occident, Paris, 1679; Traité Historique de l'Établissement et des Prerogatives de l'Église de Rome et de

¹ Tassin, Gelehrtengeschichte der Congregation von St. Maur.
ses Évêques, 1685. He was, in consequence, excluded from his Order at the instance of the Pope, but was richly indemnified by the French Court. However, he lent the assistance of his pen in other affairs of the court with equal willingness. When they began to devise measures for the conversion of all the French Protestants, he wrote his Méthode Pacifique pour ramener sans Dispute les Protestans, 1670; his partisan and mendacious Histoire du Luthéranisme, 1681; his Histoire du Calvinisme, 1682; Histoire de l’Arianisme et Socinianisme, 1682; also, Histoire du Schisme des Grecs, 1678, 2 vols.

Some of the Jesuits, also, did good service by making more complete collections of the councils than had hitherto existed. It is true that as early as 1644 the Conciliorum Collectio Regia, 37 vols. fol., had appeared in Paris in sumptuous typographical style; but it had many omissions, and was, in parts, very negligently compiled. A more complete and accurate edition was undertaken by the Jesuit Phil. Labbeus (Labbe, d. 1667), and after his death by the Jesuit Gabr. Cossart. It appeared in Paris, 1672, 17 vols. fol.

Still more complete was the collection thereupon issued by the Jesuit Jean Harduin (d. 1729), Conciliorum Collectio Regia Maxima, Paris, 1715, 12 vols. fol. But as he here and there betrayed Ultramontanist sentiments respecting the authority of the Pope, the work was prohibited by advice of the Sorbonne, but afterward gradually acquired a very general circulation.

But the zeal for the preservation of Christian antiquities was not confined to the clergy of the religious orders: there were also secular clergy, and even laymen, who participated in it.

Henri du Valois (Valesius), royal counselor and historiographer (d. 1676), furnished Eusebii Hist. Eccl., Paris, 1659; Socrat. et Sozom.; Theodoret et Evagrius. Jean Baptiste Cotelier (Cotelerius), professor and member of the Sorbonne at Paris (d. 1686), edited the Patres Apostolici; Ecclesiae Graecae Monumenta, 4 vols. 4to. Steph. Baluzius (Baluze), professor of canon law at Paris, who fell into disgrace on account of certain statements in his Histoire Général. de la Maison d’Auvergne, was banished and never afterward reinstated (d. 1718), was a distinguished connoisseur in the ancient canon law, and rendered important service, particularly in the history of the Middle Ages.
He has given us the Capitularia Regum Francorum; Vitae Paparum Avenionensium, etc.; Collectio Veterum Monumentorum, 7 vols. 8vo.

Louis Elie Du Pin, doctor of the Sorbonne (d. 1719), was a distinguished advocate of the Gallican theory of ecclesiastical freedom. He published his valuable work, De Antiqua Ecclesiae Disciplina, 1686, in defense of the Four Propositions of the Gallican clergy; but, on account of his many liberal opinions, was very odious to the Papal See and the Jesuits. His rare acquaintance with Church history was also evinced by his editions of the works of Optatus of Milevia and the chancellor Gerson. His most elaborate work, Nouvelle Biblioth. des Auteurs Ecclésiastiques, Amst. 1693, 19 vols. 4to, abounds in valuable observations, though in some parts too carelessly composed.

Pierre Daniel Huetius, Bishop of Avranches, in Normandy, resigned his bishopric in 1699, and resided with the Jesuits at Paris (d. 1721); (Origenis Commentarii in Sacr. Scriptur., Rothomag. 1668). His Demonstratio Evangelica, Paris, 1679, fol., is noteworthy; it is an argument for the truth of Christianity, in which he endeavors, with rare learning, but it must be confessed often by very artificial methods, to confirm the Biblical history by means of the profane, and to find traces of the religion of the Bible in the heathen mythology and philosophy.

Eusebius Renaudot, previously pater Oratorii (d. 1720), is celebrated for his Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio, 2 vols. 4to, Paris, 1715, and the Historia Patriarcharum Alexandrinorum.

Then we may mention those who treated the subject of Church history as a whole, or extensive portions of it:

Sebastian Le Nain de Tillemont, priest in the abbey of Port Royal and Jansenist, and for this reason odious to the Jesuits, wrote the Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire Ecclésiastique des Six Premiers Siècles, Paris, 1693, 16 vols. 4to.

Natalis Alexander, provincial of the Dominicans and professor of theology at Paris (d. 1724), wrote the Historia Ecclesiastica Vet. et Novi Test., Paris, 8 vols. fol., thorough and liberal. But because, in the history of Gregory VII., he had demonstrated the innocence of Henry IV., the Pope prohibited the printing or reading of any of his works, under penalty of excommunication.²

² This ban was afterward removed by Benedict XIII. Walch, De Conc. Lat. p. 100, 104. Ittig, Praef. Hist. Eccl. Saec. I. p. 44.
Alexander was, on this account, violently assailed even by the Roman brethren of his own Order, but did not allow himself to be influenced thereby, and afterward, in the continuation of his history, wrote still more openly against the pretensions of the Pope.

Claude Fleury, Benedictine abbot, afterward instructor of several of the royal princes, and finally confessor of the young king Louis XV. (d. 1723). He also was a radical and outspoken champion of Gallicanism, and, at the same time, threw much light upon the condition and doctrines of the ancient Church, although he always adhered to the Catholic orthodoxy, albeit the zealous advocates of the Curia endeavored to cast suspicion upon him. His principal work, Histoire Ecclésiastique, 20 vols. 4to, written in an agreeable and graceful style, became almost a classic among the French, and supplanted all other works of the kind. The best portion of it is contained in the interspersed Dissertations sur l'Histoire Ecclésiastique.

In the light which the labors of these men threw upon the earlier history of the Church, it was inevitable that the legends of the saints should be also here and there subjected to a more critical examination. Jean De Launoi (Launoius), doctor of the Sorbonne (d. 1678), obtained especial celebrity from several treatises, in which he investigated such legends of the saints as were principally circulated in France: De Duobus Dionysii; De Commentitio Lazari, Maximini Magdalense, Marthae in Provinciam Appnsu; De Origine Scapularis Carmelitarum, etc. He was, for this reason, called Le Dénicheur des Saints (one who drags them from their niches or nests); and the pastor of the church of St. Eustache at Paris used to say that he always bowed low when he met him, so that his saint might be left in peace. Launoi also defended the principles of the Gallican Church in several treatises, and wrote particularly against the monasterial exemptions and the privileges of the mendicant friars, as well as in favor of the authority of the oecumenical synods over the Pope, and the legislative power of the princes in respect to marriages (Opp. ed. Coloniae [properly Geneva], 10 vols. fol. 1731 sq.).

Adrien Baillet, librarian of an advocate-general at Paris (d. 1706). His work, Les Vies des Saints, not published in full till after his death, Paris, 1724, 4 vols. fol., is the only critical histo-
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The other theological sciences had also a number of eminent representatives, although not so many as Church history.

Conspicuous in Biblical literature was Richard Simon, from Dieppe in Normandy, *pater Oratorii* at Paris. His principal works, *Hist. Crit. du Vieux Test.*, *Hist. Crit. du Nouveau Test.*, furnished the first unprejudiced opinions respecting the origin and history of the books of the Bible, and were, for that reason, universally assailed. The Catholics charged him with being a Protestant, because he freely criticised the Vulgate and exposed the faults of the Fathers of the Church; the Protestants attacked him as an enemy of the Holy Scriptures. A clamor was raised against him in his own Order; he therefore left it, and passed his last years in his native town of Dieppe (d. 1712). It was not till long after his death that the Protestants first began to avail themselves of his investigations. Simon also wrote several other works on the condition and history of the Greek and other Oriental Christians: *Fides Ecclesiae Orientalis*, 1671; *Hist. Critique de la Créance et des Coutumes des Nations du Levant*, 1684; *La Créance de l’Église Orientale sur la Transsubstantiation*, 1687.


Augustin Calmet, Benedictine abbot at Senones, in Lorraine (d. 1757), is the most eminent Biblical commentator among the modern Catholics (*Commentaire Littéral sur tous les Livres de l’Ancien et du Nouv. Testam.*, Paris, 1707 sq. 23 vols. 4to, translated into Latin by Giovanni D. Mansi, Lucca, 1730, fol.). He is conspicuous for his rejection of all mystical interpretations and his exclusive regard for the literal meaning, as well as for having availed himself of the labors of Protestant commentators.
On the other hand, he has been reproached with an imperfect acquaintance with the Oriental languages, and an excessive tendency to crowd his works with unnecessary historical and archaeological erudition for the sake of display. The historical treatises scattered through the work have been published separately with valuable annotations: Calmet's Biblische Untersuchungen, mit Anmerkungen von J. L. Mosheim, Bremen, 2d ed. 1744, 6 vols. 8vo. In addition to these he wrote the Dictionnaire Historique, Critique, Chronologique, Géographique et Littéral de la Bible, Paris, 1730, 4 vols. fol.

Charles François Houbigant, priest of the Oratoire at Paris (d. 1783). In the Biblia Hebr. c. Notis Criticis et Versione Latina, Paris, 1753, 4 vols. fol., he gave an entirely new recension of the text, based upon the principle that the Hebrew manuscripts were of too recent origin, and contained an adulterated text. He therefore sought to restore the correct text, partly from the ancient versions, partly by critical conjectures. His labor has little independent value, but was instrumental in awakening a new interest in Biblical criticism.

Mention should also be made of Jacques Le Long, a priest of the Oratoire at Paris (d. 1721), on account of his Bibliotheca Sacra, 1723, fol. It is a catalogue of all the editions and translations of the Bible—enlarged in the edition of Andreas Gottlieb Masch (Consistorialrath at Neu-Strelitz), Halle, 1728, 4 vols. 4to.

Turning now to dogmatics and polemics, we find no one among all the French theologians who has acquired a greater reputation than Jacques Bénigne Bossuet. Born at Dijon in 1627, he studied in Paris, became doctor of the Sorbonne, and there acquired a high reputation as a pulpit orator. He was made instructor to the Dauphin, then Bishop of Meaux, and at the same time almoner of the Dauphiness (d. 1704). He was the most learned and eloquent bishop of his times, a man of very strict morals, but ambitions and illiberal in his treatment of those who differed with him. No one, in his day, exercised so great an influence upon the ecclesiastical affairs of France, was so eminent in the Church, or so influential at court, as he; and, con-

1 Veronius, who, in his Regula Fidel Catholicae, has grasped the essential idea of Catholicism more fully than perhaps any other Catholic dogmatist, is at times less reliable, because, being a tool of Richelieu, he shaped his utterances solely with a view of regaining the Protestants. See Marheineke, Symb. ii. 14; Wessenberg, iv. 287.
sequently, he was a party to all the important ecclesiastical transactions of his age. He was chiefly instrumental in the composition of the Four Propositions of the Gallican Church, in 1682; and also defended them in his Defensio Declarationis Celeberrimae, quam de Potestate Ecclesiastica sanxit Clerus Gallicanus, Genevae, 1730. He published several works against Quietism, and compelled Fénélon to recant. With similar zeal, he attacked the critical writings of Richard Simon, and was instrumental in having the Hist. Critique du Vieux Test. publicly burned in France. But he spared the Jansenists, in spite of the great hostility to them at the court, and valued their eminent writers. His chief literary efforts, however, were directed toward the Protestants, whose return into the Church he endeavored, in accordance with the desire of the court, in every way to accomplish.

His principal work in this department is the Exposition de la Doctrine de l’Église Catholique sur les Matières de Controverse, in which he endeavored so to represent those doctrines of the Catholic Church which are especially offensive to Protestants as to remove their obnoxious features. But the result was that, in the first edition of 1671, the Sorbonne found several errors to censure. These were avoided in the subsequent editions, and the work now received an authorization from Innocent XI. himself, obtained an uncommonly large circulation, and was translated into many languages. It was, notwithstanding, afterward again attacked by Catholic writers, among others by Maimbourg, on account of the reserve and ambiguity with which the doctrines of the Church were handled. On the other hand, many reformed theologians wrote refutations of this book. In the Histoire des Variations des Églises Protestantes, 1688, 2 vols. 4to, he tries to prove that, inasmuch as the belief of the Protestant churches has often changed, it can not be the true religion; but that, reversing the argument, the unaltered faith of the Catholic Church proves its truth by its very stability. Other writings of this sort treated of single points of controversy, such as the communion in both kinds, the mass, the adoration of the crucifix, and the like.

* On the literary history of this book, see the Hague Bibliothe. des Sciences, t. xviii. 20; Bibl. Critique par Mr. de Sainjon (Rich. Simon), liv. 299; Walchii Bibl. Theol. ii. 323; Ersch, Encycl. xii. 84.

* Histoire de Bossuet, par le Cardinal de Bausset, Versailles, 2d ed. 1819, 4 vols. 8. Œuvres de Bossuet, Versailles, 1815 sq. 43 vols. 8.
Next to Bossuet, the most eminent controversial opponents of the Reformed Church among the French theologians were the two leaders of the Jansenists, Antoine Arnauld and Pierre Nicole. The immediate occasion for the controversy was afforded by the Jesuits, who endeavored to represent the Jansenists, on account of their adherence to the Augustinian system, as secret friends and supporters of the Reformed. To clear themselves of this suspicion, they now wrote against the Reformed. We may particularly mention the controversy respecting the Lord's Supper with the Reformed pastor Claude, in which they tried to demonstrate that the Catholic doctrine was that of the primitive Christian Church.

Among the numerous dogmatic works which appeared in France during this period, two were received with especial favor—viz., that of J. Baptiste du Hamel, priest of the Oratoire at Paris (d. 1706), Theologia Speculatrix et Practica, Paris, 1691, 7 vols. 8vo, in which he combined the scholastic method of theology with the proof of the individual doctrines from the writings of the Fathers; and Natalis Alexander's Theologia Dogmatica et Moralis, Paris, 1693, 10 vols. 8vo.

Practical theology was also brought to a rare degree of perfection. During the age of Louis XIV. the French language had reached the highest stage in its culture. That period abounded in men who produced masterpieces in poetry and prose, and thus the public taste became more refined and elegant. It was not long before this had its effect upon pulpit oratory; and the old style of preaching, which was not above insipid jesting and delighted in a display of all sorts of pedantry, became offensive. A more dignified eloquence took its place. It must be confessed, however, that this also continued to evince the characteristics of the age and nation; even the most distinguished pulpit orators of France are lacking in elevated simplicity, while their discourses are overburdened with oratorical ornament and display, and are therefore better fitted to excite the imagination and the emotions than to produce elevation of thought and edification.

Among the most distinguished French preachers are Bossuet, whose funeral sermons, delivered on various occasions of death at the court, are particularly celebrated, and Louis Bourdaloue,
a Jesuit, who, on account of his oratorical talents, was sent by his Order to Paris, and there soon became court chaplain. For many years he was highly esteemed both as preacher and confessor, and still more for the worth of his private character (d. 1704): Sermons, Paris, 1707 sq. The fame of Bourdaloue was almost eclipsed by that of Jean Baptiste Massillon, priest of the Oratoire, court chaplain during the reigns of Louis XIV. and XV., then Bishop of Clermont (d. 1742): Sermons, Paris, 1745 sq. 16 vols. 8vo.

§ 31.
CONTINUATION.—EVENTS IN FRANCE UNFAVORABLE TO THE STUDY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SCIENCES.

An active interest in the cultivation of the theological sciences was also developing itself among the monastic orders in France, when they were confronted by a new reformer of the monastic system, whose appearance is a notable event in the history of monasticism, although his influence never spread very far.

Jean Bouthillier de Rancé entered the ranks of the clergy at an early age, and, through connections at the court, became the recipient of a great number of preferments. He was a man of great attainments, particularly in Greek literature, but led an extremely wild and dissolute life. Several events, especially the unexpected and terrible sight of the corpse of his mistress, affected him so powerfully that he resolved to devote himself to the strictest monastic life. He resigned all his livings, retaining only the Cistercian abbey La Trappe, situated in a desolate region of Normandy. His first concern was to reform the monks, who were notorious for their dissolute life, and he accordingly (1664) introduced among them such rigorous discipline as is scarcely found equaled in all the annals of monasticism. All studies were banished from the monastery, and in their place he imposed upon the monks the most difficult manual labor and the strictest penances, allowing them only the most scanty and miserable fare, consisting, for the most part, of uncooked roots (d. 1700). His example was, it is true, too discouraging to find many imitators, yet the monastery of La Trappe maintained this inhuman discipline until the Revolution. At that time the Trap-
pists were compelled to emigrate; a part of them settled in the
diocese of Paderborn, others went as far as the Vistula. Al-
though they tried to keep up their numbers there by kidnapping
children, their increase was prohibited by the Prussian govern-
ment, and they seem now to have disappeared.¹

Rancé was, moreover, the pronounced enemy of all monastic
studies, and asserted in his work Traité de la Sainteté et des Dé-
voirs de l’État Monastique that they were really a violation of
the monastic vow, and therefore to be shunned by the monks.
This induced Mabillon, of St. Maur, to write his celebrated work
Des Études Monastiques, 1691, in which he shows that the sci-
ences have been cultivated by the monks from time immemorial,
and their study recommended to the monasteries by the most
distinguished Fathers. Rancé’s work did no injury at all to the
cause of study in the French monasteries; but various causes
conspired to bring about the gradual cessation of the same, as
was, in general, the case with respect to the study of theological
sciences during the reign of Louis XV. The bishoprics and the
rich benefices in the days of this king were conferred by the
court for the most unworthy considerations, and fell more and
more into the hands of ignorant, dissolute men who squandered
their revenues at court, and gave themselves as little concern
about theological science as they did about their flocks, although
they missed no opportunity to show in public a zeal for ortho-
doxy, and to display their official dignities, that they might still
retain some respect among the people. This example of the
prelates and the ever-increasing frivolity of the age had their ef-
fect upon the other clergy also, and dampened their ardor in the
cause of science; all the more because of the appearance, just
at this time, of so many freethinkers in France, who, in propor-
tion as they exposed Church and religion to ridicule, weakened
the general interest in theological science. In the second half
of the eighteenth century theologians of learning and talent had
already become so rare in France that the so-called philosophers
met with hardly any more resistance in their attacks upon the
Church, and the apologies which appeared in answer to them
were few and insignificant.²

¹ Leben des Bouth. de Rancé, von Göckingk, Berlin, 1821, 2 vols. Der Orden der
Trappisten, von Ludw. Ritsert, Darmst. 1833.
² The most distinguished theologian among the defenders of the Church faith
Accordingly, the theological sciences had long passed their prime in France when the Revolution broke out. The effect of the latter was to drive from the country a large part of the higher and monastic clergy: there remained, for the most part, only the lower secular clergy, who had previously lived under the greatest oppression and possessed little education. Nothing was to be expected from them, either for the enlightenment of the people or the cultivation of the theological sciences. Moreover, all the seminaries disappeared during the Revolution, and were afterward only imperfectly restored. The persecution which the clergy who remained were compelled to undergo, the constantly increasing influence of the freethinkers, with which these priests were not able to cope, and the knowledge that they had lost their power over the great majority of the people, only served to confirm them in a blind, intolerant orthodoxy, because they thought that here lay the only chance of safety for the Church. Even the old party spirit of hatred to the Jansenists was reawakened, and continues to the present time among the Catholic clergy in France. But, at the same time, they were compelled to yield unconditional obedience to the government, especially after the accession of Napoleon, or else expose themselves to personal danger. A notable sign of these times was the Catéchisme à l'Usage de toutes les Églises de l'Empire Français, Paris, 1806, which received the sanction of the Papal nuncio then at Paris. It follows, for the most part, the plan of Bossuet's catechism, but differs particularly in having a section treating in detail of the duties to those in authority, and especially to Napoleon and his successors.¹

In later times a few individual theological writers have ac-

¹ In particular, the obligation of the service militaire was here emphasized, and Napoleon's merits lauded. It said: "Honorer et servir notre empereur est donc honorer et servir Dieu même;" those who do not observe their obligations to him "se rendroient dignes de la damnation éternelle." These are mere specimens of the subjection of the Church to the State at that time.
quired distinction. Among these is François Auguste Châteaubriand. When, after the conclusion of the concordat of 1801, some of the French writers endeavored to resist the general infidelity, and to awaken a new love for religion and the Church, he took precedence of them all in his work Génie du Christianisme, ou Beautés de la Religion Chrétienne, Paris, 1802, 5 vols. Although this apology lacked profundity, and did not reach the standard of true philosophy, it was wholly adapted to the French character, and produced a very general impression. In this brilliant work Châteaubriand employs the fancy pre-eminently to set forth in most attractive style the aesthetic and poetic side of Catholicism; but this very method was all the more successful because the philosophers had used similar means to draw the people away from the Church. Châteaubriand afterward followed this with several other works of a similar character, as well as several romances, intended to excite and foster a pious imagination. His Itinéraire de Paris à Jérusalem, 2d ed. 3 vols. 1811, should also be mentioned here. He became by far the greatest favorite among religious authors.

Henri Grégoire, professor at Pont-à-Mousson, one of the most distinguished deputies in the National Assembly, and one of the first to take the oath of allegiance to the constitution, became Bishop of Blois, and afterward a senator. He also, though in a different way from Châteaubriand, was active in resuscitating the French Church. His chief aim was to put an end to the abuses which were threatening to become permanent in the Church, and to secure the establishment of a settled form of Church government in opposition to the Roman Curia. When the ill-feeling on account of Jansenism was again excited among the clergy, he wrote Les Ruines de Port-Royal des Champs en 1809, Paris, 1809. He was also active under the Bourbons in maintaining the menaced Gallican Church freedom. He published at that time his Essai Historique sur les Libertés de l'Église Gallicane, Paris, 1818.

Dominicus de Pradt, Bishop of Poitiers, was appointed Archbishop of Mechlin by Napoleon, but, with many other nominated bishops, failed to receive the Papal investiture. As he was a distinguished diplomatist, Napoleon employed him extensively in political affairs.

He, too, was at this time very zealous in the defense of the ancient liberties of the Church: Les Quatres Concordats, suivis de Considérations sur le Gouvernement de l'Église en général et sur l'Église de France en particulier depuis 1815, Paris, 1818, 3 vols.  

§ 32.

THE THEOLOGICAL SCIENCES IN ITALY.

After the Reformation, Italy always had many eminent men of learning; but the peculiar circumstances of the country did not permit any free and independent investigations in theology. The supreme head of the Church was there too close at hand, and his Inquisition too greatly feared, for ecclesiastics to lightly venture upon any deviation from the system of the Church. On the other hand, the learned theologians, who were versed in dogmatics and canon law, and had not incurred the suspicion of the hierarchy by any startling opinions, found the way open to lucrative livings and the highest offices in the Church. It is therefore no wonder that theological scholarship in that country was content with a mere knowledge of that which the Church required, and held itself aloof from all freer investigations which, in any case personally injurious, might become positively dangerous. Accordingly, during this period there was an almost entire want of really independent theological works in Italy, inasmuch as the greater number only reproduced, in a slightly altered form, what was universally accepted in the Church. The most valuable works of the Italian theologians are compilations and editions of older theological writings. The following authors deserve mention:

Leo Allatius, the most celebrated of all the so-called Latinizing Greeks. He was born at Chios, went to Rome at an early age, and there joined the Roman Church, becoming librarian of Cardinal Barberini, and finally of the Vatican library (d. 1669). He performed valuable services in the cause of ancient literature, history, and archaeology, as well as by the publication of the works of several ancient authors. As a theological writer, he devoted himself particularly to the defense of the Latin Church against the Greeks, and labored to prove that the two churches agreed completely, and that misunderstandings alone

kept the Greeks separated from the Latins. It is, however, generally acknowledged that Allatius gives a very one-sided view of the subject, concealing the differences and only emphasizing the points of agreement.

Benedict XIV., previously Cardinal Lambertini (Pope from 1740 to 1758), was one of the most learned of the popes. His work De Servorum Dei Beatificatione et Canonizatione, libb. iv. 4 vols. 8vo, is particularly worthy of notice, being an accurate description of the requirements for the probation and canonization of a saint.

Especial distinction belongs to the learned Maronites Assemani, who, educated at the Maronite seminary in Rome, did much to promote the study of the language and history of their fatherland, particularly its Church history.

Giuseppe Simone Assemani was canon and custodian of the Vatican library (d. 1768): Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana, Rome, 1719–1728, 4 vols., containing more complete information concerning the Oriental churches and their history. Ephraémi Syri Opp., Rome, 1762, 6 vols., in which his nephew Stephen Evodius had a share.


Blasio Ugolino compiled the Thesaurus Antiquitatum Sacra-rum, Venet. 1744–1769, 36 vols. fol., a selection taken, for the

---

1 His chief work on this subject is De Ecclesiae Occidentalis atque Orientalis Perpetua Consensione, libb. iii. Cologne, 1648. 4.
2 Complete works of Benedict, Rome, 1747 eq. 12 vols. 4.
most part, from the works of Protestant scholars upon Hebrew
history and archaeology.

Dominico Vallarsi, Jesuit at Verona (d. 1771), published Hier-

Among the numerous dogmatists, who are scarcely more than
a repetition of each other, the most eminent is Giovanni Lorenzo
Berti, an Augustinian monk, and professor of theology at Pisa
(d. 1766). His Theologia Historico-dogmatico-scholastica, 1739
sq. 10 vols. fol., composed at the direction of the general of his
Order, is superior in matter and style to many other dogmatic
works. It contains not only the scholastic theology, but also
much historical information. The author was a strict follower
of Augustine in the doctrines of grace, and was consequently
obnoxious to the Jesuits, who openly reproached him with hav-
ing revived the errors of Jansen. In particular, the Abbé Gorgne,
of Soissons, the Archbishop Saleon, of Vienne, the Jesuit Zac-
caria and the Archbishop Languet, of Sens, charged him with
having revived the errors of Bajus and Jansen; but he defended
himself in a published apology with such force as to completely
silence his opponents.

Important contributions to the department of Biblical litera-
ture were rendered by the valuable collections of Josephus Blan-
chinus (Bianchini), secretary of the Academy of Church History
at Rome (d. 1759) (Evangeliarum Quadruplex Latinae Versionis
Antiquae, Rome, 1749, 2 vols. fol.; German, Die Evangelien
nach der Uebersetzung der Itala), and Giovanni Bernardo de
Rossi, professor at Parma (Variae Lectiones Veteris Test. Par-
ma, 1784–1788, 4 vols. 4to).

The most distinguished Italian scholar of this period, and the
only one who had also the courage to express independent opin-
ions upon theological subjects and to deviate from Roman views,
was Antonio Lud. Muratori (born 1672 at Vignola); in his early
life, for a time, curator of the Ambrosian library at Milan; then,
subsequent to 1700, archdeacon at Modena, and librarian and
curator of the archives of the Duke of Modena (d. 1750). He
rendered service of especial value by the publication of many
unknown writings of the Middle Ages: Liturgia Romana Ve-

* Anecdota ex Ambrosiana Bibliotheca, 4 vols., Anecdota Graeca. Rerum Itali-
Muratori was a very strict Catholic, and held such extreme views with reference to heretics as even to advise the use of force to bring them back into the Church. Nevertheless, he found much hurtful superstition in the religious practice of the people, which he tried to overcome. For example, the adoration of the saints, and particularly of the Virgin Mary, had assumed, in all respects, the character of idolatrous worship. This was especially encouraged by the Jesuits, who, at all their universities in Spain, Italy, and Germany, required from the instructors, and those who received academic honors, an oath to the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, and a vow to maintain the doctrine, if necessary, with life and estate. Accordingly, great was the sensation when Muratori published a work\(^6\) censuring this oath as a practice not to be tolerated, inasmuch as the doctrine itself was merely a matter of human opinion, not of divine revelation. In consequence, many refutations of his views appeared in Italy, but were all triumphantly answered. Muratori also composed several books of devotion for the people, by which more correct views upon many subjects were disseminated, as, e. g., that the adoration of the saints, although useful, is not necessary, and that excessive reliance upon the Holy Virgin is to be avoided.

In addition to this, a controversy between the Pope and the Emperor respecting the supreme power in the duchies of Parma and Piacenza, in which his own sovereign was also involved, afforded him an opportunity to develop, in an admirable manner, the subject of the rights of the empire in the States of the Church.\(^7\) In this work he set in an entirely new light the territorial donations which the Papal See had received in ancient times; and certainly he would not have done this with impunity in Italy if his own sovereign had not protected him.

\(^6\) De Ingeniorum Moderatione in Religiosis Negotiis, Paris, 1714. 4.

\(^7\) Esposizione dei Diritto Imperiali, Modena, 1712; French, Les Droits de l'Empire sur l'État Ecclésiastique, Utrecht, 1713. 4.
§ 33.

THE THEOLOGICAL SCIENCES IN CATHOLIC GERMANY DURING THE SECOND HALF OF THE SEVENTEENTH AND THE FIRST HALF OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

While the theological sciences were at their highest stage in France, they had become almost extinct among the German Catholics. All the educational institutions were in the hands of the monks, particularly of the Jesuits; and under their management the noblest germs of excellence were destroyed, and wherever a freer spirit manifested itself it was forcibly suppressed. The whole theological literature of Catholic Germany during this period is extremely meagre. The text-books of theological science were a mere repetition of the traditional opinions; for the rest, the controversial works against the Protestants still formed the most important portion of this literature.

Distinguished among this class of authors were the two brothers Von Walenburch, of whom Adrian von Walenburch was Suffragan Bishop of Mayence (d. 1669) and Peter von Walenburch Suffragan Bishop of Cologne (d. 1675). The most detestable of all was Joh. Nicolas Weislinger, a Jesuit of Strasburg, about 1720–1730.

Every where, both in Protestant and Catholic countries, the trials for witchcraft were still common, and innumerable witches were burned. True, a Jesuit, Friedrich Spee, of Treves (d. 1635), who had accompanied many of them to the stake, had already very distinctly acknowledged the innocence of these unfortunate, and had shown in energetic language the folly of the trials for witchcraft; and several sovereigns, of whom the Elector of Mayence, Philip von Schönborn, was the first, had entirely abolished these trials in their domains. Nevertheless, this fearful superstition continued to prevail in other German countries. In Protestant Germany it was brought to an end by Christian Thomasius; but in Catholic Germany it was not till 1729 that the last witch, a half-crazy nun, was burned in Würzburg, and Maria Theresa first decreed that no more witches and sorcerers should be burned in Austria.

2 Friss Vogel oder stirb—der neue luther. Heilige.
3 In his Cautio Criminalis circa Processus contra Sagas, 1631.
4 Acta Hist. Eccl. vii. 60 (by Schelhorn, see his Ergötzlichk. i. 130), also p. 671.
How gloomy the outlook was at that time in Germany is shown particularly by the Salzburg controversy respecting mariolatry in the year 1740. At the University of Salzburg, as in most of the German Catholic universities, the oath respecting the Immaculate Conception was required, and the worship of Mary was carried to the greatest excesses. At that time some young Salzburg ecclesiastics returned from Italy to their native country, and brought back with them many liberal opinions on the subject of Church legends and other superstitions, such as were prevalent in Italy chiefly through the influence of Muratori. With the co-operation of the then archbishop, they established a literary society, in which they busied themselves with various subjects pertaining to antiquity, including the antiquities of the Church. They were instrumental in circulating Muratori's book De Ingenuorum Moderatione in Salzburg, and with it more liberal opinions respecting the worship of Mary and the oath to the Immaculate Conception. These actions greatly incensed the theologians of the university. By a singular confusion of names, they took Muratori for the founder of the Freemasons (liberorum Murariorum), and now raised a terrible clamor, declaring that the new sect of Freemasons, who aimed at abolishing the worship of Mary, and eventually subverting the whole Catholic Church, threatened to get the upper hand in Salzburg, and were protected by the archbishop himself. As these complaints were brought to the notice of the people by sermons and publications, they also became restless. The archbishop, however, prohibited all writing upon the subject, and the discovery of the true cause of the misunderstanding contributed not a little to render the monks ridiculous. The result was to this extent favorable to the university that it induced the archbishop to remove these ignorant zealots, and to fill their places with men of learning, to the great advantage of theological education in Salzburg.

This period witnessed the establishment of the Academy of Sciences at Munich (founded 1759, reorganized 1807). Among the first in Bavaria to begin the work of dispelling the literary darkness was Eusebius Amort, born in Upper Bavaria in 1692, for a long time at Rome; after 1740, dean of the Augustinian mon-
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astery of Pollingen, in Upper Bavaria; in 1759, member of the Academy of Sciences in Munich (d. 1775). He was, it is true, a rigid Ultramontanist, and asserted that princes and kings were not only subject to the Pope in spiritual matters, but also that the latter was the arbiter in secular affairs, at the same time defending the Inquisition and forcible conversions; but he inveighed against visions and revelations, and was in other respects tolerant and of eminent moral character.

This was during the reign of the Elector Max Joseph (1745–1777), a liberal ruler who took the Academy of Sciences under his protection, and devoted his attention to the improvement of the lower and higher schools. But how far Catholic Germany was behind the age as late as 1773 is shown by a letter of Clement XIV. to a German prelate, dated December 5, 1773. He complains that the priests and monks are, for the most part, extremely ignorant, and in consequence addicted to the blindest superstition; that for a long time the best books in Germany have come from the Protestants exclusively; exhorts him to encourage the study of the classics and of history, philosophy, and theology; praises the institutions at Mayence and Würzburg; and points to the efforts of the King of Prussia in behalf of his Catholic subjects as an example worthy of imitation.

§ 34.

EVENTS PREPARATORY TO THE AWAKENING OF THEOLOGICAL LEARNING IN GERMANY.

The first tokens of an awakening to greater freedom of thought upon theological subjects appeared in Austria during the reign of Maria Theresa. Although a strict Catholic, this sovereign was very jealous of her royal prerogatives, and knew how to secure them against the encroachments of the hierarchy. She also did much to encourage the study of theological science. As a consequence, the theologians began to think more independ-

* As early as 1730 he had founded a literary society, Academia Carolo-Albertina, which rendered good service in the diffusion of aesthetic and literary culture, and published its transactions in 6 vols.—Parnassus Bolcus. He wrote De Indulgentiis; Demonstratio Crit. Religionis Cathol.; Vetus Disciplina Canonic. Regularium et Secularium; Elementa Juris Canon.; Leben der Heiligen Gottes.


ently; and, after the gradual decrease in influence and final abolition of the Order of Jesus had removed the hindrances to progress, theological learning sprang up full of promise among the German Catholics, at the very time when it was steadily declining in France.

The German Catholic theologians did not, it is true, accomplish so much in the field of theology proper as did the French during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; but it is worthy of notice that the Germans, as soon as they had begun once more to cultivate the theological sciences, immediately endeavored to apply the results of their scientific labors to the practical life of the Church; whereas, in France, even during the most flourishing period of theological learning, the results of this kind were small, and confined to the defense of the rights of the Gallican Church. The theological awakening in Germany began with the removal of old prejudices respecting the ecclesiastical law; and from that time onward proceeded uninterruptedly in the endeavor to restrict the power of the Papal hierarchy, and, on the other hand, to augment the authority of the sovereigns and the bishops. At the same time the leaders in the movement aimed to disseminate enlightened religious ideas among the people, and to adapt the form of worship to the requirements of the times. And now, as in the days of the Reformation, was manifested that honest disposition of the Germans in religious matters which allows no dissimulation, but imparts without concealment that which it has recognized as true.

Among the first encouraging signs in Catholic Germany were the pastoral letters of two Catholic bishops, who, with great plainness of speech, inveighed against many of the faults of their Church. The first, from the Archbishop of Vienna, Prince von Trautson (1750), gave the priests some plain-spoken directions to disseminate purer religious knowledge among the people, censuring the excessive saint-worship and the extravagant regard for indulgences, rosaries, images, processions, and the like. He said that the conceptions of the people, chiefly through the fault of their preachers, had become wholly superstitious. The other, from the Bishop of Gurk, Count von Thun (1771), took advantage of the celebration of the post-jubilee year to give some very important instructions respecting penance, the forgiveness of

sins, and the efficacy of indulgences. Of no little significance, in the course of events, was the reform soon afterward (1752) inaugurated at the University of Vienna, by which the influence of the Jesuits in that university was considerably restricted.

But these events were overshadowed in importance by the work of the suffragan bishop Von Hontheim (Justini Febronii De Statu Ecclesiae et Legitima Potestate Romani Pontificis, 1763–1774, 5 vols. 4to). This it was that actually aroused the German theologians from their lethargy, and stimulated them to free investigation. The principles of the Gallican Church became increasingly prevalent in Germany, and even Maria Theresa was won over to them, chiefly through the influence of her distinguished physician in ordinary, Baron Van Swieten.

The latter also brought about a much-needed reformation in the system of instruction in Austria. He secured the appointment of the Benedictine Stephan Rautenstrauch, of Prague, one of the most liberal and learned canonists of that period, as director of the theological faculty at Vienna (1774); and through his efforts new instructions were now issued to all the theological faculties of the Catholic states, by which the foundation was laid for a more thorough study of theology. They required all students of theology to study five years, applying themselves at first to the Oriental languages—particularly the Hebrew—Church history, hermeneutics, and exegesis, and afterward to dogmatics, canon law, and pastoral theology. The young emperor Joseph took some part in these changes as co-regent; when, however, he assumed exclusive control, the government entered upon those remarkable reforms which gave a new impulse to theological inquiry, and inspired the theologians with a courage and freedom previously unknown. The theologian who advocated the Emperor's policy, particularly from the standpoint of the ecclesiastical law, and did much to promote the diffusion of liberal ideas in Austria, was Joseph Valentin Eybel, professor of canon law at Vienna, afterward gubernatorial counselor at Innspruck (d. 1805). He had previously written a very liberal treatise on canon law, on account of which he had been assailed by the Papal party. During the reign of Joseph II. he labored with great assiduity, by means of short pop-

\[\text{Act. Hist. Eccles. iii. 743.}\]
\[\text{Introductio in Jus Ecclesiasticum Catholicorum, 2d ed. 1778. &}\]
\[\text{vol. v.—17}\]
ular treatises in the German language, to correct many widely prevalent misconceptions.  

Contemporaneous with these movements in Austria, encouraging signs also appeared in other Catholic countries. In Bamberg, the bishop Franz Ludwig von Erthal (1779–1795) was an active patron of the sciences. He furnished young men of talent with the means of traveling for purposes of study, and sought to encourage scholarship by instituting prize-discussions. In Salzburg, subsequent to the scandalous controversy respecting mariolatry, much light had been diffused; and before Joseph had commenced his reformation in Austria, the energetic Archbishop Jerome had here issued in his pastorals, from the year 1776 onward, many excellent regulations and instructions for the eradication of prevalent abuses and superstition.

The period during which the government furthered these efforts in Austria and in Salzburg, which was afterward united with that country, did not, however, long continue. Under Francis I. many of Joseph's reforms were abandoned, and the theological writers and teachers were again subjected to strict espionage and rigid censorship. After that time it was unmistakably the tendency in Austria to return as far as possible to the old order of things, and to exclude the entrance of all new ideas, political as well as ecclesiastical, because to these were attributed all the civil revolutions and national disturbances of modern times. Nevertheless, there have always been individuals who have preserved a measure of enlightenment from that better period; and it was scarcely to be expected that the nation could be kept so intellectually isolated, and free from all foreign influence, as that any great results should flow from these attempts.

The course of events in Bavaria was singular. At first, under the liberal government of Maximilian Joseph (1745–1777), the country participated in the new light which was dawning in Germany. A Theatine monk at Munich, P. Sterzinger, first ventured, in 1766, to attack the belief in witchcraft as an unfounded prejudice. He caused great excitement, and found not a few antagonists; but triumphantly defended his position, and destroyed the belief of many in that pernicious superstition.

* Thus, e. g., he wrote: Was ist der Ablass? 1780; Was ist der Papst? 1783; Was ist ein Bischof? 1782; Was enthalten die Urkunden des Christenthums von der Ohrenbeichte? 1784.
His success irritated the Obscurants, particularly the Jesuits, and they put forth every effort to bring the Devil once more into repute. They found a convenient tool in Johann Joseph Gassner, a priest from the Grisons, who, in 1774, began to acquire notoriety at Ellwangen, in Suabia, as an exorcist. He divided all diseases into two classes, natural and supernatural; asserting that the latter proceeded from the Devil, and could be cured by the name of Jesus, if the sufferer had a firm faith in the power and efficacy of that name. He declared himself able to discover whether a disease was natural or not by the praecptum probativum, in virtue of which he commanded the Devil to produce the paroxysm; if this thereupon ensued, the disease was unnatural. Gassner also visited other towns, and everywhere the diseased flocked to him by thousands. But it was not long before several bishops as well as the secular governments declared against him, and forbade him to ply his trade. It was quite evident that the possessed whom he actually cured had been prepared beforehand for their part. Of the countless other patients, he had to dismiss the majority uncured, either under the pretext that their disease was natural or that they did not have sufficient faith; while excitable persons, of strong imagination, not unfrequently believed themselves cured, only to relapse afterward into a worse state. Even Pius VI. was compelled to condemn the miraculous cures of Gassner as superstitious. Nevertheless, the latter had a deanery in the See of Ratisbon conferred upon him (d. 1779).  

Although the Bavarian government had taken very decided steps against the disorders of Gassner, it exhibited a surprising change under the new Elector, Carl Theodor (1777–1799). This prince was completely under the influence and control of the ex-Jesuits, and consequently acted in a spirit directly contrary to that of Joseph. This was first manifested in his treatment of Andreas Zaupfer, secretary of the military council of the court at Munich. He published an Ode on the Inquisition, portraying in lively colors the detestable character of that institution. The ex-Jesuits, enraged at this, not only preached against him, but also obtained from the Elector a decree whereby all copies of the ode were ordered to be confiscated, its contents were censured, and Zaupfer commanded to make before the

* Die aufgedeckten Gassnerschen Wunderkuren aus authent. Urkunden beleuchtet (probably by Sterzinger), 1775.
magistracy a confession of the Catholic faith. Under Carl Theodor the government continued to act in the same spirit. While in Austria processions and pilgrimages were prohibited, in Bavaria they were earnestly recommended, and many of the abolished holidays restored. But immediately after the death of Carl Theodor and the accession of King Maximilian Joseph, the supremacy of monachism and superstition was overthrown. The Protestants received universal toleration, the sovereign rights were rigidly maintained in opposition to the hierarchy, greater freedom of thought and of the press was conceded, the educational institutions were suitably reorganized, and Protestant scholars were invited from abroad to give a new impulse to learning. Since that time Bavaria has made great progress also in theology; and, in particular, much has been done for the improvement of the public worship, the proper education of the clergy, and the eradication of deep-rooted popular prejudices.

In many of the German ecclesiastical states, as well, much had been done for theological enlightenment. But in these, more than elsewhere, the cause met with bitter opposition, and was endangered by every new change of rulers. The greatest results were accomplished in the electorate of Cologne by Joseph's brother Maximilian, under whose protection canonists like Hedderich and exegetes like Derser could teach and write with great freedom. When these men were accused at Rome by the cathedral chapter of Cologne, Maximilian defended them there also with great zeal.

In other places, however, the Obscurants succeeded in stirring up persecutions against the liberal theologians. The most notable instance was that of Johann Lorenz Isenbiehl. As pastor of the Catholic congregation in Göttingen, he had engaged extensively in the study of the Oriental languages under Michaelis; and for this reason had been called by the Elector of Mayence to that city as professor in this department, but had incurred the enmity of the Obscurants. On the occasion of a change of sovereigns, they succeeded in having him deposed from his professorship (1774), and banished to a seminary for the purpose of recommencing the study of theology. He was subsequently made teacher of an inferior school with a very meagre salary, and thereupon published his Neuer Versuch über die Weissagung vom Immanuel, Es. vii. 14, Coblenz, 1778, in which he denied the
Messianic character of that passage. He was thrown into prison, where he finally consented to repudiate his book after it had been condemned by many bishops, faculties, and the Pope himself. He then received a position as prebendary, which, however, was exchanged, after the secularization of 1803, for a small pension. He died in 1818 at Oestrich, in the Rheingau.

After the majority of the ecclesiastical principalities had been secularized, and, for the most part, had come under the control of Protestant princes, the liberal theologians there too were able to prosecute their work with greater freedom, and without fear of governmental interference. The clergy of the German provinces which had fallen to France now took little part in the intellectual life of the German people; Austria too shut herself off from it, and endeavored, as far as possible, to return to the old order of affairs. On the other hand, the Catholic theologians in Bavaria, Württemberg, and Baden vied with each other in free theological inquiry. They endeavored to expose and remove superstition and ecclesiastical abuses, to regulate the relations of the hierarchy to the temporal governments, to restore individual Catholic dogmas to their original definitions, and to disencumber them of later accretions.

The then primate of the Rhenish Confederation, Carl von Dalberg, favored these efforts, although he endeavored, at the same time, to adhere faithfully to the orthodoxy of the Church. Several theological periodicals served as organs of the progressive party.⁶

The results of this tendency were most generally diffused in the See of Constance, which had the Prince-primate for its bishop, but was administered for him by the excellent vicar-general, Baron von Wessenberg. At the direction of the latter, pastoral conferences were established which stimulated the clergymen to scientific labors, and effected many reforms in the public worship. In particular, the German language was introduced into the worship, as was also the case in many parts of Bavaria.⁷


⁷ One result of the pastoral conferences in the See of Constance was the Archiv für die Pastoralconferenzen in dem Landcapitel des Bisthums Constanz, Constance, 1804 sq.
It was not surprising that the orthodox party violently resisted these rapid progressive measures. Their principal organ was the Literaturzeitung für katholische Religionslehrer, published by Felder, afterward by von Mastiaux, Landshut, since 1810.

But this journal was too deficient in candor and in intellectual power to be able to check the tendency of the times. It dealt alternately in extravagant praise and extravagant censure without thorough criticism. Moreover, the disagreement between the two parties constantly increased, and the liberals exhibited more and more of that spirit of protest which had produced the Reformation in the sixteenth century.

§ 35.
DISTINGUISHED THEOLOGICAL WRITERS.

In the department of Biblical literature, Dominicus von Brentano, priest in the foundation of Kempten (d. 1797), attained distinction. At the direction of his abbot, Rupert II., he translated the Bible into German.¹

Thaddaeus Anton Dereser was first professor of exegesis at the University of Bonn, then at Freiburg, in the Breisgau, afterward at Breslau. At the request of the Elector of Cologne, Dereser composed, in 1791, a German breviary, intended primarily for nuns.²

Carl Van Ess, pastor at Huysburg, near Halberstadt, and Leander Van Ess, professor and pastor at Marburg, translated the New Testament.³

Johann Jahn, professor of the Oriental languages at the University of Vienna, on account of his many liberal opinions (such as that the books of Job, Jonah, Tobit, and Judith were didactic poems, and that the demoniacs of the New Testament were merely diseased), was subjected to many persecutions, which resulted in his removal from his professorship (1807). He spent the remainder of his life as prebendary in the church of St. Stephen, in Vienna (d. 1817).⁴

² The 8th ed. of which appeared in 1830. Also a Biblisches Erbauungsbuch, Heilbronn, 1810, 4 pts.
³ Sulzbach, 1807; 11th ed. 1830.
⁴ With respect to these persecutions, see the letters prefixed to John Jahn's Nach-
Franz Carl Alter, ex-Jesuit and instructor at a gymnasium in Vienna (d. 1804).

Johann Leonhard Hug, professor of theology at Freiburg, the most learned and acute of the Catholic critics of the New Testament.

In Church history the following did good service by the elaboration of single portions and the collection of documents: John Nicolas von Hontheim; Stephan Alexander Würdtwein, suffragan bishop at Worms (d. 1796); Gerbert, Prince-abbot of St. Blasius, in Baden (d. 1793).

Less was accomplished for general Church history, though it was not left entirely untouched. Among the laborers in this field were Caspar Royko, professor of Church history at Prague, afterward retired as archdeacon and gubernatorial counselor (d. 1819), and Anton Michl, professor of canon law and Church history at Landshut (d. 1813).

Dogmatic theology also had its representatives. The principal were Benedict Stattler, an ex-Jesuit, at first professor at Ingolstadt, then censorial counselor at Munich (d. 1797); Engelhardt Klüpfel, an Augustinian, professor of theology at Freiburg (d. 1811); Patricius Benedict Zimmer, professor of theology at Tübingen, 1821. His most celebrated works are:

- Einleit. in die Bücher des Alten Bundes, 2d ed. 1801, 1803, 2 vols.; Bibl. Archäologie, 3 vols. 1796–1805; edition of the Hebrew Bible, 1806, 3 vols. He also wrote several grammars and chrestomathies for the Oriental languages, as well as compendiums of hermeneutics and of several of his larger works.

Less was accomplished for general Church history, though it was not left entirely untouched. Among the laborers in this field were Caspar Royko, professor of Church history at Prague, afterward retired as archdeacon and gubernatorial counselor (d. 1819), and Anton Michl, professor of canon law and Church history at Landshut (d. 1813).

Dogmatic theology also had its representatives. The principal were Benedict Stattler, an ex-Jesuit, at first professor at Ingolstadt, then censorial counselor at Munich (d. 1797); Engelhardt Klüpfel, an Augustinian, professor of theology at Freiburg (d. 1811); Patricius Benedict Zimmer, professor of theology at Tübingen, 1821. His most celebrated works are:

- Einleit. in die Bücher des Alten Bundes, 2d ed. 1801, 1803, 2 vols.; Bibl. Archäologie, 3 vols. 1796–1805; edition of the Hebrew Bible, 1806, 3 vols. He also wrote several grammars and chrestomathies for the Oriental languages, as well as compendiums of hermeneutics and of several of his larger works.

Less was accomplished for general Church history, though it was not left entirely untouched. Among the laborers in this field were Caspar Royko, professor of Church history at Prague, afterward retired as archdeacon and gubernatorial counselor (d. 1819), and Anton Michl, professor of canon law and Church history at Landshut (d. 1813).
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Landshut (d. 1820); MARIANUS DOBMAYER; LIEBERMANN, regent of the theological seminary at Mayence.

Worthy of notice was the attempt made by Friedrich Brenner, parish priest at Bamberg, to apply the philosophy of Schelling to the Catholic theology. On the other hand, Kant's philosophy was employed in support of the Catholic system by Ildefons Schwarz (d. 1794), a Benedictine, professor of theology at the monastery of Banz.

Among the Catholic theologians who endeavored to modify and give a rational presentation of single doctrines, and to reform the worship of the Church, mention should be made of Benedict Maria von Werkmeister, first a Benedictine, then ecclesiastical counselor, and member of the Board of Education at Stuttgart. And in the improvement of the liturgy Veit Anton Winter, ecclesiastical counselor and professor of theology at Landshut (d. 1814), took a prominent part.

Among the representatives of pastoral theology, especial distinction belongs to Johann Michael Sailer, ex-Jesuit, professor of theology at Landshut, finally Bishop of Ratisbon, who, in his writings, aimed always at the production of genuine piety; and, in the spirit of an elevated mysticism, endeavored to vitalize the forms of public worship, and to make them conducive to religious feeling and purpose. During a long career as public instructor, he imparted his opinions to a great number of Bavarian clergymen, among whom he possessed great influence. The sticklers for orthodoxy, however, doubted his soundness; and this

---

14 Theologia Christiana Dogmat. 1789, 2 vols.; and Theol. Christiana Specialis et Theoret. 1802—a very clear development, with the attempt to present the doctrines in their mildest form.
15 Systema Theologiae Catholicae, Sulzbach, 1808 sq. (voluminous collection), 7 pts. incomplete.
16 Institutiones Theologicae, 2 vols. Mayence, 1820—very rigid, and returning entirely to the old system.
18 Handbuch der christlichen Religion, 3 vols. 5th ed. 1818.
19 Thomas Freikirch, oder freimütige Untersuchungen über die Unfehlbarkeit der katholischen Kirche, 1792. An die unbescheidenen Verehrer der Heiligen, besonders Mariä, 1803.
20 Liturgie, was sie sein soll, unter Hinblick auf das, was sie im Christenthum ist, 1809—plain-spoken censure of the mechanical features of the Catholic worship, that it was unintelligible to the people in the Latin language, and conducive to various superstitions. As plans for improvement he presented Erstes teutsches kritisches Messbuch, 1810; Erstes teutsches kritisches katholisches Ritual, 1811, in which he took the Protestant worship, in many particulars, for his model.
induced him to make a confession of his faith in the Church, and to revoke all that he might have uttered to the contrary.\textsuperscript{21}

Mention should be made of two other Catholic theologians, both of whom withdrew from the Church, without, however, joining the Protestants. First, Pierre François Le Courayer, a clergyman and librarian of the chapter-house of St. Geneviève at Paris. The union negotiations between the French Catholic and the English Episcopal churches afforded him an opportunity (1723) to show that the English bishops derived their consecration in unbroken succession from the apostles; that it was therefore canonically valid, and did not need to be repeated in case of a possible union. These assertions involved him in controversy with many French theologians; even the government seemed likely to take action in the matter, and his position became so dangerous that he was obliged, in 1728, to take refuge in England. During the course of this controversy he was led to advocate many opinions abhorred in his Church as heretical. He denied the sacrifice in the mass and the character indelebilis of the priests, and censured the low masses, the celibacy of the priests, and the worship of saints and images. Although he approached so closely to the Protestants, he did not openly profess their faith, notwithstanding the fact that he was ejected from his own Church (d. 1776).\textsuperscript{22}

The other was Alexander Geddes, a Catholic clergyman of Scotland, who, to acuteness and sound criticism, united an extensive acquaintance with the Oriental languages. He published a new English translation of the Bible, with explanatory and critical notes, 1788 sq., which involved him in a violent controversy with the Apostolic Vicar in England. He had expressed many liberal opinions in his notes, in particular, calling in question the genuineness of the Mosaic writings. But he gave still


greater offense by numerous contradictions of the Papal pretensions, especially by the assertion that the Catholics of England had the right to elect their own bishops. Finally, in 1796, in a very emphatic letter to the Apostolic Vicar, Geddes declared that he renounced the Papacy, but not the Catholic Church. He resided in London till his death, in 1802.  

Geddes' Notes on the Pentateuch are translated and incorporated into Vater's Comment. zum Pentateuch, Halle, 1802–1805, 3 vols.
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HISTORY OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

FIRST CHAPTER.

INTERNAL HISTORY.

I.—PERIOD OF THE CALIXTINE SCHOOL AND THE SYNCRETISTIC CONTROVERSIES.


§ 36.

ORIGIN OF THE CALIXTINE CONTROVERSIES.

The University of Helmstedt had long been regarded with suspicion by the strict Lutherans, because, as in all the provinces of Brunswick, the Form of Concord was not there accepted; and consequently the instructors were allowed greater latitude as to many doctrines. In particular, George Calixtus had given offense by many of his opinions since he assumed his professorship, in 1614. At the very beginning he had publicly contradicted the doctrine of the ubiquity of Christ's humanity, and declared the communicatio idiomatum realis to be Eutychianism. He made no attempt to conceal his strong desire for a reunion of the Lutheran Church with the Catholic and Reformed, and attached little value to many of the doctrines regarded as distinctive. He believed all the Christian churches to be one in the ground of their faith, and all who possessed this common faith to be alike destined to salvation. He accordingly saw, in the different churches, only different societies, which, neverthe-

1 "Symbolum Apostolicum esse sufficiens" had already been the judgment of Cassander (Gerdes, scrin. vi. 756).
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less, were the same in all essentials. At the same time, however, he was not indifferent to all the distinctive doctrines of the Catholic Church, but regarded many of them as contradictory to, and in the way of, the true Christian faith. Still, he made little account of many of the points of difference; he did not hesitate to concede to the Pope the primacy in the Church; and also thought that the Lord's Supper might be called a sacrifice, and that the prayers for the dead were necessary. On the other hand, he was not less free with respect to many articles of belief then accepted in all the churches. Thus, he took the ground that not every thing in the Scriptures is to be regarded as of divine revelation, but only that portion in which doctrines are communicated. In like manner, he denied that the doctrine of the Trinity is taught with such distinctness in the Old Testament that a convincing argument for it can be drawn from that source.

He believed that, in order to effect a union, all the churches must return to the symbolis and decisions of the councils of the first five centuries (consensus quinquesecularis), and forget all later controversies. He thereby apparently gave the tradition of these centuries an authority as a source of knowledge co-ordinate with that of the Holy Scriptures. These principles met with general acceptance at Helmstedt; the fame of Calixtus attracted many students thither, and thus the Calixtine School became extensively diffused, especially in the provinces of Brunswick, both Wolfenbüttel and Lüneburg, of which Helmstedt was at that time the common university. The general characteristics of this school were a more zealous cultivation of historical theology and moderation in dogmatical opinions.

At the same time, it can not be denied that the teachings of Calixtus had an injurious effect upon many of his scholars. Inasmuch as the prevailing tendency of the age elsewhere was to doctrinal rigidity and intolerance, these milder opinions naturally led many to regard the existing churches with indifference, although Calixtus himself was far from doing so; and always

---

2 He was of the Catholic opinion respecting the doctrine of Original Sin, Hase's Dogm. § 87.
4 Cassander, ep. 37, also praises the counsel of some wise men in France at the beginning of the Reformation: Se libenter compromittere hanc controversiam arbitrio ecclesiae praeceo patrum quingentorum a Christo annorum; reliquis qui in seculi sint annis non gravatim renunciaturum (Anton. de-Domin. vii. c. 13, p. 123).
maintained that, while all the churches contained the essentials of Christianity, they were kept in the background and covered up by abuses to a greater degree in one than in another, and that consequently one Church was more favorable to genuine Christian life than another. Accordingly, if such a Calixtine fell into the hands of one of the adroit Catholic theologians, such as the Jesuits, who at that time devoted themselves especially to the conversion of Protestants, he was brought over to Catholicism with little difficulty; for it was not hard to show that there were more traces of the _consensus quinquesecularis_, particularly as regarded the constitution and practices, in the Roman than in the Lutheran Church. The result was that, at an early period, some of the friends and pupils of Calixtus went over to the Catholic Church, and that, as long as this school existed, a considerable number of theologians and scholars turned in that direction; while others, to say the least, regarded such a course with indifference.

At last a preacher of Hanover, Statius Buscher, opened the attack upon Calixtus and his followers. The Helmstedt theologians published a defense; but they were not able to weaken the impression which the accusations of Buscher had made throughout the whole Lutheran Church. Calixtus and his followers were everywhere regarded with extreme suspicion. The attack upon them did not, however, become general until after the religious conference at Thorn. The King of Poland, Vladislaus IV., arranged this conference (1645) between Catholic and non-Catholic theologians (Dissidents), in the hope that the two parties, by a peaceful discussion of their respective beliefs, would be able to remove many mutual prejudices, and thereby be encouraged to come to an understanding. To this end the Reformed in Poland proposed to the Lutherans of that country to unite with them in this conference; but the latter were at that time extremely hostile to the Reformed, and would not consent to be mixed up with them. On the other hand, the Elector of Brandenburg, Frederic William, who sent some Reformed theologians to Thorn, induced Calixtus to go thither also to look after the common interests of the Protestants. The rigid Lutherans, of whom Abraham Calovius, then preacher at Dantzig, was

---

* In the work _Cryptopapismus Novae Theologiae Helmstadiensis_, 1639.
the leader, were highly displeased at the coming of Calixtus, whom they regarded as no longer a true Lutheran theologian; they were still more irritated with him because, while at Thorn, he lived on the most intimate terms with the Reformed theologians, and even assisted them in the preparation of their confession of faith. The conference soon came to an end, with no other result than to intensify the animosity between the two Protestant confessions. The Lutherans now attacked Calixtus, whom they regarded as a traitor to pure Lutheranism, with great bitterness. During the conference, he had taken occasion to declare in his writings, without reserve, that all the articles of belief necessary to salvation were contained in the Apostles' Creed, and that, in consequence, all the Christian churches were perfectly united in the ground of their belief. Accordingly, the charge of Syncretism, which had often been made against him before, was clamorously urged, and the Syncretistic controversy began.

Syncretism properly designated the community of feeling among the Cretans which led them, in spite of all their internal divisions, to unite against the common enemy in case of danger from without. In this sense, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, David Pareus, a Reformed theologian of Heidelberg, had desired to have the Protestants join in a syncretism against the Roman Church. But the Lutherans were at this time bitterly opposed to any association with the Reformed Church; and so syncretism acquired among them the signification of a mingling of religions, an indifference to all existing marks of distinction between the churches, for which reason they intentionally gave the word a false derivation from συγκράννυμι. With this meaning, Calixtus was now accused of Syncretism; he was charged with being partial at once to Catholicism, Calvinism, Socinianism, and Arminianism.

7 The expression is to be met with as early as the days of the Reformers. Marheineke, Symb. i. 48, Note. Hering, Geschichte der kirchlichen Unionsversuche, ii. 86, as early as 1519; Illgen's Zeitchr. ii. 2, 228; in Zwingli, 1535, Ep. ad Oecol. Epist. vii. 1, 390. Schmid, 247.

8 Calovius turned it into a συγκροτησμόν—a contact of opponents, collision of adversaries, disunion (from συγκροτω), Gass, p. 107.
§ 37.

HISTORY OF THE CONTROVERSY ITSELF.

The most violent opponents of Calixtus were the theologians of Electoral Saxony, led by Jacob Weller, chief court-preacher at Dresden. At his suggestion, the Elector endeavored to persuade the princes of Brunswick to take legal measures to compel the return of Calixtus and his school at Helmstedt to orthodoxy. But they declared that they preferred to leave to the theologians themselves the justification of their course. Accordingly, in 1650, the conflict began. Innumerable controversial writings were exchanged; and as their authors did not hesitate to indulge in the most bitter recrimination, and even cutting personalities, this controversy was one of the most violent ever carried on in the Lutheran Church.

The most important antagonists of Calixtus were Jacob Weller, formerly professor at Wittenberg, then superintendent in Brunswick, and, after 1646, chief court-chaplain at Dresden (d. 1664), and Abraham Calovius, the Flacius of this period, previously preacher in Danzig, after 1650 professor of theology and superintendent-general at Wittenberg (d. 1686). Calovius was undeniably one of the most sagacious and learned theologians of his age, as is evidenced by his great work on dogmatic theology, which ranks, with Gerhard’s work, among the most important dogmatical writings of the seventeenth century, and is distinguished for its accurate and clear development even of the most abstruse problems. Less valuable was his great exegetical work, which had the solely dogmatico-polemic object of fortifying the Lutheran orthodoxy at all points, and was particularly directed against the recently published opinions of Grotius. All the writings of Calovius are characterized by the most extreme churchly orthodoxy, and by contemptuous asperity and zealous vehemence against all doctrines in the slightest degree deviating from it. This is true particularly of his numerous writings against the Syncretists, in which he did not shrink from personal abuse to

1 The works are catalogued in Walch’s Bibl. Thcol. ii. 672.
2 Schmid, 237.
4 Biblia Illustrata, 1672, 4 vols. fol.
gratify his theological rancor. He was by far their most formidable opponent, wrote most frequently and at greatest length against them; and his writings were the most profound, as well as the most bitter and injurious, which appeared in this controversy.

Next to Calovius stands Johann Hülsemann, professor at Wittenberg, afterward professor of theology and superintendent at Leipsic (d. 1661), an industrious author of many polemical works against Catholics, Calvinists, and particularly the Syncretists. He also published a manual of dogmatic theology,⁵ which is remarkable for its scholastic sophistry and obscurity as well as its barbarous style.

On the other hand, Calixtus was supported by the whole university of Helmstedt, including Hermann Conring, the most celebrated German scholar of this period, a polyhistor, who excelled in almost every department of human knowledge, professor of medicine and political science at Helmstedt (d. 1681). He composed several works on the reformation needed in the Roman Church, on the desirability of a union of all the Christian churches, and also in defense of Calixtus and the University of Helmstedt against the charges of their enemies.

Calixtus died in 1656, while the dispute was still raging. After his death, his son, Friedrich Ulrich Calixtus, also professor of theology at Helmstedt (d. 1701), took the principal part in defending his father and carrying on the controversy. He did not, however, possess the intellect and learning of the latter; and his zeal in behalf of his father's honor not unfrequently led him to such abusive treatment of his opponents as gave the controversy more and more the character of a personal quarrel.

After the death of the elder Calixtus, the most prominent among the professors of theology in Helmstedt was Joachim Hildebrand, who, although he took little part in the controversy, rendered valuable service to the cause, in the spirit of George Calixtus, in the department of ancient Church history. He afterward became superintendent-general at Celle (d. 1691).⁶

Several theologians of Königsberg were also charged with Syncretism. The Elector Frederic William had a high regard for the tolerance of the Calixtine school, and desired a more

---

⁵ Breviarum Theologiae, 1648.
⁶ Of value are his works De Priscæ Ecclesiae Sacris Publicis, Templis et Diebus Festis; De Precibus Veterum Christ.; De Nuptiis et Natailitis Veterum.
general diffusion of their principles in his states in order to
mitigate the dissensions between the Reformed and Lutheran
theologians. He therefore called to Königsberg two pupils of
Calixtus, Christian Dreier and Johann Latermann, who were,
however, there violently assailed as Syncretists. Nevertheless,
they found many supporters, and Dreier (d. 1688) particularly
did much to disseminate the Calixtine principles in Prussia.\footnote{1}

One of the more important incidents of the controversy was
the appearance of a work composed by Calovius, Consensus Re-
petitus Fidei Vere Lutheranae, which the theologians of Elector-
al Saxony issued against the Syncretists as a public and solemn
condemnation of their errors.\footnote{2} Their intention was to obtain
for this work symbolical authority in the Church. It was sub-
scribed by all the theologians in the two universities,\footnote{3} but never
obtained any more general authority—a result which was chiefly
due to the calm, unpartisan course of the theologians of Jena and
of Ducal Saxony in general.

Among the latter, Salomon Glassius, previously professor at
Jena, then superintendent-general at Gotha (d. 1656), enjoyed
the highest reputation. At the direction of his sovereign, Ernest
the Pious, Duke of Saxe-Gotha, he published an opinion upon the
controversy, in which he demonstrated with equal impartiality
and thoroughness that the disputed points were unimportant,
and that the erroneous doctrines with which Calixtus was charged
were at most only indiscreet expressions.\footnote{4} The theologians of
Jena maintained this impartiality throughout the whole contro-
versy, although they thereby incurred the enmity of the theolo-
gians of Electoral Saxony, and were themselves charged by the
latter with many errors.

At that time, the leader at Jena was Johann Musaens, a theo-
logian of high standing, the author of several profound dox-
matical treatises, in particular of a good Introductio in Theologiam,
1679 (d. 1681). He took the chief part in the composition of
the detailed declaration in which the theologians of Jena denied

\footnote{1 Mandat. pro Syncretistis, 1676. Unschuld. Nachr. 1736, p. 60. Propositions and
counter-propositions touching five points of controversy in Calovii Hist. Syncret.
p. 885 ss.
\footnote{2 Calovii Declaratio, 1678; see in Winkler's Anecdota, i. 848.
\footnote{3 Also theologians of Mecklenburg; Wigger's Kirchengesch. Mecklenburgs, p. 205.
\footnote{4 In the year 1644: Unschuld. Nachr. 1738, p. 41. For his opinion, published in
1662, see Unschuld. Nachr. 1732, p. 486.
the charges made against them, and afterward followed it with a
scathing review of the Consensus Repetitus, which the theolo-
gians of Electoral Saxony wished to force upon the Church. He
thus did much to quiet the general excitement.

Finally, the Elector of Saxony himself became weary of the
disputes of his theologians, although at first he had zealously
supported them in their opposition to the Syncretists. When
Calovius published his Historia Syncretistica, 1682, 4to, the
Elector had it suppressed, and it was therefore secretly repub-
lished in 1685. Notwithstanding the violence of this work
against the Syncretists, it is valuable on account of the numer-
ous original documents contained in it. It was also the last im-
portant work in this controversy, which after the death of Calo-
vius ceased entirely. But the two different schools, the Calixtine
and the Electoral Saxon, continued to exist in the universities;
the former being characterized by moderation and tolerance to-
ward other churches, which indeed often bordered on indiffer-
entism, the latter by the greatest dogmatical rigidity and pre-
cision.

§ 38.

THE EFFECT OF THE SYNCRETISTIC CONTROVERSY UPON THE RE-
LATIONS OF THE LUTHERAN AND REFORMED CHURCHES.

After the Calixtine Controversy, there was always a party
in the Lutheran Church that not only earnestly desired a union
with the Reformed, but also regarded it as feasible, inasmuch as
the points of difference related to matters comparatively unes-
sential. The Helmstedt theologians, in particular, continued to
maintain this opinion.

On the other hand, these controversies increased the hostility
with which the Reformed were regarded by their opponents, and
in many places it appeared more openly than before. This was
the case particularly in the states of the electorate of Branden-
burg, of which the rulers were Reformed, while the great major-
ity of the subjects were Lutheran. Most of the Lutheran cler-
gymen in that country had been educated at Wittenberg, where
they had imbibed the most malignant conceptions respecting the
Reformed; for in Wittenberg the students were still taught to
believe that the Reformed Church had fallen into the grossest
errors, that it was unworthy the name of an evangelical Church, and that it was not to be reckoned as belonging to the Augsburg Confession. Accordingly, the Lutheran preachers of Brandenburg now incessantly assailed the errors of the Reformed from their pulpits. The Elector Frederic William therefore finally decreed that no theologian who had studied at Wittenberg should be appointed to office in his territories; and soon afterward (1664) took measures to check the extravagant polemics which were in vogue in the pulpits. He forbade the practice of attacking the other Church by a forced construction of its symbols, the use of insulting epithets, and the abuse of the so-often-recommended tolerance as Syncretism. Some of the Lutheran preachers who refused to submit were deposed and banished, among them the famous sacred poet Paul Gerhard.

In other places, also, zealous Lutherans endeavored to demonstrate the superiority of their Church to the Reformed. Hector Gottfried Masius, chaplain of the King of Denmark, wrote a work to prove that Lutheranism alone could give security to the throne, and that the other religions, particularly the Reformed, endangered it. He thereby became involved in a protracted controversy with Reformed theologians, and also with Thomasius.

The result was that at that time the Reformed were still regarded with extreme aversion in most of the Lutheran countries, so that all connection with them was avoided, and marriages between Lutherans and Reformed were considered unlawful. When, in 1689, the Lutheran duke William of Saxe-Zeiz married a Brandenburg princess, a preacher of Magdeburg actually published a work declaring such marriages unlawful and dangerous, which gave Thomasius the opportunity for a sharp refutation.

1 His edict is contained in the Unschuld. Nachr. 1736, p. 51. Opinions respecting it, ib. 1718, pp. 228, 616, 630; 1736, p. 158; 1750, p. 499. In regard to previous attempts at union, particularly the conference at Cassel in 1661, see also Unschuld. Nachr. 1727, p. 1069; 1730, p. 587.

2 Interesse Principum circa Religionem Evangelicam, Hafn. 1687. 4.
§ 39.

CONVERSION OF LUTHERANS TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN CONSEQUENCE OF THE SYNCRETISTIC CONTROVERSY.

No period can show a greater number of distinguished converts from the Lutheran to the Catholic Church than the time during, and shortly after, the Syncretistic Controversy. Many of them, it is true, were actuated by external and unworthy motives. But it can not be denied that this step was taken by not a few in consequence of the controversy itself. Weary of the perpetual conflicts and feuds in their own Church, they came to regard a supreme, decisive authority, like the Pope in the Catholic Church, as indispensable. Many, also, were carried over by the principles of Calixtus, who undeniably imbued his pupils with indifference to the distinctive doctrines of the various churches. Not a few of his less discerning pupils laid great stress upon the principle that salvation was possible in any of the churches; and, when they fell in with adroit Catholic theologians, were entrapped by the argumentum a tuto. A similar effect was produced by the false doctrine of Calixtus that the faith and practice of the first five centuries possessed a kind of judicial authority. It was not difficult to demonstrate that many of the peculiar doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church which the Protestants rejected existed as early as those centuries. Calixtus, it is true, was too well acquainted with history not to perceive the essential difference between the modern Catholicism and that of the fifth century; but many of his followers were misled by the similarity of certain customs and practices, and allowed themselves to be deceived as to the true character of many of the doctrines of the later Catholic Church by qualifying explanations.

The consequence was that not a few who belonged to the Calixtine school went over to the Catholic Church; and, in their published apologies, frequently appealed to their instructors in justification of their course, urging them, in accordance with their principles, to take the same step. The opponents of Calixtus were therefore not wholly wrong in asserting that his Syncretism led to Catholicism, although mistaken in charging him with any such proclivities.
The first remarkable instance of this sort was the conversion of John Frederic, Duke of Brunswick, afterward reigning Duke of Hanover. While he was traveling in Italy, the Jesuits succeeded in converting his chaplain, Blume, who had previously been a professor at Helmstedt. Through the influence of the latter, the Duke himself was brought over to the Catholic Church (1651).

Many other conversions produced a great sensation. Christoph Von Rantzow, a nobleman of Holstein, who had studied theology with great success at Helmstedt, while at Rome, in 1650, was converted to Catholicism. He afterward went so far in writings against Calixtus as to endeavor to prove the agreement of the Catholic Church with ancient Christianity.

Andreas Fromm, provost at Berlin, joined the Catholic Church in 1667, and received a parochial charge in Bohemia. In his explanation of this step, he appealed directly to the theologians of Helmstedt, who, as he said, had certainly themselves admitted that, to escape from the perplexities of modern theological controversy, it was necessary to return to the Christianity of the first five centuries. This, however, was to be found only in the Catholic Church.

Matthaeus Praetorius, a Prussian clergyman, also went over, in 1685. In a work published in consequence, Tuba Pacis, he appealed expressly to the theologians of Königsberg.

Johann Philip Pfeiffer, court-chaplain, and professor at Königsberg, followed in 1694.

The learned Johann Ernst Grabe, of Königsberg, was also disposed to take this step, likewise in consequence of the Calixtine doctrine of the *consensus quinque secularis*. He was dissuaded

---

1 Unschuld. Nachr. 1713, p. 383; 1726, p. 733. It has been asserted that, from hatred to the Electoral house, he wrote in revenge the prophecy of the monk Hermann of Lehnin; see V. H. Schmidt, Die Weissagung der Mönche Hermann von Lehnin über die Mark Brandenburg und ihre Regenten, Berlin, 1820. According to Wilken, in Schmidt's Allgem. Zeitschr. für Geschichte, vol. ix. 1846, Seldel was the author; according to Giesebrecht (Die Weissagung von Lehnin und Chr. Heln. Delven) the last named. For the proof of this authorship, see Gieseler: Die Lehninsche Weissagung gegen das Haus Hohenzollern, als ein Gedicht des Abtes von Huyseburg Nicolaus von Zitzwitz, aus dem Jahre 1692, nachgewiesen, erklärt und in Hinsicht auf Veranlassung und Zweck beleuchtet, Erfurt, 1849. The prophecy appeared, complete in all but a few verses, first in G. P. Schultz, Das Gelahrte Preussen, vol. ii. (Thorn, 1723). See Gieseler, as above, p. 25.

2 Des Matth. Praetorius Aufruf zur Vereinigung, übersetzt herausgegeben von Binterim, Aachen, 1823.
from it, however, by other theologians, particularly Spener; but went to England and joined the Episcopal Church, in which he believed that he had at last discovered the true primitive constitution of the Christian Church. He resided there from 1700 until his death, in 1711, as a private individual, supported by a pension from the English Queen, and completed his valuable works on Christian antiquity.

The following sovereigns also went over, for reasons in part unknown:

Ernest, Landgrave of Hesse-Rheinfels, was converted in Vienna by a Capuchin in 1652. Christine, Queen of Sweden, abdicated in 1654, became a Catholic, and spent the remainder of her life at Rome (d. 1689). A passion for singularity, which was otherwise characteristic of her, seems to have been her principal motive, for she afterward treated the worship of the Catholic Church with remarkable indifference. Frederic Augustus, Elector of Saxony, withdrew from the Protestant Church in 1697, in order to become King of Poland, but at the same time gave the country satisfactory guarantees for the inviolability of its religious constitution. His conversion was planned by Jesuits who were secretly residing in the country.

His edition of Irenæus.—Ed. LXX. Spicilegium SS. Patrum Prorum Saeculorum.


§ 40.
LATER RESULTS OF THE CALIXTINE PRINCIPLES.


1. PACIFICATORY NEGOTIATIONS OF SPINOLA AND BOSSUET WITH MOLANUS AND LEIBNITZ.

The strikingly liberal sentiments which so many Lutheran theologians cherished toward the Catholic Church were well calculated to excite the hope among the Catholics that they would now be able to labor with greater success than formerly for the reclamation of the Lutheran Church. Especial efforts were made, with this end in view, by Christopher Rojas de Spinola, Bishop of the Neustadt (New Town) in Vienna. After the year 1676, he traveled with the strictest secrecy, and under different names, through the countries where he was most hopeful of influencing the theologians, particularly the Brunswick principalities, where he was received with especial favor at the Hanoverian court. The most eminent theologian of that country was Gerhard Walter Molanus, Abbot of Loccum, a pupil of G. Calixtus, who had adopted all the Syncretistic principles of his instructor; but, less sagacious than he, did not perceive the dangers of a union with the Catholics.¹ After the negotiations of Spinola, Molanus drew up an opinion.² He held the union to be practicable and desirable, and believed that it was only necessary that the two parties should come to an agreement as to the authoritative sources of belief. With respect to this point, he assigned the first place to the Holy Scriptures, and the second to the Church’s interpretation of the same.

Then, he thought, they must convince each other by mutual explanations that they were agreed in the essentials of their be-

² Regulae circa Christianorum Omnium Ecclesiasticam Reunionem, in Œuvres de Bossuet ed. Versailles, xxi. 205 (1817).
lief, and that they held no unchristian errors. The differences in harmless matters of opinion must be mutually allowed; and, notwithstanding these, they could unite, leaving the settlement of them to a council to be convened at some future time. The communion under both forms, and the marriage of priests, were to be still conceded to the Protestants, and no abjuration of errors to be required from them.

Spinola, however, was sent by the Emperor with a new commission to Hungary and Transylvania to treat with the Protestants of those countries (1691); and now the celebrated Bossuet was called to take part in the negotiations with Molanus. The reigning Duchess of Hanover, Sophia, a daughter of the unfortunate Elector Frederic V. of the Palatinate, had a sister Louisa who had become a Catholic in France, and was Abbess of Maubuisson. The latter, a friend and admirer of Bossuet, no sooner heard of the negotiations between Spinola and Molanus than she induced her sister to make Bossuet a party to them. A correspondence was now carried on with the greatest secrecy between Molanus and Bossuet, in which Leibnitz also afterward participated (1691-1694). But although Molanus was almost too compliant, the negotiations led to no result. Bossuet would not listen to a union between the two churches, unless the Protestants would formally adopt the doctrines of the Catholic Church, although upon other points he made many concessions, e. g., the communion under both forms, the marriage of priests, and even the formal recantation.

Subsequently, at the direction of Duke Anton Ulrich of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, Leibnitz re-opened the correspondence with Bossuet (1699-1701), but again without result.

* Unschuld. Nachr. 1721, p. 234 sq.
* The opinions of Molanus and Leibnitz of 1698, Winckler's Anecd. i. 312. The strange will of Molanus, Unschuld. Nachr. 1738, p. 633; complete, 1781, p. 309.
2. CONVERSION OF THE BRUNSWICK PRINCESS CHRISTINE ELISABETH, AND HER GRANDFATHER, THE REIGNING DUKE ANTON ULRICH, TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

In these negotiations for union, the courts of Brunswick and Leibnitz had reckoned especially upon the pacific disposition of the Helmstedt theologians; and they had therefore been very careful to appoint none but theologians of the school of Calixtus to positions in that university. But these theologians now committed an error which was justly regarded throughout the whole Lutheran Church as extremely offensive.

The granddaughter of the Duke of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, the Princess Christine Elisabeth, was to be married to the King of Spain, Charles III., afterward the Emperor Charles VI.; and it was required that she should enter the Catholic Church. This she was at first reluctant to do; but was persuaded by the representation that she would not change her religion, but only her communion; and the marriage took place in the year 1708. Opinions were requested from a great number of theologians respecting the propriety of this step. They all pronounced against it with the exception of the Faculty of Helmstedt, who, with certain qualifications, defended it. The author of the latter opinion, Johann Fabricius, had already endeavored, in other writings, to show, in the spirit of Calixtus, the unimportance of many doctrines hitherto regarded as essential. These views were not without their beneficial effect at a time when an exaggerated value was attached to certain dogmatical formulas; but the conclusion which he drew, that the difference between the churches was unimportant, was plainly false. For surely, if certain articles of belief are unessential and to be decided by the individual conscience, it is wrong to sacrifice personal liberty by accepting and swearing to certain definitions of them as the only right ones with no inward conviction of their truth.

The opinion of the Faculty of Helmstedt, which, contrary to the wishes of the authors, was made public, was the more offens-
ive because the Brunswick court-chaplains were simultaneously dismissed for having opposed the above-mentioned change of religion.\(^9\) The general indignation was expressed with great vehemence, and the Syncretistic Controversy threatened to break out with fresh violence, although Fabricius and the theologians of Helmstedt declared that their opinion had been published in a falsified form. Fabricius, in order to put an end to all offense, resigned his academical office in 1709, and was appointed superintendent of the schools in Brunswick. He devoted his leisure to the composition of his valuable Historia Bibliothecae Fabricianaæ, Wolfenb. 1714 sq. 6 vols. 4to. But by that time the theologians were fully occupied with the Pietistic Controversy, and he did not attract their attention.

An event even more remarkable was the conversion of the old duke Anton Ulrich (then more than seventy years old), which, however, did not cause the slightest change in the religious constitution of the country.\(^10\)

§ 41.

OTHER EMINENT THEOLOGIANS OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH DURING THIS PERIOD.

In all the departments of theology except dogmatics, those theologians were most eminent, and rendered the most valuable services to science, who took no part in the prevalent controversies.

In Biblical philology, Johann Vorstius carried forward with distinguished success the work begun by Glassius. At first rector of the school at Flensburg, he afterward entered the Reformed Church, and became rector of the gymnasium of Berlin and superintendent of the Electoral library (d. 1676). He was an excellent philologist, and in a comprehensive treatise first demonstrated the Oriental character of the New Testament dialect.\(^1\)

Among the exegetes, two distinguished theologians of this period are deserving of especial mention. Martin Geier, professor

---


\(^10\) He desired the restoration of the cup to the laity, but without success. Gerdes, Scrin. vil. 113.

\(^1\) Philologia Sacra, Leyden, 1658. Republished under the title Commentarius de Hebraismis Novi Test. cura J. F. Fischer, Lips. 1778.
of theology at Leipsic, afterward chief chaplain of the court at Dresden (d. 1680), was the author of commentaries on the Psalms, Daniel, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes. They are the best commentaries on the books of the Old Testament which appeared during this period—copious, abundantly supplied with critical grammatical explanations, and free from the dogmatical and polemical applications which were usual at that time.

Also, Sebastian Schmidt, professor of theology at Strasburg (d. 1696). His translation of the Bible is verbally accurate and free from obscurity, although it contains many errors. In addition to this, he left commentaries upon most of the books of the Bible.

In Church history, Christian Kortholt, professor of theology and chancellor of the university at Kiel, attained distinction (d. 1694). Although he wrote several apologies for his Church, in reply to Catholic writers, he never took part in the internal disputes of the Lutheran Church, but rendered more valuable service by monographs on Church history and ecclesiastical archaeology.

Among the dogmatic theologians, Johann Andreas Quenstedt, professor at Wittenberg, ranks next to Calovius (d. 1688). His Theologia Didactico-polemica, 1685, like the Wittenberg school, from which it proceeded, is characterized by a rigid, intolerant, heresy-seeking orthodoxy. The author was advanced in years when he wrote it, and wished to make it the depository of the results of his theological investigations. The prolixity and garrulousness of age can be readily recognized in it; but, in spite of all these faults, it displays great learning and profound thought. The dogmatic theology of David Hollaz, provost and pastor at Jacobshagen, in Pomerania (d. 1713), is not of equal literary value.

* Opp. 1695, Amsterd. 2 vols. fol.
* Strasburg, 1696.
* The most valuable are those on the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Job, Jeremiah, Hosea, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the First Epistle of John. Others were published by his pupils after his death, and are unimportant.
* Particularly by the works De Calumnis Paganorum in Vetereis Christianos; De Persecutionibus Ecclesiae Primaevae; Disquisitiones Anti-Baronianae.
* His Examen Theologicum is a synopsis of the larger works of Gerhard, Calovius, and Quenstedt in catechetical form, and in itself of no especial merit. It was particularly designed for the preparation of candidates for examination, and for this reason was very popular and frequently reprinted.
During the Syncretistic Controversy the one-sided dogmatism of the so-called orthodox school was strikingly manifest. It appeared, from the zeal with which they maintained the importance of all the distinctive doctrines of the Lutheran Church, as if all that was necessary to make a man a good Christian was that he should be a firm adherent of that system. The moral influences of Christianity were ignored in this controversy; and even in preaching it was more usual to discuss theological themes from their polemical side than to give them a practical moral application. The better preachers of the day could not but be sensible of this fault; and now Spener, like Arndt and Andreae in earlier times, came into prominence through his efforts to correct the prevalent deficiency.¹

Philip Jacob Spener was born in 1635 in Alsace; was at first a preacher at Strasburg, and in 1666 was called to Frankfort-on-the-Main as senior of the evangelical pastors. He was deeply impressed with the fact that the sermons of the day, which were, for the most part, composed of dogmatic disquisitions and violent attacks upon those of differing opinions, could be of little profit to the people. He accordingly endeavored to give them an intelligible and edifying form, wholly avoiding the controversial terminology, and adhering to the simple language and ideas of the Bible. He also brought the catechetical exercises, which were then entirely neglected by the clergymen and left to the school-teachers, again into repute. Although under no obligation to do so, he undertook the catechisations himself, and thus infused new life into this important department of instruction.

In order to exert a greater influence over his congregation, he

¹ Forerunners of Spener: Walch, Streitigkeiten der lutherischen Kirche, iv. 1066. Spener laments the prevalent atheism: Schelhorn, Ergötzellichkeit, ii. 198—a revulsion from previous superstition, p. 303.
began in 1670 to hold private meetings in his own house, *collegia pietatis*, in which he repeated his sermons, expounded passages from the New Testament, and also gave those present an opportunity to make inquiries and express their own opinions. Finally, he made known his views respecting the necessity of a reformation of the public instruction in the Lutheran Church in a work entitled *Pia Desideria*, which first appeared (1675) as the introduction to a new edition of Joh. Arndt's Sermons, but was afterward considerably enlarged, and published separately. His especial object in this book was the reformation of the clergy. He said that most of the preachers regarded religion as a mere matter of the understanding, and believed that they fulfilled their obligations if they were able to defend the orthodox doctrines against their opponents; while upon themselves their religion had no moral influence; that they were unacquainted with personal piety, and consequently could not awaken it in the hearts of their congregations. He desired that the system of education for the prospective clergymen in the universities should be remodeled; and that instead of occupying their time, as had hitherto been the case, almost exclusively with dogmatics and polemics, the effort should also be made to awaken in them a spirit of personal piety; for, he declared, only a regenerate man possesses the true theology. Without the new birth it might be possible to attain to a *philosophy* of divine things, but not to a *theology*. He insisted upon a reformation not only of the clerical profession, but of all the other walks of life, for the purpose of reviving the spirit of vital, inward Christianity. All were under obligations to assist and edify each other in this respect. In order to emphasize this point, he called particular attention to the often-repeated declaration of Luther that all Christians are entitled to participate in the spiritual priesthood, notwithstanding the fact that certain individuals are appointed by the Church for its regular administration.

This work of Spener attracted universal attention. However much it may have wounded the feelings of many at the time, its complaints and the wishes it expressed were too just to be openly contradicted. A great number of clergymen cordially embraced the sentiments of Spener, and endeavored to co-operate with him in his plans. *Collegia pietatis* were introduced in other places; but they were immediately strenuously opposed by not a few of
the theologians; and it is possible that in some cases there were disorders which gave cause for complaint. Spener's reputation, however, steadily increased, and in 1686 he was called as chief court-chaplain to Dresden, where he entered a more extensive, but at the same time more dangerous, sphere of labor; for he now came to the country where the zeal for the orthodoxy of the letter had reached the highest pitch. He there rendered many important services, securing, in particular, the general introduction of catechetical examinations in the Saxon electorate. He next endeavored to bring about a reform in the method of theological instruction in the national universities. At Leipsic, things had gone so far that the students were taught scarcely any thing except dogmatics, polemics, philosophy, and homiletics. For many years there had been no lectures on exegesis. Spener procured the issue of an order to the theological faculty requiring the resumption of the exegetical lectures, but thereby incurred their displeasure. About this time three young masters of arts in Leipsic—August Hermann Francke, Johann Caspar Schade, and Paul Anton—began, in the manner of Spener, to give lectures in German on the books of the Bible, not for the sake of learned exposition, but simply for the purpose of awakening and stimulating genuine piety. These collegia pietatis were largely attended both by students and citizens; but aroused the displeasure of all the other clergymen in Leipsic, who discovered much that was dangerous in these meetings, and feared that the pure doctrine might thereby be imperiled. The seemingly austere life introduced by these young men and their followers, together with their abstinence from all kinds of amusement, were regarded as fanaticism, and the nickname Pietists was invented to designate them. For these reasons an effort was made to have the lectures prohibited, which object was accom-

---


4 Already given in Frankfort, Planck, p. 189.
plished after a legal investigation; and in 1691 the three masters left Leipsic.

Spener was unable to do anything in their behalf, because he had incurred the displeasure of the Elector by the freedom with which he, as confessor, had censured the morals of the latter. He was consequently himself desirous of a change, and in 1691 accepted a call to Berlin as provost and preacher.

In Leipsic, Christian Thomasius had been a defender of August Hermann Francke against the attacks of his opponents, and by many other acts and utterances had there incurred great enmity. He was accordingly compelled, in 1690, to leave Leipsic. He went to Berlin, and thence to Halle, where he was instrumental in founding a new university. The court of Brandenburg favored this step, because hitherto most of the Lutheran theologians of Brandenburg had been obliged to study in Leipsic and Wittenberg (Frankfort and Duisburg being Reformed, and Königsberg too distant), where they imbibed a spirit of intolerance and partisan hostility toward the Reformed. A theological faculty, however, organized under the direction of Spener, promised better things. The theological professorships were filled entirely in accordance with his suggestions; and thus it happened that August Hermann Francke and Paul Anton, together with Joachim Justus Breithaupt, were invited thither. Halle now became the principal seat of the Pietists, as they were called, against whom the most violent opposition arose from Wittenberg and Leipsic. After Spener had left Saxony, it was no longer thought necessary there to spare him, and he and his party were accused of innumerable errors. The hostility to the Pietists and their new university was increased by the fact that Wittenberg and Leipsic, deprived of the Brandenburg students, now noticeably lost ground. Accordingly, two parties once more arose in the Lutheran Church—the Pietists, Hallensians, or Spenerians, and the Orthodox or Wittenberg party.
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PIETISTS.—THE CHARGES MADE AGAINST THEM BY THE ORTHODOX.


The essential difference between the school of Spener and the so-called Orthodox consisted in this, that the former regarded Christianity as pre-eminently a matter of the heart and will, and holiness, or the inward regeneration through God's grace, as its necessary fruit; while the Orthodox, on the other hand, had transformed Christianity almost entirely into a formal theology or system of speculation. Upon this difference were based all the charges which were made, not unfrequently after an extremely unfair interpretation of their principles, against the Pietists.

The school of Spener deviated in no respect from the Lutheran orthodoxy, but attached little value to subtle doctrinal distinctions; and particularly insisted that the symbolical books, as of human composition, must be always carefully distinguished from the sole divine source of faith, the Holy Scriptures. They declared that only a mind enlightened by the Holy Spirit could interpret the Bible; that genuine Christianity was the result of such an interpretation alone; that human philosophy had no right to meddle with theology; and that from such meddling the prevailing demoralization had arisen. They accordingly set a comparatively low estimate upon the necessity and utility of the symbolical books. Some also had scruples about swearing to them; but no one was willing to question their ecclesiastical authority. The charge of disregard for the symbolical books, made against them by the Orthodox, was consequently unjust. The course of the latter, however, who unduly exaggerated the importance of these books, calling them divine, inspired of God, and infallible, was truly censurable.

Among the Spenerian principles there was one which gave especial offense to the Orthodox—viz., that the theology of the unregenerate was no true theology. Spener did not, of course, deny that an unregenerate man could comprehend the truths of religion, so far as they are expressed by the understanding in
ideas, and that therefore his theology could be logically correct; but he was unwilling that any but the vital, fruit-bearing knowledge of divine things should be called true theology. The Orthodox, on the other hand, insisted that an unregenerate man could also possess the true theology, and might be capable of being, to a certain degree, enlightened. The unconverted teachers, they declared, could exercise their office as beneficially as the converted, in virtue of the official grace imparted to them (gratia ministerialis).

The school of Spener insisted particularly that the faith of justification must be a living faith, and accompanied by good works. The prevalent abuse and misconception of faith as a mere assent to the Orthodox system made it all the more necessary to emphasize this point. The Orthodox, on the contrary, went so far as to assert that the faith of justification itself was not yet living, and had no connection with good works. They sought to make it appear that the Pietists taught justification by works.

The followers of Spener, considering sanctification an indispensable condition of redemption, were very strict in their moral principles. They wished to have the whole life regarded as a continuous worship of God; and held all worldly recreations and amusements (dances, games, plays, fashions in dress, feasts, jesting), which were usually considered adiaphora, or things indifferent, to be unlawful. The Orthodox, on the other hand, countenanced these things.

Finally, another harmless opinion of Spener was counted as one of the grossest of errors. He hoped that a more glorious period of the Church was to come when the Jews would be converted and the Papacy overthrown. This better time was, as he believed, expressed in the Apocalypse under the figure of the Millennium (although it was not to last precisely a thousand years nor to be an earthly kingdom, since these expressions were only to be taken figuratively). He was accordingly charged with Chiliasm.

1 Dogmatical liberality of the Pietists, Unschuld. Nachr. 1707, p. 284, 467; 1708, p. 495; 1709, p. 53; 1710, p. 522.
2 Spener did not declare the adiaphora in themselves sinful; but, as they now existed in the actual world, true Christians would not participate in them, because they were connected with so many sins, and it was difficult to avoid contamination. Yet it must be left to the judgment and conscience of each. Some of his pupils, however, went much further, and did great harm by their extravagance and legal strictness. Cf. Spener, Consilia Theolog. ii. 113. Letzte theolog. Bedenken, iii. 710.
FOURTH PERIOD.—DIV. II.—A.D. 1648–1814.

There were also many other subjects of dispute between the two parties. The *collegia pietatis*, meetings held by the Spenerians, in addition to the public divine service, were condemned by the Orthodox as injurious, and conducive to erroneous belief. And because the Spenerians judged the elder mystics mildly, and respected them for their Christian spirit, although admitting their errors, they were placed in the same category with them. The followers of Spener desired that polemics should be banished from the pulpits, and the practical exposition of the Scriptures again be made the chief end of preaching; they endeavored particularly to awaken repentance as the preparation for the divine grace, and the enlightenment which that grace produces. The main object of the old preachers, on the contrary, had been the so-called *elenchus* of unbelievers; and they therefore found, in the new style of preaching, culpable indifference to error. All sorts of heresies were imputed to the followers of Spener by their opponents, who compared them now with the Platonists, now with the Schwenkfeldians, Socinians, Anabaptists, etc.

§ 44.

FANATICS IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH, AND THEIR RELATION TO THE PIETISTS.

Shortly before, and during, the Pietistic Controversy, many fanatics made their appearance in the Lutheran Church. This fact was injurious to the Pietists, partly because they did not condemn these men as severely as the Orthodox (Spener, for instance, was unwilling to condemn Jacob Böhme), and made a distinction between their pious disposition and their errors; partly because many of these fanatics manifestly had a certain affinity to the Pietists. This gave the Orthodox an opportunity to attack them still more vehemently, and to place Pietism in the same category with these forms of fanaticism. And, indeed, it can not be denied that, especially later, many of these men found their way into the ranks of the Pietists, and, to some extent, disseminated their opinions among them, although the original spirit of Pietism had nothing akin to fanaticism.

Quirinus Kuhlmann, from Breslau, whose mind had become deranged through the influence of Böhme's writings, wandered

1 Interview with a Pietist of Cassel, 1697: Winckler's Anecdota, i. 677.
about Europe endeavoring to found the fifth monarchy of the saints, and declaring that he was a prince of God. He was burned at Moscow, 1689.\(^3\)

Johann Georg Gichtel, a jurist of Ratisbon, abandoned his country and office at an early day, and privately gathered a party about him in Holland. He derived his opinions from Böhme's writings, but desired to be himself greater than Böhme. His chief object was to found a priesthood after the order of Melchisedek. These priests were to live, like the angels, without marriage and labor, that they might be able by their prayers to appease the wrath of God over the sins of the world, and to change it to love and beneficence. Gichtel died in 1710.\(^3\) His followers, Gichtelians or Angel Brothers, not only survived long in Holland, but traces of them were subsequently discovered in several places in Germany.

These two fanatics and their adherents deviated so much from the doctrines of the Bible that the Pietists could not in any way be confounded with them; but there were two others who did them much harm.

Johann Wilhelm Petersen had been superintendent at Lüneburg, but was deposed, and died on his estate near Zerbst in 1727. He taught Chiliasm and Restorationism, i.e., the return of all things, even of the reprobate, to their original condition. His idea of the Millennium was visionary and extremely sensual. As he was acquainted with Spener, who judged him very mildly, and about the same time first gave expression to his hope of the better times, which subjected him to the charge of Chiliasm, Petersen and Spener were often classed together as agreeing in their principles, although Spener, it was allowed, expressed himself with more caution and delicacy.

Johann Conrad Dippel was born in Darmstadt, and in his earlier days taught at Giessen. He afterward attacked the Lutheran Church with violence and ridicule, roamed about in every direction, was imprisoned for a time in Denmark, and died in 1734 at the Castle of Wittgenstein. By his "chemical theology" he attached himself entirely to the school of Böhme, and, like him, desired the abolition of all the external institutions of the Church.\(^4\)

---

\(^3\) Unschuld. Nachr. 1711, p. 755; 1748, p. 965.
\(^4\) Id. 1758, p. 213, 815, 488, 567, 791, 878; 1759, p. 63, 161.
Gottfried Arnold was far less extravagant than Dippel, but devoted to a fanatical mysticism. Born in Saxony, he was personally acquainted with Spener, and a diligent attendant at his collegia pietatis in Dresden. He became professor of history at Giessen, but resigned his position in 1698 because he could no longer endure the state of affairs in that university. Through Spener's influence he was appointed ecclesiastical inspector at Perleberg in the March (d. 1714).

He differed from the school of Spener, for which he otherwise had a high regard, in many fanatical opinions, which are expressed at length in his work Geheimniss der göttlichen Sophia. Most remarkable is his history of the Church and of heresy, the chief aim of which is the disparagement of the Orthodox and the defense of the so-called heretics as the only representatives of true Christianity.\(^5\) Arnold's opinions, also, were commonly ascribed by the Orthodox to the whole party of the Pietists.\(^6\)

§ 45.

THE MOST EMINENT ADHERENTS AND OPPONENTS OF THE SCHOOL OF SPENER.

The Spenerian school produced few theologians of distinguished learning. Its chief object was to awaken Biblical Christianity within itself. Science was valued only as contributing to this end. The Spenerians attached great importance to the knowledge of the original languages of the Bible, and did good service by breaking up the exclusive study of scholastic theology; but they contented themselves with simple, practical exposition, better adapted to meet the wants of the heart than the requirements of scientific theology, and did not enter into the investigation of historical questions. By the prominence which they gave to the study of the Scriptures, and their freedom from prejudice with respect to the dogmatic system of the Church,


\(^6\) With regard to the excesses of separatism and fanaticism in the county of Wittgenstein, particularly the fearful depravity of Eva von Buttlar and the Buttlar gang, see M. Göbel's Geschichte des christlichen Lebens in der rheinisch-westfälischen ev. Kirche, ii. 736 sq.
they prepared the way for a more scientific treatment of the Bible, although not themselves able to commence it.

Among the most eminent theologians of this school who took part in the controversy with the Orthodox, Philip Jacob Spener himself holds the first place (d. 1705). He wrote several works in defense of his principles.¹

Next comes August Hermann Francke, the pious founder of the Orphan House at Halle, a very large institution which he established entirely from charitable contributions. By his zeal and active piety Francke acquired an influence and respect in the Protestant Church such as few theologians have ever possessed, which enabled him to do much to disseminate the principles of Spener. The thousands who were educated in the schools of the Orphan House, and studied at the University of Halle, were there gained for the cause of Pietism, and, in the positions which they afterward occupied, spread its principles far and wide.² The Bible Society connected with the Orphan House, which was established by Baron von Canstein, also advanced the cause by securing a more general circulation of the Bible than had previously been possible. Francke died in 1727. He also was subjected to various attacks from the side of the Orthodox.³

Most of the Spenerian theologians maintained a very temperate attitude in this controversy, and only defended themselves when they were assailed. A distinguished exception, on account of the multitude and acrimony of his controversial writings, was Joachim Lange, after 1709 professor at Halle (d. 1744).⁴

Among the opponents of the Pietists were counted all the theologians of Wittenberg and Leipsic. After the beginning of the eighteenth century the principal leader was Valentin Ernst Loescher, from 1709 superintendent at Dresden (d. 1749), a man who made valuable contributions to modern Church history.⁵

¹ Among his writings may be mentioned, Theologische Bedenken, 1700 sq. 4 vols. 4.—A collection of opinions on questions of theology and Church government, containing many valuable plans for reform.
³ Especially on account of his Observationes Bibliicae, in which he made some modest propositions for the improvement of several passages in Luther's translation of the Bible.
⁴ Here belong particularly his Antihbarbarus Orthodoxiae; Gestalt des Kreuzreichen Christi in seiner Unschuld, etc.
⁵ By his Vollständige Reformationsacta, 1730 sq. 3 vols. 4. and Historia Motuum between the Lutherans and Reformed, 1717 sq. 3 vols. 4.
Besides publishing a great number of smaller works against the Pietists, he established, in 1701, a periodical for the purpose of opposing them, Unschuldige Nachrichten von alten und neuen theologischen Sachen, which also contains much other valuable information.

At last the two courts interfered to end the controversy. The Dresden government prohibited the use of the name Pietists, and forbade Loescher to continue the publication of the Unschuldige Nachrichten (1720). This action did not, indeed, reconcile the parties, but the controversial writings became less frequent. The attention of the theologians was soon turned in a different direction by the appearance of Wolf's philosophy, and in the universal interest excited thereby this controversy subsided. The principles of Spener long continued to prevail in Halle, and from that centre were extended over a great part of Protestant Germany. To this school unquestionably belongs the credit of having revived the study of the Bible; restored theology to its Scriptural basis, from which it had become separated in its polemic development; and made religion once more a matter of the heart and will, whereas it had been reduced almost entirely to a matter of the understanding.

On the other hand, it can not be denied that the Halle school made not a few hypocrites. A rigid, external type of piety soon began to be insisted upon, and all the pupils were forced to conform to it. The result was that many simulated the piety which they did not possess. The collegia pietatis, which were imitated in other places, were also the source of much mischief. Loquacious and ambitious persons often obtained the management of them, and perverted them to the gratification of their own vanity; not unfrequently they were fanatics who circulated their fanatical opinions. These meetings fostered indifference to the public services of the Church, particularly in congregations where the preachers were popular with the upper classes. They also produced a sectarian spirit which looked down upon all who did not belong to the sect as mere worldlings, and consequently did more to prevent than to promote Christian charity. The result

was that in most countries these conventicles were soon prohibited.

§ 46.

MORE MODERATE THEOLOGIANS IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

Even during the Pietistic Controversy some of the Lutheran theologians had maintained an intermediate position between the two extremes of the conflicting parties. They recognized the excessive tendency to speculation, and the tyrannical intolerance of strange opinions which prevailed among the Orthodox; and were equally sensible of the dangers which the Pietists incurred by the prominence which they gave to emotion in religion, their extravagances in religious services, and their neglect of learning. The theologians of Jena deserve respectful mention in this particular, especially Buddeus, one of the most learned and eminent theologians of his times. After the excitement of the controversy had subsided, more moderate views prevailed, and most of the Lutheran theologians occupied a middle ground, where they endeavored to avail themselves of the merits and avoid the faults of both parties. The Pietistic Controversy was consequently very beneficial to the Lutheran Church. It prevented theology, which was degenerating into a barren scholasticism, from falling into total decay, and gave a new impulse to the almost entirely neglected study of the Bible. It also restored dogmatic theology, in a measure, to its Scriptural basis, gave a fuller development to its practical side, and freed it of many useless subtleties. At the same time, the partisan Church history of Gottfried Arnold, by its paradoxical statements, awakened new interest in the study of historical theology. When, not long afterward, Wolf appeared with his new philosophical system, he found, it is true, numerous opponents among the theologians; but there were, notwithstanding, many to employ his discoveries in the interests of dogmatic theology, and to him particularly belongs the credit of having stimulated the theologians to an acute, perspicuous, systematic development of their subjects. Thus, from the period of the Pietistic Controversy down to the time when the theological sciences received a new impulse and direction, there is an unbroken line of eminent theologians who cultivated and elucidated the various departments of theology with thoroughness and diligence.
In Biblical literature, particularly that of the New Testament, valuable service was rendered by Johann Christoph Wolf, professor of theology at Wittenberg, afterward preacher at Hamburg (d. 1739). While at Wittenberg he opposed the Pietists, and wrote against them; but afterward found fault merely with their style, and took no further part in the controversy.

Likewise Christian Schoettgen, rector of the Kreuzschule at Dresden (d. 1751), and Johann Albert Bengel, who was attracted to Pietism in his early days by the writings of Arndt, Gerhard, and Francke, and remained true to its principles during his whole life. He was abbot and counselor of the consistory in Württemberg (d. 1753). His chief claim to distinction was that he was the founder of New Testament criticism in the Lutheran Church.

Valuable contributions to Old Testament literature were made by Johann Heinrich Michaelis, professor of the Oriental languages and theology at Halle, a friend of Francke, whose Observationes Biblicae he helped to defend (d. 1738), and Christian Benedict Michaelis (d. 1764); also, Johann Gottlob Carpzov, pro-

1 The Absurda Halensia, 1707.
3 His Curae Philologicae et Crit. in Nov. Testamentum, 1732, 4 vols. 4., contain a collection of the best interpretations, and are still very useful. Also his Bibliotheca Hebraica, 1715 sqq., 4 vols. 4., is the most complete work on Hebrew literature.
4 Horae Hebraicae et Talmud. in Nov. Testamentum, 1733, 2 vols. 4. Also his lexicon (Nov. Lex. in Nov. Testamentum) was far more valuable than any which had preceded it.
5 Previously it had been usual to follow the text of the Elzevier editions without investigation. The plious Bengel found in other editions numerous different readings, and, becoming alarmed as to the certainty of the text, was led from conscientious motives to revise it. His New Testament with an Apparatus Crit. 1734. 4.; the Apparatus much enlarged, 1763. 4. Although very cautious in the changes which he made, he was violently assailed on account of them. As an expounder of the New Testament, Bengel was by no means unprejudiced; he found everywhere emphases which the ordinary rules of grammar were not sufficient to explain. But his Gnomon Novi Testamenti, 1759. 4., contains many good philological observations.
6 Biblia Hebraica, 1720, with various readings and some marginal notes. Annotationes Uberiores in Hagiographos, 3 vols. 4. The best commentaries, however, on the Proverbs, Lamentations, and Daniel are by Christian Benedict Michaelis, nephew of the above, and his successor as professor of the Oriental languages and theology at Halle, a far more learned man than the former, whose disquisitions are still valuable.
Numerous theologians devoted themselves especially to Church history. Among them was Johann Franz Buddeus, professor of theology at Jena (d. 1729), a man familiar with almost all the departments of theology, who possessed at once profound philosophical and extensive historical learning. His work on dogmatics, to which he was the first to give the name *Theologia Dogmatica*, maintained a happy medium between the extremes of the then conflicting parties, avoided unnecessary speculations, and carefully developed the Scriptural basis and the history of doctrines, yet with no lack of philosophic accuracy.

Also, Johann Alb. Fabricius, professor in the gymnasium at Hamburg (d. 1736), who was conversant with all the branches of archaeology, and rendered exceedingly valuable service in ecclesiastical antiquities.

Christoph Matthaeus Pfaff, professor of theology and chancellor at Tübingen, afterward at Giessen (d. 1760), was eminent in canon-law and Church history. He was the first scholar in the Lutheran Church to furnish a thorough discussion of the former, and to the latter he made many separate contributions.

Johann Lorenz von Mosheim, professor of theology, first at Helmstedt, then at Göttingen, where he was also chancellor of the university (d. 1755), is one of the most distinguished theologians of his times. He was the author of valuable works in all the departments of theology, also in dogmatics and ethics; but particularly in two, Church history and pulpit oratory, he excelled all his contemporaries. His method of treating Church history introduced a new era. His numerous works upon that

---

7 *Critica Sacra Vet. Test. 1728.* 4. *Introductio ad Libros Can. Biblitorum Vet. Test.* 1721, 3 vols. 4. As far as the Church system applies to these sciences, it is strictly followed. Otherwise, these works are learned and accurate, and contain many original researches, e. g., on the old versions.

8 Among his numerous other works, which include a collection of short treatises, *Miscellanea Sacra*, the principal are the *Historia Eccles. Vet. Test.*, 2 vols. 4., and *Isagogae Historico-Theologica ad Theologiam Universam*, a compendium of the history of the theological sciences—both still valuable.

9 By the publication of several old ecclesiastical works, *Codex Psuedepigraphus Vet. Test.* 2 vols.; *Codex Apocryphus Nov. Test.* 3 vols.; *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica*; *Salutaris Lux Evangelii Toti Orbi Exoriens*.

10 In his work *De Originibus Juris Ecclesiastici*.

11 His *Introductio in Historiam Theologiae Litterariam*, 3 vols. 4., is very valuable for the literature of theology.
subject are distinguished as much for their thorough research as for their pragmatical spirit and beautiful style. He could write German with quite as much elegance as Latin; his Versuch einer gründlichen Ketzerhistorie being one of the first finely written German works. As a pulpit orator Mosheim occupied the first place in the Lutheran Church. He formed his style after English and French models. The influence of the latter can be plainly seen in the frequent overburdening of his discourses with rhetorical figures; but he never loses sight of the chief objects of preaching, instruction and edification; and his sermons are consequently distinguished for clearness, practical relation to life, and adherence to the Scriptures.

Johann Georg Walch, professor of theology at Jena (d. 1775), a man of great learning, but lacking in acuteness and original research, published many useful compilations in the departments of theological literature and Church history.

Among the dogmatic theologians of this period, the most eminent are those who applied the philosophy of Wolf to theology. When Wolf first appeared in Halle with his system, he was not only attacked (and finally driven away) by the theologians of that place, who were in general hostile to all philosophy; but also by the Orthodox party, who wished to maintain the Aristotelian philosophy. Gradually, however, his system was adopted by some of the theologians and applied to dogmatics. Among these were Canz, in Tübingen (d. 1753); Reinbeck, provost in Berlin (d. 1741); Schubert, professor at Helmstedt and afterward at Greifswalde (d. 1774). But no one went so far as Jacob Carpov, director of the gymnasium at Weimar (d. 1767), who in his Dogmatics endeavored to demonstrate the whole system of doctrine by the reason, in accordance with the principles of Wolf. His work made a great sensation at first, but was soon forgotten.

The most distinguished dogmatician of this period was Siegmund Jacob Baumgarten, professor of theology at Halle (d. 1757), a man of profound philosophical thought and extensive learning.

12 Particular mention should be made of his Institutiones Historiae Ecclesiasticae, still one of the best works of this sort, and Commentarii de Rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum Magnum.
13 Heilige Reden, 6 vols. 8. 1765.
15 Particularly by Joachim Lange.
who also made valuable contributions to history, particularly the history of literature. His most important works were the Evangelische Glaubenslehre and Untersuchung theologischer Streitigkeiten. From the study of Wolf's philosophy Baumgarten derived his careful systematization, accurate definition of conceptions, and strictly logical argumentation. These features are characteristic of all Baumgarten's works, particularly of the two just mentioned. Both are unequaled of their kind, and the polemic theology is remarkable for the correct presentation of the opinions of others, the faithful statement of their arguments, and the rigid logic of the refutations. His published opinions upon theological subjects are also very instructive on account of their references to contemporaneous history, and their thorough discussion of various vexed questions in dogmatics and ecclesiastical law.

From the school of Baumgarten proceeded several eminent theologians who aided in the foundation of the new theology. Baumgarten, it is true, adhered strictly to the traditional theology, and most of his pupils followed his example. But the more distinguished men of his school were stimulated to independent thought and research, and opened new lines of thought, which led to new discoveries.

§ 47.

ATTEMPTS AT UNION BETWEEN THE REFORMED AND LUTHERAN CHURCHES.

Rudelbach's Reformation, p. 610.

At the beginning of the eighteenth century there were already many theologians in the Lutheran Church who favored a union with the Reformed, and there was consequently a better prospect for success in the negotiations for union than in the case of those instituted in the seventeenth century. The theologians of Helmstedt and their followers were particularly partial to such a union, and the school of Spener were also not averse to it. Spener, indeed, had scruples about the decretum absolutum, and

17 Halle, 1759, 3 vols. 4.
16 It appeared, 1762, in 3 vols. 4.
15 Theologische Bedenken. In all, nine collections.
regarded it as a dangerous error; but he believed a union possible, inasmuch as the two churches appealed to a common standard of faith, the Holy Scriptures, while with respect to the many doctrines upon which they could not unite, he held that they must exercise mutual toleration. The only reason why Spener and his followers took no more active part in the subsequent negotiations was that, being already involved in so many controversies, they were not willing to increase them for fear of causing a division in the Church.

In this desire for union several of the sovereigns also participated. The House of Brandenburg had long favored a union upon political grounds, inasmuch as it was itself Reformed, while the great majority of its subjects were Lutherans. Under Frederic I., Leibnitz had exerted great influence, particularly with the learned queen Sophia Charlotte, and the ensuing efforts for union are said to have been largely due to him.

One of the first indications of Frederic's disposition was that, on his acceptance of the crown, in 1701, he appointed, for his coronation and anointment, his two court-chaplains, Bernhard von Sanden and Benjamin Ursinus, to the office of bishop. This was evidently a step in the direction of the English Church, with the intention before long of entering into negotiations with that Church also. Soon afterward conferences of Lutheran and Reformed theologians were actually held in Berlin for the purpose of securing a union between the two churches. The negotiations were, however, soon suspended (1703). One of the Lutherans engaged in the conference, Winkler, preacher in the cathedral at Magdeburg, had presented the King with a plan embodying his views respecting the most feasible method of accomplishing the union. The substance of it was that certain practices in the Lutheran Church, such as exorcism, the wearing of the chasuble, etc., should be abolished, but that liberty should be allowed with respect to many matters of belief. This plan was published, in 1703 (by whom it is not known), under the title Acanum Regium, and produced great excitement. The

---

1 Connected with this was the conversion of Duke Moritz Wilhelm of Saxe-Zeitz to the Catholic Church. Fritzscbe, De Jesuitarum Machinationibus Halensis Theol. Opera ad Iritum Redactis, Comm. 1.


theologians of Electoral Saxony assailed it with especial violence, and the negotiations in Berlin had to be broken off in spite of the earnest efforts of the Swiss Reformed theologians to bring them to a successful conclusion. Nevertheless, some few churches at Berlin and Königsberg were at that time set apart for the use of mixed congregations, and consecrated by clergymen of both communions. The King now conceived the idea of a closer union between the Reformed Church of Brandenburg and the English Episcopal Church, a project in which Leibnitz again took an active part. The plan was to introduce the English liturgy, which recommended itself to the King’s fondness for display, into the Reformed Church of Brandenburg and the Lutheran Church of Hanover. In the mean time, however, Frederic died (1713), and his son, Frederic William I., was at first wholly indifferent to the union.

Not long afterward two Tübingen theologians, Johann Christian Klemm and Christoph Matthaeus Pfaff, revived the proposals for a union. Their writings (1719–1720) made a strong impression even upon the corpus evanglicorum at Ratisbon, and that body took some steps to promote the union. But the most eminent Lutheran theologians, Cyprian and Mosheim, and particularly the Supreme Consistory of Dresden, were still opposed to it; and the attempt was consequently again unsuccessful.

After this time, however, the two churches grew more and more friendly. The controversy between them subsided, and the unimportance of the differences between them came to be more and more acknowledged. Frederic William I., it is true, failed in his attempt to secure the union by inducing the Reformed to relinquish their doctrine of the decretum absolu- tum; while, in 1736, he ordered the abolishment of some of the objectionable practices in the Lutheran Church (the chasuble, exorcism, and candles on the altar). But this measure, which once would have certainly occasioned great commotion, created at that time no unusual excitement. When Frederic II., immediately after his accession in 1740, gave the congregations entire

* Mohnike, Mittheilungen, i. 112.
FOURTH PERIOD.—DIV. II.—A.D. 1648–1814.

liberty in these matters, there were already very many that did not desire to have these practices restored.

During the negotiations, the German Reformed theologians had decidedly favored the union, and always declared that they did not regard the difference between the two churches as fundamental. In this spirit they readily joined the Lutheran theologians, after the controversy had ceased, in their researches and labors in the field of theological science. Accordingly, from this time the history of theology in the two churches becomes identical. The scientific labors of their theologians became so interdependent as no longer to be distinguished by their ecclesiastical differences.

§ 48.

THE ORIGIN OF THE HERRNHUTERS, OR UNITED BRETHREN.

Herder, x. 56.—Planck, Gesch. d. Theologie, p. 265.—Tholuck, Verm. Schriften, i. 433.

The tendency which prevailed in the earlier school of Halle, but which even in Halle gradually assumed a more moderate character, resulted in the founding of a separate community which, in a form peculiar to itself, continued to maintain the principles of Spener. This was the United Brethren, the community founded by Count Nicholas Ludwig von Zinzendorf.

Born at Dresden, in 1700, of a family intimately associated with Spener, he received a pious education, and was accustomed from his childhood to religious meditation and attendance at the daily meetings for prayer. He afterward came under the care of Francke, in the grammar-school at Halle, where this tendency was further confirmed. His guardian endeavored, without success, to turn his mind in a different direction, and for this reason sent him to Wittenberg. There, also, he persevered in his religious exercises, and studied theology with quite as much zeal as the law, although the latter was the profession for which he was intended. The one idea which governed all his thoughts and feelings was the desire to attain the closest union with the Saviour, to whose sole guidance he wished to commit himself. At that early day this idea had taken complete possession of his imagination and manifested itself in various ways, often to the extent of triviality and even impropriety. He considered all the other theological doctrines comparatively unimportant, and this
alone the real essence of Christianity. After the completion of his studies he made a journey through the Netherlands, France, and Switzerland, and then, at the desire of his relatives, accepted an office under the government at Dresden, although he had previously always wished to devote himself to the ministry. While occupying this position, he found time to publish several devotional works, and every Sunday held religious meetings at his own house, after the model of the *collegia pietatis*. At this period he constantly lamented the decline of genuine Christian piety; and, inasmuch as he saw that it was impossible to reform the Church as a body, he conceived the thought of gathering out of it a society of sincere friends of the Saviour, or, as Spener had once expressed it, an *ecclesiola in ecclesia*.

Since the Thirty Years' War the so-called Bohemian and Moravian Brethren had been compelled, by severe persecutions, to emigrate from Moravia.¹ They had already formed several congregations in Saxony, when a proposition was made to the Count to permit some of their families to settle upon his estate Bertholdsdorf, in Lusatia. In 1722 three families settled on the Hutberg, near Bertholdsdorf, and the construction which one of their number put upon that name—viz., that the settlement was under the protection of the Lord (*unter der Hut des Herrn*)—was the occasion of the name which the new colony assumed, *Herrnhut*. This colony was soon considerably increased, not only by the emigrants who constantly joined it, but also by strangers. It was not long before contentions arose. There were many fanatics in the number, who separated from the rest. Some wished to have the Reformed doctrines adopted, others the Lutheran, while the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren strenuously insisted upon the preservation of their ancient constitution and discipline. Finally, in 1727, the Count succeeded in effecting an agreement. By his eloquent and persuasive appeals he so far united all the members of the community that, in their desire for the firm establishment of the true theology of the Saviour's blood and cross, they were willing to overlook all unessential differences. Unreserved consecration to the Saviour, and union with him, who has redeemed us by his sufferings, were the ideas which now almost exclusively formed the basis of the religious life of the community, while every thing else was regarded as of

¹ Simler's *Samml.* ii. 918.
comparatively small importance. At the same time, however, a form of government was introduced founded upon the old Moravian constitution, but containing much that was peculiar to itself. Twelve elders were chosen, with the Count as their president, who constituted the conference of elders, and had the supreme control. A general court composed of brethren settled disputes. Regular meetings for prayer were established, and texts of Scripture (Losungen, or watch-words) were provided for them as the subjects for each day's meditations. Certain of the brethren and sisters associated themselves to keep up the so-called horary prayer, praying incessantly from midnight to midnight in hourly rotation. The congregation was divided, according to age and sex, into smaller bands, sections, or choirs, which had their particular seasons for devotion. At the same time, they maintained their agreement with the doctrines of the Reformers; kept up their connection with the Lutheran Church in Bertholdsdorf; and only reserved to themselves the right of having their own peculiar form of government, appealing in defense of this claim to the example of their ancestors, the old Moravian Brethren. Zinzendorf's distinguished connections secured for the community numerous and influential patrons in other countries; and, since from the first brethren had been sent abroad to win souls for the Saviour, they met with great success in many of the German states, as well as in Denmark, England, and Switzerland. In 1732 Zinzendorf resigned his office under the government; was examined in Stralsund under a different name as a Lutheran candidate of theology, in order to prove his orthodoxy as a Lutheran; and was thereupon ordained by the court-chaplain Jablonsky at Berlin, the oldest bishop of the Brethen in Poland, as bishop or senior of Moravian Brethren (1737).

Meanwhile, the community had fallen into disfavor at Dresden. A commission sent from that place to Herrnhut could not, it is true, find any ground for complaint as to the orthodoxy of the Brethren, insomuch as they accepted the Augsburg Confession in every particular; nevertheless, in 1738, Zinzendorf was banished perpetually from Saxony. He now made long journeys in behalf of the community in foreign countries, not only in Europe, but even as far as the West Indies and North America (where he performed the duties of a Lutheran preacher from 1741–1743), and infused new life into the missions which had
been commenced at an earlier period. In England he obtained, in 1749, the passage of an act of Parliament declaring the community a true Episcopal Church, and granting it religious toleration.

The Brethren obviously made no distinction between the Protestant churches. They received members from all without requiring them to sever their existing relations. In order to prevent misunderstanding upon this point, the synods at Marienborn (1744 and 1745) established three different tropi paedia— the Lutheran, Reformed, and Moravian. The form of worship was ordered for each (particularly in the celebration of the Lord's Supper) according to the usage of the Church to which the tropus belonged. In their associate relations, however, no distinction was made between the tropi. The manifest indifference of the community to the distinctive doctrines of the churches caused it to be regarded by many with suspicion; and many other peculiarities, both on the part of the Count and his followers, had the same tendency. The Brethren fully adopted the religious idiosyncrasies of Zinzendorf; and, although they were deserving of respect on account of their sincerity, yet the influence of a religious imagination upon the pious emotions produced many fanatical notions of a dangerous tendency. The main idea which characterized the whole religious life of the community was that of intimate union with the Saviour, to whose guidance they wished to confide themselves in a childlike and submissive spirit, and whose death upon the cross was their sole and certain reliance. To a truly childlike piety the Count united an extremely vivid imagination; and he consequently embellished this idea with comparisons which, in his familiarity with the Saviour, he did not always carefully select, and which, for that very reason, were often offensive to others. These favorite figures had reference partly to the atonement through Jesus's death, and became standing metaphors among the Brethren; partly to the union of the congregation with him, which was represented as a marriage, and often illustrated by indelicate comparisons. So exclusive was the worship of the Saviour that God the Father was quite

Such, particularly, as represented Jesus as a lamb in many trivial images; the blood of Jesus cries for us to righteousness; we must take refuge in the wound in his side, etc.

With the cohabitation of marriage, etc. Cf. the Messallians, Neander, ii. 2, 520. Ammon, Fortbildung des Christenthums, ii. 2, 208.
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left out of view. Zinzendorf said, "God the Father is not directly our Father, but the Lord Jesus is our real Father; we have to do only with the Son." He wished to have the Son only worshiped, and all those offices ascribed to him which are usually distributed between the three Persons of the Godhead—creation, redemption, and sanctification. He also not unfrequently used comparisons with reference to the three Persons of the Trinity which could not but be offensive to others. For example, he called Christ "our dear Husband," God the Father "our dear Father," and the Holy Ghost "our dear Mother." This favorite idea of intimate union with the Saviour expressed itself in singular practices. The fundamental principle of the Brethren was to commit themselves, with no will of their own, to the Saviour's guidance. They believed that he guided them partly by his Spirit poured out upon them, while in some cases his will was to be discovered by lot. In particular, to keep the marriages free from all fleshly considerations, it was customary to determine them by lot.

From the first the Brethren had regarded themselves as an association of the heirs of grace gathered out of the great corrupt churches, and standing in the closest connection with, and under the most immediate direction of, the Saviour. The rapidity and success of their progress seemed to them the result of a miracle wrought by the Saviour in their behalf, and accordingly confirmed this belief. They considered themselves the elect flock of Christ, and the inevitable result was an injurious spiritual pride, which made them look down upon the other churches in spite of their outward appearance of humility.

The Count and his community were indifferent to dogmatical definitions, except in so far as they were related to their all-important conception of intimate union with Christ. It was this indifference, and not, as has been charged, hypocrisy, which made the Count declare his entire agreement with the Augsburg Confession. For this reason he strongly disapproved of the practice of studying the Bible for the purpose of culling the doctrines from it. He spoke at times in very strong language of the obscurity of the Scriptures, and declared that no human learning

* Zinzendorf's Passagier, mit einem Vorwort von D. A. Petersen, Jena, 1850—a dramatic representation of his relation to Lutheran orthodoxy.
was able to interpret it, but only the Spirit who illuminated the sacred writers themselves. Accordingly, he encouraged the reading of the Bible only conditionally, in order to guard against abuse.

It is not surprising that these peculiarities seemed dangerous to many, and that, especially after the year 1740, many writings against them were published. The principal theologians who opposed the society, and in their works severely censured them, were Johann Gottlieb Carpzov, Baumgarten, and Bengel. On the part of the society, replies were published by the Count and other members, particularly August Gottlieb Spangenberg, one of the most distinguished Brethren. He lost his position as adjunct professor in the theological faculty at Halle (1733) on account of his attachment to Zinzendorf, and from that time identified himself entirely with the society. He was active in the cause of its missions, making many journeys, particularly to North America, and also wrote a number of apologetic works in reply to various attacks. His learning and calm judgment, for which he was distinguished in the community, admirably fitted him for this task. To him the Brethren owed the first complete exposition of their doctrines, Idea Fidei Fratrum, Barby, 1779, as well as the Ratio Disciplinæ Unitatis Fratrum (a description of their form of government), 1789. He died a bishop at an advanced age in 1792.

As long as Zinzendorf lived, he was, although under various names, the leader of the whole society. After his death, in 1760, the direction was confided to a conference of elders, which now has its headquarters in Bertholdsdorf. In addition, the Synod, which exercises the supreme power and consists of deputies from all the congregations, meets from time to time. During its session the elders' conference is dissolved, and a new one elected by it. Each congregation, also, has its particular conference, which is subordinate to the general conference. The settlements of the United Brethren are very numerous, especially in the Saxon Electorate, Lusatia, Prussia, Russia, Holland, England, and America. All are distinguished for their honesty and industry. This last trait, and the aid of many benevolent friends, enable them to meet the outlay required by the institutions of the community and the missions. They have all, however, become heavily indebted, especially in late years, which have not been favorable to their business.
FOURTH PERIOD.—DIV. II.—A.D. 1648–1814.

The United Brethren undoubtedly exerted, in many respects, a beneficial influence upon the Evangelical Church. They gave prominence to that great essential of Christianity, the cultivation of the heart; and set the example, in their communion, of ignoring the differences of the Protestant denominations. By their expressive and affecting worship, by their close relation to pious evangelical Christians, even when they did not actually enter the society, as well as their influence over the great number of children not belonging to their community who were educated in their schools, they gave a wide circulation to these principles. The tendency to fanaticism, which was at first manifested, has, in later times, gradually disappeared, although the external discipline has remained the same. It could be desired that the latter might also be remodeled, for in its present form it is conducive to hypocrisy and spiritual pride, and that the community might be externally reunited with the Evangelical Church to which it really belongs; otherwise it can never realize that universality which is essential to Christianity.

III.—PERIOD OF MODERN THEOLOGY, FROM 1760 TO 1814.


§ 49.

PREPARATORY EVENTS.

Soon after the middle of the eighteenth century, a period of more independent theological inquiry began in the German Lutheran Church, during which all the doctrines of the Church sys-

tem, which had been hitherto regarded as almost beyond ques-
tion, were one after another examined, and in many respects
changed. From the nature of things, it was inevitable that such
a period should follow the Reformation. For the Reformation,
by rejecting all human authority in matters of faith, really de-
prived the dogmatic system of its authority, and left it to the
private judgment of the individual. The new Church, it is true,
adopted a large portion of that system; but only because its at-
tention was turned at first chiefly to the doctrines of practical
importance, and they only were reformed. The continuation of
this reformation was prevented partly through the fear of con-
ceding too much to the fanatical parties of the day, partly by the
belief that the symbolical books permitted no change in the de-
finitions of the doctrines. Moreover, the Catholics had often ac-
cused the Lutherans of altering their system of theology, and
even sought to question the right of the later Lutherans to claim
affinity to the Augsburg Confession. Inasmuch as the Luther-
ans themselves had no conception of a unity of the Church apart
from unity of doctrine, they were the more tenacious of the doc-
trinal system which the Augsburg Confession embodied. Ac-
cordingly, in the seventeenth century the Lutheran Church pre-
sembled the spectacle of a new scholasticism which laid the whole
stress upon the letter of the Church theology, counted the accept-
ance of the letter to be saving Christian faith, and devoted all its
energy to the development of the orthodox doctrines, even to the
most unimportant particulars. The Calixtinians endeavored,
without success, to check this tendency. They were regarded,
and, particularly in later times, not without reason, as too un-
sound to be worthy of consideration. The Pietists did more to
arouse the conviction that the Church system was of human
making, and that adherence to it was by no means identical
with true Christian faith. From that time theologians labored
in the departments of exegesis and Church history with less re-
gard to dogmatical considerations, and those who had a leaning
toward Pietism often even manifested in their writings an op-
position to the so-called Orthodox, which, although productive
of party feeling, nevertheless resulted in greater freedom of
thought.

During this period numerous works of Deists and Naturalists
against Christianity appeared, especially in England. The Ger-
man theologians, finding that these writings were, to some extent, translated into German, and that they were becoming increasingly popular, were obliged to take steps to counteract their influence. In their efforts to refute them, the theologians not unfrequently discovered points in the Church system which could not be easily defended. At the same time, their attention was called to theological works of an earlier date, such as had appeared particularly in England and among the Arminians, which subjected individual doctrines of the Church to an historical and philosophical criticism. They soon became aware that if some of the doctrines which were opposed to reason, and consequently difficult to defend, could be modified, it would be much easier to refute the Deists. At the same time, the study of the Bible began to be carried on with greater care and freedom from prejudice. The works of Grotius and Richard Simon, which had hitherto been regarded with suspicion, were more generally studied, and laid the foundation for new critical and exegetical researches. The knowledge of the Orient and its languages became more accurate and comprehensive. Scholars began to read the books of the Bible in the spirit of the original, and to recognize the error of the earlier dogmatists who had applied the principles of the cold understanding to the language of emotion and imagination, and by literal interpretations had deduced doctrines from types and bold metaphors. Accordingly, they were not satisfied with relieving the doctrines of their later additions and restoring them to their original Scriptural form, but began also to examine the proof-texts to discover how much belonged to the rhetorical style, and how much to the essence of the thought. It was therefore inevitable that the whole system should be remodeled; nor was it strange that many who remained true to the old beliefs found fault with these methods of procedure, and regarded them as certain to result in Naturalism. Consequently, with this time began the contest between the conservative and progressive parties which still continues. The Prussian theologians were the most active in their candid investigations of the system of the Church—a result due to the freedom of the press and of instruction which prevailed during the reign of Frederic the Great.
§ 50.
SEMMLER. MICHAELIS. ERNESTI.

The three Lutheran theologians who exerted the greatest influence upon the advancement and development of the theological sciences were Semler, Michaelis, and Ernesti. The intellectual revolution in the department of theology was due, most of all, to Johann Salomo Semler. He was educated at the school of the Orphan House, and was attached to the Pietistic principles, but afterward imbibed more liberal opinions in the school of Baumgarten. He became a devoted follower of the latter, and, even when he was appointed professor at Halle (1752), still continued to adhere to his principles; but after Baumgarten's death he began to assume a more independent position. The field of research to which Semler devoted his comprehensive and profound study included all the branches of historical theology. A remarkable memory and great diligence enabled him to attain to such knowledge in this department as is seldom acquired. To these advantages he united a talent for observation, a power of combination, and a keen perception which made him incomparable in criticism, although he was often, it must be confessed, too aggressive and dogmatic. He was, however, deficient in power to elaborate his thoughts systematically and to present them clearly, perhaps only because he worked too rapidly, and did not take the requisite pains. He investigated the departments of Biblical literature and the literature of Church history with marvelous industry, and, never satisfied with traditional opinions, always went back to the original sources, in order to reach an independent conclusion. He communicated his various discoveries in numerous works, large and small, generally only partially elaborated, because he did not take sufficient time for the task; but he always stimulated others to further investigations. This was particularly the case in New Testament criticism and doctrinal and Church history. From the standpoint of doctrinal history he exerted an influence upon dogmatic theology. His careful examination of the Church systems of all ages in their true historical form, and his accurate knowledge of their deviations from each other, inclined him to look with indulgence upon

1 H. Schmid, Die Theologie Semlers, 1858.
the differences in doctrine, while his natural amiability made him regard rather the disposition and intent of others than the form of their expressions. He was, moreover, a man of child-like piety, who clearly recognized in himself the fact that inward piety, and not the doctrinal utterance, makes the Christian. Accordingly, in his examination of doctrines he went to work with the greatest freedom. He held that a distinction should always be made between the private religion, which is the property of the individual, and in which each must follow his own conscience, and the public religion, or distinctive doctrine of the Church, which must be the standard in public ecclesiastical utterances. He did not, it is true, make this distinction, in spite of its importance to himself, as clear as could have been desired; but by means of it he secured the necessary freedom and impartiality in his inquiries. He died in 1791.

Although Semler left a great number of works, none were completed with sufficient care to be of permanent and classical value. They contain, however, scattered through them, innumerable new though undeveloped observations and thoughts which have never been entirely exhausted and made use of; and consequently his writings are still very instructive.  

Another pioneer in Biblical literature, although not so daring as Semler, was Johann David Michaelis, son of Christian Benedict, after 1750 professor in ordinary of Oriental literature at Göttingen, then privy-counselor of justice, and knight of the Order of the North Star (d. 1791). In dogmatic theology Michaelis remained true, with a few unimportant exceptions, to the system of the Church, but accomplished little in that department. His most successful work was in Biblical criticism and exegesis. He freed himself from the opinions which had hitherto acted as a restraint upon criticism, and performed valuable services in the investigation of the origin of various Biblical books, and also in the correction of the text. In particular the credit belongs to him of having brought about a more accurate knowledge of

---

the condition of the Orient and its peculiarities, and having applied it to the explanation of the Bible. He thus originated the more accurate historical interpretation.

The third of the three distinguished theologians who were instrumental in inaugurating the new era in theology was Johann August Ernesti, one of the most celebrated theologians of his day, at one time rector of the St. Thomas school in Leipsic, then professor of oratory, and after 1759 professor in ordinary of theology (d. 1781). Ernesti's greatest service to theological science was in the department of New Testament interpretation. He was the first to theoretically develop an exact grammatical interpretation in its perfect purity, and to apply it practically—a task for which he was fitted, above all others, by his familiarity with classical antiquity. He completely demolished the theory that the language of the New Testament was pure Greek, as well as the doctrine of *emphases*, which destroyed all accurate interpretation. On the contrary, he insisted that the idiom, both the general and that peculiar to the individual writers, should be observed. His theological works are not numerous, but are of great value, particularly on account of the critical linguistic observations. He also exerted a wide influence through his numerous pupils, many of whom afterward became distinguished exegetes. In dogmatics Ernesti adhered, for the most part, to the doctrines of the Church, but favored the efforts made to reform them so far as they were based upon thorough investigation, and were not the result merely of a rash zeal for innovation.

By the thoroughness and moderation with which he judged the new efforts of his age in the department of theology, he restrained the indiscretion of the progressive party, while the great


* Several valuable exegetical and critical treatises are collected in his *Opuscula Philologicae Criticae*, 1764, and *Opuscula Theologicia*, 1773. Special distinction belongs to his *Institutio Interpretis Novi Test.* 1761 (and often afterward), which not only excels all previous, but also most of the later hermeneutics—a thesaurus of critical observations and admirable rules, written in classical Latin.

* His *Neue theolog. Bibliothek* (1760–1769, 10 vols.) and *Neueste theolog. Bibliothek* (1771–1774, 4 vols.) belong to the most substantial theological journals.
respect which was everywhere felt for him secured an unprejudiced hearing for the new opinions, and suppressed the tendency to brand them as heresy.\(^5\)

§ 51.

PROGRESS OF THEOLOGICAL ENLIGHTENMENT.

The spirit of free inquiry in the department of theology first manifested itself in the treatise of Semler De Demoniacis quarum in Nov. Test. fit Mentio., 1760. The occasion of this work was the case of a woman, in the vicinity of Wittenberg, who believed herself to be possessed, and was so regarded by several of the theologians of that place. In refuting a work which had appeared with reference to this case, Semler came to the conclusion that the doctrine of possession by evil spirits was nowhere sanctioned by Jesus and the Apostles, but that they had only accommodated themselves to the then prevalent mode of speech, which itself was founded upon conceptions borrowed from the heathen, and tinctured with the strange notions of the people themselves. The demoniacs of the New Testament were accordingly persons who were suffering from violent and unusual diseases. This explanation of Semler drew out fierce attacks from several quarters; but so many similar expressions of opinion followed in quick succession that public attention could not long be confined to one.

A great sensation was produced when, after the death of the Göttingen theologian Christoph August Heumann, his posthumous work, The Proof that the Doctrine of the Reformed Church concerning the Lord's Supper is the Right and True, was published by A. F. W. Sack, in 1764. It called forth several replies; but the Reformed doctrine had already too many supporters among the Lutherans for any considerable controversy to grow out of it. Semler, meanwhile, proceeded with his investigations. In the year 1764, he showed, in his Observations on the So-called Proof texts of Dogmatics, the spuriousness of the passage 1 John v. 7, and became thereby involved in a violent controversy with

---

Johann Melchior Götze, senior pastor at Hamburg. More important were his Inquiries concerning the Canon, which now followed and began with the Apocalypse. The genuineness of this book had already been questioned by Ernesti, Michaelis, and Semler, when, in 1769, the last-named published the posthumous work of Georg Ludwig Oeder, dean at Feuchtwang in Anspach, Christlich freie Untersuchung über die sogenannte Offenbarung Johannis. This work occasioned a lengthy controversy. Christian Friedrich Schmidt of Wittenberg, Chancellor Reuss of Tübingen, and Knittel, superintendent-general of Brunswick, wrote in favor of the Book of Revelations, while Semler took ground against it. During the progress of this controversy, Semler’s Freie Untersuchung vom Canon appeared, containing a great number of new and daring disclosures. He showed how widely the ancient churches had varied in their designation of the canon, and that certain of the Biblical books, having been intended for particular times and readers, were consequently not equally applicable to entirely different circumstances. This, he held, was especially true of the Old Testament, the contents of which could not be regarded as wholly divine, inasmuch as certain features of it, e.g. its particularism, were even refuted by Jesus and the Apostles. He thereby not only asserted the right to subject the historical origin of these books to the freest investigation, but insisted that the ecclesiastical canon was to be distinguished from the Word of God contained in it. Whether any particular portion is the Word of God can not be determined by historical evidence, but must be decided by its internal character, as it does or does not contain that which is true and useful for all men in every age. For this reason he would have every reader free to retain whatever book of the Bible he found most conducive to his edification.

These opinions at that time met with great opposition. In particular, Christian Friedrich Schmidt endeavored to refute them in his Historia Antiqua et Vindicatio Canonis, Lips. 1775, 8vo. But he attempted to prove too much by his laborious treatises, and consequently proved nothing at all.

Another controversy had reference to the utility and author-
ity of the symbolical books. Provost Lüdke of Berlin took

ground against them in his work Vom falschen Religionsseifer,
1767, and consequently found many assailants. The most vio-
lent in this instance, also, was Johann Melchior Götze; but he
injured his cause by recommending compulsory measures. An-
ton Friedrich Büsching, member of the supreme consistory, came
to the aid of Lüdke, at the same time criticising the symbolical
books of the Lutheran Church, and denying some of their doc-
trines. Finally Semler also took the same side. After this
controversy, the conviction became more and more general that
the symbolical books did not possess unchangeable authority,
and could not restrain free individual investigation.

While the theologians were thus correcting the opinions re-
specting the sources of theology, the philosophers did much to
exhibit the doctrines of religion itself in a clarified form. The
Popular Philosophy, which was then beginning to prevail, was,
it is true, justly chargeable with superficiality and shallowness,
for it often dealt merely with externals, and discarded thorough
investigation as useless refinement. Nevertheless, at that time
it exerted a beneficial influence, partly by its stimulating power,
partly by the many good ideas to which it gave more general
currency. Prominent among the representatives of this philos-
ophy was Johann Bernhard Basedow, noted as a reformer of the
educational system, and founder of the Philanthropin in Dessau
(died at Magdeburg, 1790). He proposed as the pure and genu-
ine Christianity a system of natural religion; but he showed too
much the want of thorough, systematic research. A much more
profound philosopher was Johann August Eberhard, a preacher
at Berlin, and afterward at Charlottenburg, finally professor of
philosophy at Halle (d. 1809). In his Neue Apologie des Socras-
tes, 1772, he attacked, in the first place, Augustine's doctrine of
the condemnation of the heathen, and then the doctrines of
Christ's vicarious atonement and of the eternity of future pun-
ishment. In the same spirit, Lessing wrote his Erziehung des
Menschengeschlechts, 1780.

It was not long before even theologians openly adopted this
philosophy. The most noted was Wilhelm Abrahain Teller, pro-

3 In his Apparatus ad Libros Symbolicos Eccles. Lutheranae, Halle, 1775.
4 In his Philalethia, 1764, 2 vols.; Theologisches System der gesunden Vernunft;
Versuch einer freimüthigen Dogmatik.
Professor at Helmstedt, afterward a member of the supreme consistory, and provost at Berlin (d. 1804). In his earlier works he deviated from the system of the Church chiefly in matters of minor importance; but he gradually came to attach less value to the positive doctrines, and to regard only the truths of reason contained in them as essential to Christianity.

Gotthilf Samuel Steinbart, professor of theology at Frankfort-on-the-Oder (d. 1809), took a similar position.

A most important agency for the dissemination and defense of these new opinions was the Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek, which, from the year 1765, was published at Berlin by the learned bookseller Friedrich Nicolai. Its chief object was the promotion of intellectual enlightenment, and the contributors were all supporters of the new theological principles. They gave utterance in it to the freest sentiments, and by its aid kept up a perpetual warfare against the old system.

The immediate results of these sudden changes could not but be injurious to religion in general. The dogmatic system, hitherto regarded as impregnable, was on every hand assailed and disputed; and, inasmuch as the piety of many was involved with this system, it naturally suffered when the latter was impugned. Moreover, the substitutes which were from time to time offered in place of the old faith were generally weak and unworthy of respect, being chiefly borrowed from the superficial French philosophy, which did more to injure religion than to promote it.

Accordingly, this period, taken by itself, presents a melancholy spectacle; and it is only when it is regarded as a necessary stage to the attainment of a more thorough and comprehensive religious culture that its value can be recognized.

---

6 In the later eds. of his Wörterbuch des neuen Test. 1722, this tendency began to show itself; it was openly expressed in his Religion der Vollkommeneren, 1792.

6 In his System der reinen Philosophie, oder Glückseligkeitslehre des Christenthums, 1778.

7 Nicolai's Leben und Meinungen des Herrn Mag. Sebaldus Nothanker, 1776, 3 vols. did much to bring the pastoral office into ridicule.
Although the new philosophical views of Christianity met in general with little favor among the theologians, yet they were not without influence upon them. So strong was the doubt expressed concerning certain doctrines of the old system, not merely on philosophical but also on Biblical grounds, as a result of the increasing thoroughness of exegesis, that most of the theologians found themselves compelled either to surrender these doctrines entirely or else to give them a new form. Moreover, the new investigations had the effect upon even the most orthodox theologians of inciting them to give, as far as possible, a practical application to the doctrines of the Church, in order thereby to demonstrate their importance. All empty speculation was now entirely banished from dogmatics, and gave place to a salutary, practical tendency.

Among the defenders of the old system against all modern attacks, Georg Friedrich Seiler, professor of theology at Erlangen (d. 1807), deserves mention. He not only defended single doctrines in his writings,¹ but also presented the whole system according to a freer method, without, however, attempting to reduce it to the scholastic form.²

Two other dogmatists of this period occupied a more moderate position between the two extremes, and endeavored by qualifying explanations to preserve the essentials of the Church system while surrendering points of minor importance:

Johann Christoph Doederlein, professor of theology at Altorf, afterward at Jena (d. 1792). His work on dogmatic theology³ was very popular on account of its clearness, its fullness combined with terseness, and its moderate tone, although the author’s theological system is not entirely consistent with itself.

Samuel Friedrich Nathanael Morus, professor of theology at Leipsic (d. 1792), a distinguished linguist and New Testament exegete, educated in the school of Ernesti, restored dogmatic the-

¹ Ueber die Gottheit Christi, 1775; Ueber den Versöhnungstod Christi, 1778.
² In his Theologia Dogmatico-polemica, 1774.
³ Institutio Theologi Christiani in Capitibus Religionis Theoreticis Nostris Temporibus Accommodata, 1780, 2 vols.
ology⁴ to its Scriptural basis, and surrendered those doctrines which could not be proved from the Bible upon strict exegetical principles, such as the imputation of Adam's sin and the ubiquity of Christ's human nature. He also mentioned the eternity of future punishment with doubt.

All at once, however, it seemed as if free inquiry were again to be suppressed in the very country where, under Frederic II., it had been allowed the most untrammelled development, and the old and abandoned theological status to be forcibly restored.⁵ Frederic William II. assumed the government with the firm purpose of eradicating the innovations in religion. He appointed as minister of religious affairs a former preacher, Wöllner, who had succeeded in gaining his confidence. This man was the author of the celebrated religious edict⁶ which appeared in 1788, and was intended to completely restore the old orthodoxy. All preachers and school-teachers were commanded, under penalty of removal, to adhere to the doctrine of the symbolical books. Inasmuch as the system of the Church was thus declared unchangeable, and the secular power endeavored to secure it from investigation by forcible means, this edict called forth a great number of opinions, and occasioned a series of writings which were mostly occupied with the question whether the doctrines of the symbolical books were to be considered unalterable, and how far the authority of Protestant princes extended with regard to Church doctrines.⁷

More stringent measures were adopted. The King called from Breslau to Berlin as members of the supreme consistory the preacher Hermes, a well-disposed but narrow-minded man, and Hilmer, a teacher in the gymnasium, who, according to popular

⁴ In his Epitome Theologiae Christianae, Lips. 1789.
⁷ Henke's Beurtheilung aller Schriften, welche durch das königl. preuss. Religionsedict veranlasst sind, Kiel, 1793. Admirable conduct of the Consistorialrath Diterich, whose earlier work, Die ersten Gründe der christl. Lehre, was about to be introduced as a text-book. He declared that he no longer regarded it as useful, and that he would make a public statement to this effect: the whole edition had to be withdrawn. S. J. J. Spalding's Lebensbeschreibung, von ihm selbst aufgesetzt, Halle, 1804, p. 123. Diterich's life and character in Henke's Archiv der neuesten Kirchengesch. v. 221.
report, espoused this cause from motives of policy; and a course was now entered upon of which even Wöllner did not wholly approve. Some of the members of the supreme consistory, among them Teller, were retired; and in 1792 an **Immediat-Commission** was constituted, in addition to the supreme consistory, with especial control over the theological examinations. All the provincial consistories were also supplemented by examining commissions which were placed under the direction of the Immediat-Commission. Hermes prepared a scheme for the examination of candidates which was particularly designed to test their orthodoxy; and every one who received an ecclesiastical office was obliged to bind himself by a condition annulling his commission in case of unfaithfulness to the system of the Church. In this way it was supposed that the necessary precautions had been taken to exclude from the offices of the Church all who did not strictly adhere to the doctrines of the symbolical books.

These measures, however, were so distasteful to public opinion that they could not be completely carried into effect. This was particularly demonstrated in the case of the proceedings against the preacher Schulz at Gielsdorf, near Berlin, who had, it must be confessed, preached with great levity and indiscretion against many of the doctrines of the Church. It was found impossible to obtain a decree of condemnation against him from the supreme court,\(^8\) and it became necessary to depose him by an order of the cabinet (1791).

Menacing intimations were made to the most distinguished professors in the universities—Kant, Nösselt, Niemeyer—to change the tone of their instructions; and finally Hermes and Hilmer began to travel through the country, and everywhere to purge the schools and churches of heterodox elements. They, however, met in general with an unwelcome reception, especially at Halle, whence they were formally expelled by the students in 1795. Their zeal now began to abate, and after the death of Frederic William II., in 1797, all these measures were abolished; Wöllner, Hermes, and Hilmer dismissed; and the supreme consistory reinstated in all its rights.\(^9\)

---

* Water's Anbau, i. 237.
* Gesch. des preuss. Staates, ii. 7.
§ 53.

CONTINUATION.

Manitius, Die Gestalt der Dogmatik in der lutherischen Kirche seit Morus, Wittenb. 1806.

So far were these compulsory measures in the Prussian states from hindering the progress of free thought that even during their continuance the new movement in philosophy and theology was actually gaining ground. This result was due to the philosophy of Immanuel Kant, which, after the year 1790, began to exert a more general and predominant influence. He examined more carefully than any of his predecessors the grounds of religious belief, as well as the grounds of morality, overthrew the prevalent eudaemonism in ethics, and represented morality as governed by the dictates of the practical reason, which of itself, without any external reference to happiness, requires obedience. But since we possess the desire for happiness, and this as a matter of right is connected with virtue, we are compelled to assume a harmony between morality and happiness. This we can do only upon the assumption that there is a God and an eternal life. Both of these truths must be accepted as postulates of the practical reason. Accordingly, religion is founded upon morality; but the latter receives from the former the dignity of a divine enactment. But the supreme arbiter, even in matters of belief, is the practical reason, and the value of religious belief is to be determined solely by its connection with morality or the law of the practical reason. In accordance with these principles, Kant now made public his work Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, 1793—a critical examination of the Christian revelation, in which he followed a method entirely new, and gave a new direction to theology. He left the question undecided whether there is a supernatural or superrational revelation, since reason affords no decisive grounds upon which to base a conclusion. He rejected all dogmatical knowledge, from which only fanaticism and superstition could result, and made the real core and essence of a revealed faith to consist in the pure ethical belief of religion, which must be the source and end of a revelation.

This conception of revelation he called Rationalism, and was accordingly the author of an expression which, afterward used vol. v.—21
in a much broader sense, designated that theological view which makes the reason the supreme arbiter in matters of faith.

In this work Kant reviewed the Church system, extracting from the doctrines their ethical contents, and passing judgment upon their value accordingly. He did not, however, always enter into an analysis of the doctrines in their historical form; but often took them as symbols of moral ideas, and by his ethical construction not unfrequently imposed an entirely new meaning upon them. Accordingly, he made the doctrine of the Church merely a symbolical representation of the new religion of reason.

He admitted that these doctrines as a system did not have the meaning which he found in them; but he asserted that they included this moral sense also; that it constituted their chief merit; and that it was because they contained it that they had made so deep an impression upon the minds of men, and had found such general acceptance.

In connection with this theory, Kant called for an ethical interpretation of the Scriptures. While admitting that the Church required a statutory law based upon divine revelation, and that such a law could only be preserved by a Holy Writ, he demanded, on the other hand, that the Scriptures should always be interpreted in a sense agreeable to the dictates of the practical reason. He did not wish to have this ethical interpretation substituted for the historical explanation of the Scriptures, as has been often erroneously supposed; but to have it regarded as something higher, and only applicable to the Bible so far as its contents are divine.

Kant's work produced a profound sensation, but met with quite as much opposition as approval. Among the theologians who, to a greater or less extent, adopted Kant's ideas, and, after his example, endeavored to rationalize the Church system, the most noted were, Johann Heinrich Tieftrunk, professor of philosophy at Halle; Christoph Friedrich Ammon, professor of theology at Göttingen, afterward at Erlangen, finally chief court-chaplain at Dresden; Johann Wilhelm Schmid, professor of theology

1 The Word, which was in the beginning with God, is the ideal of ethical humanity.
3 Entwurf einer wissenschaftlich pract. Theologie, Göttingen, 1797.
The philosophy of Kant did not, however, permanently maintain this influence in theology. Its own supporters, particularly Ammon and Staudlin, afterward abandoned it. The ethical interpretation was assailed by others on account of its arbitrary character, and was soon generally regarded as untenable.

The more recent philosophical systems have also had an influence upon dogmatics: the philosophy of Schelling, which guided Carl Daub in his speculations; the system of Johann Friedrich Fries, which De Wette followed. Hegel also exerted a decided influence upon Marheineke's Dogmatics and Schleiermacher upon Twesten.

Another series of later dogmatists have been less influenced by particular philosophies. They rather unite the historical with the philosophical method. They attempt to discover historically what originally constituted the essence of the teaching of Jesus, how it was understood and reproduced by the Apostles, and by rational criticism seek to separate the permanently true from the temporary and local.

Thus Jacob Christoph Rudolph Eckermann, ecclesiastical counselor, and professor of theology at Kiel; Heinrich Philipp Conrad Henke, professor of theology at Helmstedt, and abbot of Königslutter (d. 1809); Julius August Ludwig Wegscheider.

On the other hand, other dogmatic theologians adhered to and defended the old system. Among these were Gottlob Christian Storr, professor at Tübingen, afterward chief court-chaplain at Stuttgart (d. 1805); Franz Volkmar Reinhard, chief court-
chaplain at Dresden (d. 1812). Augusti, professor and member of the supreme consistory at Bonn. Carl Gottlieb Bretschneider, member of the supreme consistory at Gotha.

§ 54.

THE OTHER THEOLOGICAL SCIENCES.

In this modern period after Semler, all the theological sciences were so far revised and enriched by numerous contributions as to receive an entirely new form. The emancipation from the restraints of the old scholastic theology was everywhere conducive to free, impartial investigation; and although in the mass of new productions there is much to be found which is superficial, indiscreet, and untenable, the modern period has contributed many important discoveries of permanent value.

In the department of Biblical literature may be mentioned Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, professor at Jena, afterward at Göttingen. His Introduction to the Old Testament is the first historico-critical treatment of this science, but is not free from untenable hypotheses.

Johann Jacob Griesbach, professor at Jena (d. 1812), labored in the department of New Testament criticism. He was the first to avail himself of all the rich material extant to furnish a complete criticism of the New Testament.

Numerous separate contributions were made to the interpretation of the Old Testament. The following were eminent commentators: Johann Christoph Doederlein, Wilhelm Gesenius, professor at Halle; Ernst Friedrich Carl Rosenmüller, professor of Oriental Literature at Leipsic.

13 Vorlesungen über die Dogmatik, 1801.
1 1780, 3 vols.
6 Scholia in Vet. Test. 7 vols., more a compilation.
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Distinguished as New Testament commentators are: Johann Benjamin Koppe, professor of theology at Göttingen, afterward superintendent-general at Gotha, finally court-chaplain and member of the consistory at Hanover (d. 1791).\(^7\)  
Julius Pott, professor at Göttingen, previously at Helmstedt.\(^8\)  
Samuel Friedrich Nathanael Morus (d. 1792).\(^9\)  
Johann August Nösselt, professor of theology at Halle (d. 1807).\(^10\)  
Georg Christian Knapp (d. October 14, 1825).\(^11\)  
Heinrich Eberhard Gottlob Paulus, professor at Heidelberg, previously at Jena and Würzburg.\(^12\)  
Christian Gottlieb Kuinoel, professor at Giessen.\(^13\)

The following are distinguished as writers on Church history: Christian Wilhelm Franz Walch, professor at Göttingen (d. 1784), eminent for his thorough and impartial research.\(^14\)  
Johann Andreas Cramer, chancellor and professor of theology at Kiel (d. 1788).\(^15\)  
Johann Matthäus Schroeckh, professor of history at Wittenberg (d. 1808).\(^16\)  
Ludwig Timotheus Spittler, previously professor of history at Göttingen, afterward minister of state in Württemberg (d. 1810).\(^17\)  
Gottlieb Jacob Planck, member of the consistory and professor of theology at Göttingen.\(^18\)  


\(^8\) He furnished Vol. IX. of the above work, Epist. Cathol. more distinguished than the other continuations.

\(^9\) Valuable exegetical treatises in his Dissert. Theol. et Philolog. 2 vols. 1787. After his death many of his exegetical lectures were published by his pupils—not equal in value.


\(^12\) Philol. krit. und histror. Comm. über das Neue Test. 4 vols. 1804—very valuable on account of numerous historical disquisitions inserted in it.

\(^13\) Comm. in Libr. Novi Test. Histor. 4 vols. 1807-1818—is a compilation.


\(^15\) Continuation of Bossuet's Introduction to the Universal History of the World, 7 vols. 1757-1786—especially valuable for the history of the scholastics.


\(^17\) Grundriss der Geschichte der christl. Kirche, 1782—an admirable summary; he also carefully investigated particular portions of Church history in several smaller works: the History of the Spanish Inquisition; of the Cap in the Lord's Supper; of Canon Law down to Pseudo-Isidor.

Ernst Christian Schmidt, professor at Giessen. August Neander, professor at Berlin.

The department of ethics was cultivated by Reinhard, Ammon, Stäudlin, and De Wette.


APPENDIX.

THE SWEDENBORGIANS.

Herder’s Werke, ix. 478.—Möhler’s Symbolik.

While events were preparing for the better period of theology in the Lutheran Church, Emanuel Swedenborg revived in Sweden the old theosophical fanaticism, and became the founder of a sect which has maintained itself until the present time. He was the son of a bishop of West Gothland, and was well acquainted with the natural sciences, especially chemistry and metallurgy; but was carried away by mystical opinions respecting the correspondence of the spiritual and physical worlds, after the manner of Jacob Böhme, and after the year 1743 began to have divine revelations, and to hold communication with spirits and angels. He constructed a strange system of fanatical theology, and found many followers. His desire was to found a Church of the New Jerusalem, and he hoped that this would soon extend over the whole world. In England, especially, he met with great
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success. He died in London in 1772. The Swedenborgian Theosophic Society in England, and the so-called Exegetical Philanthropic Society in Sweden, still maintain themselves, and form the first germs of the future Church of the New Jerusalem. They have many peculiarities both in theology and Church government.¹

SECOND CHAPTER.

EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANTS IN GERMANY.

§ 55.

THE PERSECUTION OF THE PROTESTANTS IN THE PALATINATE.

Notwithstanding the Peace of Westphalia, which so solemnly guaranteed toleration to the Protestants after the normal year 1624, they were, even until recent times, subjected in many countries to much oppression from their Catholic rulers. This was particularly the case in the Palatinate, which from the days of the Reformation had been entirely Protestant.

The line of Reformed electors became extinct with the Elector Carl in 1685, and the Catholic house of Pfalz-Neuburg obtained the government. Louis XIV. also laid claim to several portions of this country, and a war arose in consequence, in the course of which the Lower Palatinate was overrun by the French, the Protestant worship broken up, and the churches given over to the Catholic priests. Finally, in the Treaty of Ryswick (1697), Louis XIV. obtained by menaces a stipulation that, in the portions of the country which the French were about to evacuate, the Catholic religion should be maintained in the condition in

which it was at that time. When the Catholic electors were once more in undisturbed possession of the country, they availed themselves, at the instigation of the Jesuits, of this stipulation to permanently restrict the exercise of the Protestant religion. The Prussian Court, it is true, extorted an agreement (the *Interims-Religionsdeclaration*), in 1705, by which the Elector promised to allow his subjects the fullest religious freedom. But neither was this agreement long observed, nor did the subsequent remonstrances of Protestant princes, and even the commands of the Emperor, secure any permanent relief for the subjects of the Palatinate.

At the Congress of Baden, in 1714, the Protestant Estates urgently demanded the repeal of the stipulation. The French envoys refused to accede to this demand. The Pope, as it appeared, had charged the King's confessor, Letellier, by a rescript, in 1712, to dissuade Louis from yielding to the requests of the Protestants.¹ The Protestant princes accordingly protested against the Peace of Baden.

The electors endeavored to secure the general introduction of an arrangement (*simultaneum*) by which the possession of the churches should be divided between the three religious confessions. The Lutherans, who, under the earlier Reformed electors had been without churches in many places, were at first well satisfied with this arrangement, and thanked the electors for it. But it soon appeared that this measure was really in the interests of the Catholics, its sole object being to foster disagreement between the Reformed and Lutherans. A large portion of the Church property was given to the Catholics. The Jesuits found their way into the Reformed National University of Heidelberg and obtained possession of several of the professorships. In mixed marriages it was required that the children should become Catholics; the Protestants were obliged to join in the celebration of Catholic festivals and the like. During the continuance of the houses of Pfalz-Neuburg and Pfalz-Sulzbach, until the death of Carl Theodor, in 1799, these oppressions were kept up under various forms. Inasmuch as even earlier there had been reason to apprehend the extinction of these houses, the electors

¹ It has, however, recently come to light that the Pope took this course with reference to the King of France only at the express request of the Court of Vienna. For the correspondence on this subject, see Koch, *Recueil des Traité*, i. 269; Schoell, in Koch's Hist. Abr. des Traité* des Paix*, ii. 152.*
made every effort to bring over the house of Pfalz-Zweibrücken, which was next in the line of succession, to the Catholic Church. They finally succeeded in securing Prince Frederic (1746). The first elector of this house was Maximilian Joseph, who, however, immediately deserted the principles of his ancestors, and by legal enactment granted the Protestants universal toleration not only in the Palatinate, but also in Bavaria.

Accordingly, in 1801, the first evangelical citizen was admitted in Munich, notwithstanding the excitement which the event produced in that place. In consequence of the changes which afterward took place, the Palatinate has fallen to Baden, and thus again come into the possession of a Protestant sovereign.

§ 56.

IN SALZBURG.

As far back as the days of the Hussites, and more especially since the time of Luther, there had been in Salzburg, particularly among the mountaineers, many secret adherents of the evangelical doctrines, who, however, did not dare to express their opinions publicly, and consequently had no uniform doctrinal system. Many of them had received but little instruction, and they agreed only in their contempt for the Catholic worship and in their practice of secretly reading the Bible and certain Protestant devotional books, particularly Luther's Domestic Sermons (Hauspostillen). At the same time, for the sake of peace, they outwardly conformed to the Catholic practices. These secret Protestants had before this period been from time to time discovered, and on several occasions many of them had been ban-

---

1 Papal rescript to the Elector, February 12, 1803, in Müller's encyclopä. Handbuch des Kirchenrechts, i. 190.
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ished. This had been the case shortly before the Thirty Years' War, and in the year 1684.

A more serious persecution, however, was commenced in the year 1729 by the Archbishop Leopold Anton, Count of Firmian. He first sent around a band of Jesuits to search out the secret Protestants. They were discovered by their private gatherings for prayer, their Protestant devotional books, and especially by their neglect to employ the salutation which had shortly before been recommended by the Pope, and to which an indulgence was attached. When the demand was made that they should deliver up their books and abjure their opinions, it caused serious disturbances in several places. The Archbishop made this a pretext for treating the Protestants as insurgents. He had a great number of them imprisoned, and called upon the Emperor for military assistance. The \textit{corpus evangelicorum} for a long time remonstrated without success, and insisted upon a legal investigation of the alleged civil offenses, which, however, was never instituted. Finally, a decree was published (October 31, 1731) requiring all the Protestant inhabitants, under severe penalties, to immediately leave the country. The unfortunate people, who could not in so short a time dispose of their property were mercilessly expelled in the midst of winter. They numbered about 22,000—a tenth of the whole population.

The Protestant powers zealously espoused the cause of these persecuted people. Frederic William I., in particular, immediately received a large portion of them (about 17,000), supplied their necessities, and allowed them to settle in Prussian Lithuania, and some other districts in Prussia which had been depopulated by an epidemic (1709). Others went to South Carolina, in North America, and there, under the protection of the King of England, founded the town of Ebenezer.

The example of the Archbishop of Salzburg was immediately followed by the Prince-prior of Berchtolsgaden (1733), who also had many secret Protestants in his country. They found refuge in Berlin and in several cities of Hanover, where their artistic skill made them a welcome accession.\footnote{1 \textquoteleft Gelobt sei Jesus Christus\textquoteright—\textquoteleft in Ewigkeit. Amen.\textquoteright} \footnote{2 J. J. Moser, \textit{Actenmüssiger Bericht von der jetztmaligen schweren Verfolgung der Evangelischen im Erzstift Salzburg}, 1732. From the Salzburg side, however, they are treated as insurgents: J. B. De Caspari, \textit{Actenmäss. Gesch. der berühmten Salzburger Emigration}, aus dem Lat. MS. von Huber, Salzburg, 1790. Zau-
§ 57.

IN THE AUSTRIAN COUNTRIES.

In the German states of Austria the Protestants had not even been included in the Peace of Westphalia, and the government would grant them absolutely no toleration. When the secret Protestants in the neighboring country of Salzburg had been discovered and compelled to emigrate, the Austrian Protestants began also to feel a desire for religious liberty; but they were not allowed to leave the country of their own accord. From time to time, however, numbers of them were transported to Transylvania, where the majority of the inhabitants were already Protestants. At last Joseph II., by the Edict of Toleration in 1781, permitted them, under certain restrictions, to form congregations, and many were established in Carniola, Carinthia, Upper Austria, and even at Vienna.

In Silesia the principles of the Reformation had been very generally diffused, particularly in Lower Silesia. Religious liberty had been expressly guaranteed to this country by the Peace of Westphalia. Nevertheless, it was not long before oppressive measures began to be adopted. The Protestants were deprived of most of their churches; numerous laws were enacted to their disadvantage; and the Catholic clergy, particularly the Jesuits, exerted themselves to the utmost to convert them. Charles XII. of Sweden, it is true, by the Treaty of Altranstadt (1707), obliged the Emperor to restore the religious affairs of the country to the condition contemplated by the Peace of Westphalia, and thus for a time put a stop to these oppressive measures. But not long afterward they were resumed and continued until in 1742 the whole of Lower Silesia was ceded by the Treaty of Breslau to Prussia.¹

In Hungary complete religious liberty had been guaranteed to the Protestants by formal treaties, particularly by the peace of Vienna (1606), and that of Linz (1647). Nevertheless, the rude, intolerant Hungarian clergy, who exerted a great influence over certain officials of high rank, found innumerable ways of oppressing the Protestants by depriving them of their churches, restricting their preachers, enticing individuals into the Catholic Church, etc.

They availed themselves in particular of an insurrection in Hungary in 1671 to accuse the evangelical clergymen of instigating sedition, although it was proved that the ringleaders were Catholics. At the Imperial Diet of Oedenburg in 1681, new articles materially restricting the exercise of the Protestant religion were enacted. And even the meaning of these Oedenburg articles was constantly perverted to obtain pretexts for new oppressions. This state of affairs continued till Joseph II., by his Edict of Toleration, put an end to all these persecutions, with the exception of some lesser annoyances. They were, however, afterward resumed in Hungary. Many new complaints were consequently made to Francis I., but it is not known with how much success.

Already in earlier times every effort had been made to prevent the Protestants in Hungary and the Austrian states from studying in foreign countries. Joseph II. allowed them this privilege; but afterward, in 1820, an evangelical Faculty of Theology was established at Vienna, and all natives were forbidden to attend foreign universities.
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PART FOURTH OF SECOND DIVISION.

HISTORY OF THE REFORMED CHURCH IN ENGLAND.


§ 58.

When Cromwell became Protector of the English republic which was established after the execution of Charles I., he found the ecclesiastical affairs of the nation in the greatest confusion. The Episcopal Church, as well as the Catholic Church, had fallen with the kingdom. But of the parties which had been established in opposition to it, many were to some extent hostile to each other, and of these more and more sprang up during these times of religious excitement, prominent among them the Quakers. The most powerful religious parties of this period were the Presbyterians and the Independents, both of which were ambitious to become the national church. Cromwell, however, although himself an Independent, gave the preference to no particular party, but tolerated all except Episcopalians and Catholics. His son and successor, Richard Cromwell, soon resigned the Protectorate; and Charles II., who had secretly become a Catholic in France, was called to the throne in 1660. He immediately restored the Episcopal Church to its position as Established Church, and at the same time favored the Catholics, but soon began to persecute the other dissenters. He, however, placed so many Catholics in high offices that Parliament, fearing for the safety of the national religion, passed in 1673 the famous Test Act, by which it was enacted that no one not a member of the Episcopal Church could occupy any public office.¹

¹ The founder of the English Unitarians was John Biddle (Bidellus). Erasch, Encycl. x. 101. Tzschirner’s Archiv, iv. 66. Fock, Socinianismus, i. 205.

² [Fletcher’s Hist. of Independents in England, 3 vols. Rev. Thomas Coleman, The Two Thousand Conferences of 1662, 2d ed. 1882; ib. English Conferences after the
After the death of Charles, in 1684, his brother, James II., who openly professed the Catholic faith, and quite as openly avowed his purpose to introduce and disseminate it in England, became king. Accordingly, he began by issuing, in 1687, a declaration of tolerance for all parties. Its object, however, was immediately detected, as it was accompanied by many other measures in the interest of the Catholics. Thereupon his disaffected subjects invited the King's son-in-law, William, Prince of Orange, to come to England. He made his appearance in 1688 with an army. James was compelled to leave the kingdom, and William became King of England. Soon afterward Parliament passed the Toleration Act, granting religious liberty to all the Christian denominations except the Papists and Socinians, although by the Test Act they still continued to be excluded from all public offices. In Scotland, however, the Presbyterian was declared the national Church. Finally, it was enacted by Parliament that no Catholic sovereign could reign over the kingdom. Accordingly, after the death of Queen Anne, the House of Hanover came to the throne (1714). Under this house the ecclesiastical constitution has remained, in general, unchanged, except that the stringency of many of the laws against the Non-Episcopalian was relaxed. The Catholics, whose worship had not hitherto been allowed, and against whom very strict laws existed, were in 1778 placed upon the same footing with the other dissenters and granted the same degree of toleration. Since 1829 they have received additional advantages, although not until after numerous and protracted contests in Parliament.

§ 59.

THE QUAKERS.

Tzschirner's Archiv, ii. 585.

During the agitated times when Charles I. was deposed and the English Republic established, a great number of small sects arose, almost all of which soon disappeared. More successful,
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however, than the rest were the Quakers. In the wide-spread religious fanaticism of the day, it was a common opinion that neither learning nor spiritual office was necessary for the acceptable preaching of the Word, but that all depended upon the gifts of the Spirit. There were accordingly at that time among the Independents and Baptists many gifted brethren who were accustomed to speak in public. Moreover, the excessive importance attached to the externals of worship in the then odious Episcopal Church had brought forms generally into contempt.

Among those who grew up during these times was George Fox, a shoemaker, by nature quiet, reserved, and fond of religious meditation. After having tried in vain to obtain instruction and consolation from others, he discovered that the source of all religious knowledge and all godliness was the Inner Light, which is, indeed, weakened and obscured by error and sin, but which by the help of God can be again developed. The neglect of this Inner Light he charged chiefly to the then existing churches, in which the Gospel was preached merely for the sake of the temporal support it afforded, instead of from the impulse of the Spirit, and had been entirely transformed into a worldly science. After the year 1649 he began to preach in public and to gather a sect about him; but both he and they were not unfrequently subjected to severe punishments on account of the disparaging language which they constantly uttered against Church and clergy. Nevertheless, Fox found many ardent followers, who, with equal enthusiasm, won new Friends, as they called themselves, on every side, until in 1658 their number was already so great that Fox was able to convene at Bedford a general assembly of delegates from the various congregations to discuss a form of government and worship. At first much rude fanaticism made its appearance among the Quakers. They sought opportunity to utter denunciatory messages to all classes of people. They entered the churches during service and interrupted the preachers. Sometimes they ran about naked and announced coming judgments. During the reign of Charles II. this fanaticism gradually disappeared, particularly after numerous men of culture joined the Quakers. Samuel Fisher, George

1 They acquired the name Quakers in the following manner: A magistrate whom Fox addressed with the words "Quake before the Word of the Lord!" first called him and his followers by this nickname. For their explanation, in 1661, Unschuld. Nachr. 1715, p. 423.
Keith, William Penn, and Robert Barclay, particularly the last-named, were chiefly instrumental in reducing their belief to a definite system. William Penn, the son of an admiral, joined the Quakers while still a boy, although his father had recourse to severe measures to induce him to abandon them. Having come into possession of his large fortune, he used a considerable portion of it to obtain for the Friends a secure retreat away from Europe. In payment of a claim which he held against the Crown, he received a tract of country in North America, which was called, after him, Pennsylvania (1681); purchased the land again from the Indians, and settled it for the most part with Quakers, although he granted equal rights to all inhabitants of the new state. The Quakers soon afterward obtained toleration by the Toleration Act of James II. Subsequently they were also exempted from the obligation of taking the formal oath. When Fox died, in 1691 (near London), he left behind a society already numerous, and possessing an external organization which secured its permanent existence.

The doctrines of the Quakers were first scientifically formulated by Robert Barclay (d. 1690), a learned Scotchman. The fundamental principle of their system is the doctrine of the Inner Light, or the Christ in us—an immediate operation of the Divine Spirit upon the soul, through which alone men can be enlightened and sanctified. This Inner Light is the supreme standard of faith, and the sole means of understanding the Holy Scriptures. It is the living original, while the Bible is only a dead copy, which it alone can vivify. It is this inward Christ, who sanctifies and justifies us, and who would do so even if we were ignorant of the objective Christ. Pious heathen even have been visited by this inner Christ and brought to salvation. Accordingly, the Quakers made little of the historical element in Christianity, and usually regarded the history of Jesus as an allegorical representation of the Christ in us. In like manner, they held that the true baptism and the true Lord’s Supper were things merely subjective and spiritual—cleansing from sin, regeneration. The external baptism and Lord’s Supper are only shadows of these higher realities, and, consequently, must cease entirely for those who possess the substance. All externals in

* His principal work is Theologiae vere Christianae Apologia, 1676, 4. Vater’s Anbau, ii. 93.
worship, temples, altars, music, holidays, marriage and funeral services, are superfluous, and founded on superstitious ideas. The Inner Light alone can fit a man to become a true evangelical teacher, and only God himself can therefore train and consecrate true teachers. Consequently, a ministry of human appointment is unnecessary and harmful, and it is a disgrace to preach a prescribed system of doctrine for pay. Learning and eloquence are of no value; their results are human and therefore uncertain; the Spirit speaks simply and without art. Consequently the Quakers have a great aversion to all technical theological terms. The whole system, accordingly, rested upon a few principles which permitted the freest development of subjective piety without restricting it by the obligation of formulas, and was, it must be confessed, especially in the early days of Quakerism, productive of much fanaticism. The religion of the Quakers had always a practical tendency, and was distinguished for its strict moral principles. As its chief aim is to let the Divine Light shine within, all attachment to earthly things must be severed, and all the vanities of the world forsaken. Hence the sober character of the Quakers and their renunciation of amusements, rich dress, fashions, etc. Moreover, since the Divine Light dwells in all men, all are to regard and love each other as equal; and while giving servile reverence to none, at the same time to give no offense.

Accordingly, they uncover the head before none, call each other "thou," and refrain from compliments. They also avoid war and strife, and decline to perform military service. Lastly, they regard oaths as sinful, because all are bound to tell the truth under all circumstances, and an oath implies the creation of a stronger obligation to truthfulness.

On the Continent the Quakers have never obtained any extensive following. Since 1791, however, a Quaker community has been formed in Pyrmont and another in Minden. On the whole, this sect is declining. In England they are diminishing in number, and many no longer observe the old strict rules of the society, but allow themselves certain luxuries.

3 In recent times, however, the practice of allowing all persons without distinction to speak in public has been considerably restricted. Most of the congregations have men who, with no especial distinction, and without leaving their secular vocations, generally perform the preacher's duties.

4 W. Sewel's History of the Origin, Growth, and Progress of the Christian People vol. v.—22
§ 60.

THE METHODISTS.

Herder, x. 206.—Tzschirner's Archiv, iii. 334.

A religious society was subsequently formed which was contemporaneous with, and in its character closely akin to, the Herrnhuters of Germany.

At that time there was a general feeling in England that true piety and morals were declining. Naturalism was becoming increasingly prevalent among the higher classes, and ministered to their immorality. The common people were in a state of extreme religious ignorance. The Episcopal Church, from which most might have been expected, was doing almost nothing to remedy these evils. While the dissenters were noted for their activity and fervor, there was too much formality in the worship of the Episcopalian, and the higher clergy were too indifferent to the duties of their office to accomplish any thing.

A feeling of these deficiencies induced some Oxford students, chief among whom was John Wesley, to form an association in 1729. Their purpose was to read together in the Greek and Latin authors, and also in the New Testament. But the society soon assumed an exclusively religious character. To counteract the influence of unbelief and immorality, to awaken practical Christianity and genuine piety, and, if not successful in their own country, to preach the Gospel to the heathen, were the objects they proposed. While still in Oxford, they began to visit the sick and prisoners. They also held devotional meetings, fasted frequently, and attended the communion every Sunday. One of the numerous nicknames which this society received was that of Methodists, on account of the regularity of their pious exercises, which were called the new method of obtaining salvation. The society, nevertheless, increased in numbers, and, in 1734, received an important accession in the person of George Whitefield, who was afterward regarded as their second founder.

It was he who, after Wesley had gone to America as a mis-called Quakers, transl. into German, 1742. W. Penn's Brief Account of the Christian Society of Friends called Quakers, transl. by Ludwig Seebohm, Pyrmont, 1792. By Non-Quakers: Gerhard Croese (a Dutch clergyman), Historia Quakeriana, Amstel, 1695. Georg Wilh. Aliberti, Aufricht. Nachricht von der Religion, Gottesdienst, Sitten und Gebräuchen der Quaker, Hannover, 1750.
sionary in 1735, first appeared among the people as a revival preacher. His fervid eloquence everywhere produced the profoundest impression, and Methodism spread extensively among the masses. Meanwhile, Wesley had returned from America; and, while in England, made the acquaintance of the Herrnhuters, in whom he found, as he believed, the same spirit and aims, and whom he honored as the only true Christians remaining in the world. He accordingly went to Germany, where he visited Count Zinzendorf and the various settlements of the Brethren. Afterward, however, Wesley had a disagreement with Zinzendorf, because the latter taught that Christians were not bound by the law; that they might be conformed to the world, etc. Wesley censured him especially for not maintaining strict principles respecting the duty of truthfulness. After his return from Germany, he preached extensively in England, and sent out pious laymen as itinerant preachers to carry on the work in the provinces. As the Episcopal churches were soon closed against him and his assistants, they preached in the open air, often to many thousands. The chief subjects of Wesley’s preaching were the moral corruption of men, the merits of Christ, the grace of God in Christ, and justification by faith. He taught that the divine grace often comes upon the unconverted so instantaneously and powerfully that they are immediately transformed, converted, and enlightened. These representations produced such an effect upon his hearers that it was not uncommon, while he was preaching, for many to cry aloud, fall to the earth in convulsions, and then declare that they felt themselves converted and forgiven. The Methodists called this the “getting grace,” and it was a part of their belief that it could be distinctly recognized and felt.

In the year 1741, a controversy arose between the two leaders of the Methodists, Wesley and Whitefield. Whitefield, like Calvin, taught the doctrine of unconditional election, while Wesley held the grace of God to be universal. A correspondence between the two ensued which was, it is true, conducted with calmness and propriety, but resulted in a division of the Methodists. The Wesleyan or Arminian Methodists have always been far more numerous and successful than the Calvinistic. Wesley, who was honored as a patriarch by his followers, spent the remainder of his long life (d. 1791) in the work of organizing the rapidly increasing society. He was as little desirous of separating
from the Episcopal Church as Zinzendorf from the Lutheran, and maintained that his only wish was to revive genuine Christian life in the Established Church. The Methodists are, however, regarded as dissenters in England.

The organization of the Methodist Church is a combination of Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Moravian characteristics. The preachers are partly local and partly itinerant. The former are pious laymen who are gifted in exhortation. The true clergymen are the itinerant preachers, who go from place to place to visit the congregations and to propagate Methodism. The whole Church is subject to the direction of the conference, which meets annually in one of the larger English cities, and is composed of preachers exclusively. At present there are few towns in England where there is not a Methodist chapel, which is attended not only by Methodists, but largely by others who find here a more genuine religious life than in the forms of the Episcopal Church. Methodism has thus had a very beneficial effect in diffusing piety and morality, especially among the lower classes of the people.¹

§ 61.
THEOLOGICAL LEARNING IN ENGLAND.

During the first half of this period, valuable contributions were made to the theological sciences in England, especially in the departments of Biblical literature and Church history. Much less can be said of dogmatic theology. During the whole period the English literature has no comprehensive work to show upon that subject.

Just at the beginning of the period a work of great importance in this department appeared, the London Polyglot, 1653–1657, 6 vols., fol., which, in addition to the texts of the Paris Polyglot, furnished several others, and appended lists of various readings. The principal undertaker of this work, in which he was, how-

ever, assisted by other English scholars, was Brian Walton, previously chaplain of Charles I., who underwent many hardships during the Civil War, but was made Bishop of Chester by Charles II. (d. 1661). He was also the author of the Apparatus prefixed to the work—a general introduction, which has since been published by itself.  

This undertaking was immediately followed by another compilation of the most important commentaries on all the texts of the Bible. It was prepared by John Pearson, Bishop of Chester (d. 1686), with the help of three other scholars. Its greatest fault is that it contains the writings of many second-rate exegetes without abridgment, and is consequently extremely repetitious.

For this reason another collection, arranged upon a more convenient plan, was soon afterward made by Matthew Polus, a Presbyterian clergyman, who, like many others, was deposed under Charles II., and afterward died at Amsterdam, 1679.

The following English theologians are distinguished for their valuable services in the department of Biblical literature: John Lightfoot, professor of theology, and vice-chancellor at Cambridge (d. 1675), an eminent connoisseur in Jewish literature, who was the first to make use of the Talmud and the rabbinical writings in the interpretation of the New Testament. Humphrey Hody, professor of Greek, and archdeacon at Oxford (d. 1706). John Mill, professor of theology at Oxford (d. 1707), distinguished in New Testament criticism.

Among the various kinds of expository works, the paraphrases were extremely popular in England, and a great number were published. First in the series of English paraphrasts stands Henry Hammond, chaplain of Charles I., who was twice impris-
on account of his adherence to the royal cause (d. 1660); then John Locke, the celebrated philosopher (d. 1704). His paraphrases were so popular in England that they were continued by James Pierce, a nonconformist clergyman, and George Benson, a Presbyterian minister, and carried through all the epistles.

The most eminent of these paraphrusters was Samuel Clarke, chaplain of Queen Anne (d. 1729). He was well acquainted with the ancient literature, as is shown by his edition of Homer. His paraphrases of the Four Gospels (1701) manifested, in addition to his thorough knowledge of the language, an accurate exegetical taste.

History and Hebrew archaeology were cultivated by John Selden, a barrister in London (d. 1654); John Spencer, canon at Cambridge (d. 1693); and Humphrey Prideaux, Dean of Norwich (d. 1724).

In Church history, also, valuable work was done during this period in England. Noted in this department were James Usher, Archbishop of Armagh, in Ireland (d. 1655); John Pearson, Bishop of Chester; Henry Dodwell, an Irishman, from 1688 professor of history at Oxford (he was one of the Episcopalians who refused to take the oath of allegiance to the new king, William III., on the ground that James II. was still the rightful sov-

---

7 His English Paraphrase with Notes (1638) was translated into Latin by Clericus, and is made still more valuable by the observations of the latter.
8 His paraphrases and notes on the Epistles to the Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, and Ephesians are not remarkable philologically, but he succeeded in developing Paul’s mode of thought and sequence of ideas very happily.
9 They are also, for the most part, translated into German.
10 De Diis Syris; De Synedriis Veterum Hebraeorum.
11 His work De Legibus Hebraeorum Ritualibus is the first purely historical examination of the rites of the Hebrews. Previously, they had all been regarded as profound mysteries, and particularly as typical allusions to the Messiah. He showed their purpose historically, and proved that Moses had borrowed many customs from the heathen. This valuable work was for a long time very offensive to the theologians, and was frequently assailed; but at last its merit was recognized.
13 Annales Cypriani, Opera Posthuma, edited by Dodwell, Lond. 1688. 4.—of which the most valuable are Annales Paulini and Dissertationes Duas de Serie et Successione Primorum Romae Episcoporum.
ereign, and was for that reason deprived of his position) (d. 1711); William Cave, Canon in Windsor (d. 1713); Joseph Bingham, a clergyman near Portsmouth (d. 1723).

Meanwhile, the more liberal opinions respecting the theological system of the Church, the adherents of which had been called as early as the previous period *Latitudinarians*, had become increasingly prevalent in the Established Church. Even those doctrines hitherto regarded as essential were one after another assailed, and the way was prepared in England for that revolution in theology which was afterward completed in Protestant Germany. A remarkable exponent of this tendency was Daniel Whitby, a clergyman of Salisbury (d. 1726). He disputed the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin and the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination. Shortly before his death, he went over to Arianism, defending it in a work which was published afterward.

Samuel Clarke is noted for his doctrine respecting the Trinity, which was regarded as semi-Arianism. He differed from the received theology in assuming a subordination of the Three Persons. He declared that the Three are alike eternal, but that the Father alone is undervived, while the Son and Spirit receive their being and attributes from the Father. His work caused at the time great excitement. Clarke lost his position as court chaplain on account of it, and many writings appeared against him. Nevertheless, the so-called New Arianism steadily gained ground in the churches of England.

Another who did much to bring about this result, and was also noted for other singular opinions, was William Whiston. He had studied philosophy and mathematics under Newton, and

---

16 His *Dissertationes in Irenacum and in Cyprianum* are valuable, though at times they go too far in defense of untenable hypotheses. Not long before his death, his excessive regard for the genuine Episcopal Church led him to adopt the strange theory that the soul is by nature perishable, and that only a true baptism can give it immortality. But this true baptism is that only which is administered by a true Episcopal priest.

17 *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Historia Literaria. Primitive Christianity, or the Religion and Customs of the Early Christians. Also German.*


19 In the work *De Imputatione Peccati Adami* (republished by Semler, 1775).

20 In his *Scriptural Doctrine of the Trinity, 1713.* German, with an introduction, by Semler, 1774.
had already distinguished himself by daring speculations in these sciences before he received his pastoral charge in Suffolk. There he soon began to preach against the commonly accepted doctrine of the Trinity, and to defend Arianism as the original doctrine of Jesus; for which reason he too was deposed in 1709. He now wrote his work Primitive Christianity Revived, having found primitive Christianity, as he asserted, chiefly in the Epistles of Ignatius and the Apostolic Constitutions. He also maintained some other extremely peculiar opinions. He charged the Jews with having falsified many of the prophecies in the Old Testament respecting Christ, and proposed to restore the correct text from the writings of Josephus, Philo, and the New Testament. He announced the speedy coming of Christ, etc. Finally he became a Baptist (d. 1752).

Arthur Sykes, a clergyman in London (d. 1756), endeavored, in a work written in 1737, to prove that the demoniacs of the New Testament were afflicted with natural diseases, particularly with epilepsy. A number of works appeared on both sides of the question, and several English scholars of distinction, among them Nathaniel Lardner, declared their agreement with Sykes. The most thorough discussion of this side was by Hugh Farmer, a Presbyterian clergyman (d. 1787).

In recent times, theology has been less cultivated in England. In the department of Biblical literature, however, important services have been rendered by Robert Lowth, professor at Oxford, afterward Bishop of London (d. 1787), and Benjamin Kennicott, professor at Oxford (d. 1783); Robert Holmes, also professor at Oxford (d. 1806); and Herbert Marsh, professor at Cambridge, afterward bishop.

Church history was almost exclusively confined to the history of the Church in Great Britain, to which, however, many valua-

---

21 In 1711, 5 vols. 8.
22 In the Essay on the Demoniacs of the New Testament. Also German.
23 In his work De Sacra Poësi Hebraeorum he gave the first thorough analysis of the genius of Hebrew poetry, and demonstrated its aesthetic merit. In his Translation of Isaiah, with Notes (Germ. by Koppe), he applied the principles advanced in the former work, and explained Isaiah chiefly from the aesthetic side.
24 Noted for the extensive collation of manuscripts which he made for the correction of the Hebrew text, and his large edition of the Old Test. 1776, 1780, 2 vols. fol.
25 He projected a similar collation of manuscripts for the LXX., which appeared after 1798.
26 Notes and Additions to Michaelis's Introduction to the New Test. (translated by Rosenmüller).
ble contributions were made. A work of great merit is the Credibility of the Gospel History, by Nathaniel Lardner (clergyman, d. 1768).

Among pulpit orators England can boast several of distinction. The first to excel in this department was John Tillotson, Archbishop of Canterbury (d. 1694). His sermons have been often printed, and have done much to awaken a better taste. Among the later pulpit orators, the most noted are Hugh Blair, professor of rhetoric, and Presbyterian clergyman at Edinburgh (d. 1800), and Lawrence Sterne, also a popular author, the most distinguished preacher among the Episcopalians.

For the most part, the preachers among the dissenters excel those of the Established Church in earnestness, fervor, and true eloquence. This is largely due to the fact that the latter usually read their sermons (and in many cases out of printed books), so that real eloquence can not develop itself among them.

27 Translated by Sack and Schleiermacher, 5 vols.; see Ersch, Encycl. x. 304.
PART FIFTH OF SECOND DIVISION.

HISTORY OF THE REFORMED CHURCHES IN FRANCE, HOLLAND, AND SWITZERLAND.

§ 62.

EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE REFORMED IN FRANCE.


Under the administrations of Richelieu and Mazarin, the toleration promised to the Reformed in the Edict of Nantes was for the most part accorded, although in particular cases it was from time to time infringed upon, and they were annoyed by constant efforts for their conversion. This was also the condition of affairs when, after the death of Mazarin, in 1661, Louis XIV. himself undertook the management of the government. By degrees, however, a party extremely hostile to the Protestants obtained a predominant influence over Louis. The King was as superstitious as he was dissolute, and his pious devotion to the Church increased every year without any corresponding improvement in his morals. He endeavored to atone for his vices by confession and good works, and in this way he came completely under the influence of his confessor, the wily Jesuit La Chaise. The minister of war, the Marquis De Louvois, made common cause with the latter; and even the King's mistress, Madame de Maintenon, although previously a Protestant, entered into their schemes. It was easy to persuade the King that the most glorious and pious work which he could perform was the extirpation of heresy in France, the only difficulty being that he was too good-natured to consent immediately to forcible measures. He at first allotted large sums of money to be used in bribing the Reformed to return to the Catholic Church. This method was
successful with many of the common people. Long lists of converts were now laid before the King, and he was led to believe that the majority of the Reformed had either come over, or else could easily be persuaded to take that step. In order to hasten this result, the King by degrees caused severer measures to be employed. The Protestants were deprived of their churches, excluded from all offices, little children were enticed from their parents, and the like. These measures were taken especially after the year 1681, and chiefly at the instigation of Louvois. The most infamous were the so-called dragonnades (dragoon conversions). The King was induced to send dragoons into the provinces, where the Reformed were numerous, and compel the latter to bear the whole burden of quartering them. Louvois took care that the Protestants should be subjected to all kinds of annoyance from the soldiers, even to bodily ill-treatment. The result was an increase in the number of outward conversions; but all the greater was the inward discontent of those who were thus forced into Catholicism. It soon became necessary to employ the death-penalty against the relapsi. Obstinate Reformed Protestants, too, were executed or condemned to the galleys. Invitations came to the Reformed from England, Denmark, and Holland, to emigrate to those countries, whereupon Louvois stationed troops along the frontiers. Nevertheless, in the first three years, 50,000 families succeeded in escaping from France. Finally, on October 17, 1685, the Edict of Nantes, which had for a long time been practically annulled, was formally revoked, the Reformed worship prohibited under severe penalties, the clergymen banished, and the churches demolished. Although all who remained were forbidden to leave the country, the emigration nevertheless secretly continued. The refugees, numbering in the aggregate from five to six hundred thousand, found a cordial welcome in Switzerland, Holland, England, Protestant Germany, and par-


particularly the states of Brandenburg; and, as there were many intelligent men among them—scholars, artists, and mechanics—they every where amply repaid the kindness of their reception. After the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the contumacious Reformed Protestants in France were bitterly persecuted. Imprisonment, servitude in the galleys, and capital punishment were alternately employed against them. Nevertheless many remained steadfast, and held their meetings in forests and wildernesses.

In the mountain regions of the Cevennes, in Languedoc, events took a different course. These districts were occupied by the descendants of the old Waldenses, who still continued to differ from the Reformed in various particulars. It was now proposed to bring them also, by similar means, back to the Catholic Church. These rude mountaineers had always been inclined to fanaticism and religious extravagance, and the constant persecutions increased this tendency to a fearful extent. Prophets and miracle-workers appeared among them, and finally a terrible conflict, which involved these regions in all the horrors of a religious war, broke out between the mountaineers and the royal troops. Louis was just at that time occupied with the Spanish war of succession, and so bravely and skillfully was the contest carried on by the Camisards (as they were called from their short coats, *camise* or *chemise*), that he was compelled in 1706 to accede to a peace, by which amnesty was granted to all, and the leaders were permitted to withdraw from the country. Some of the emigrants, under the name of the Cevennes Prophets, caused a great sensation in England, Holland, and Protestant Germany by their prophecies and pretended miracles, and deceived many weak-minded people.

After the reign of Louis XIV. the condition of the Protestants in France was extremely unsettled. The laws which had been enacted against them were not revoked, but it depended upon the disposition of the provincial magistrates whether they were more or less strictly enforced. After 1743 the Protestants were

---


permitted to meet together without interference outside of the cities, and their clergymen were no longer persecuted, although the law still condemned them to the halter. They were, however, subjected to many hardships. Their marriages, for example, the so-called *mariages du désert* (because they were consecrated in the wilderness), were legally void, and the children considered illegitimate. Consequently, the Catholic collateral relatives of these children were able, whenever they pleased, to deprive them of their inheritances. Nor was this period free from scenes of bloodshed. The last was the execution of Jean Calas, in 1761, at Toulouse. He was a feeble old man who was accused of having hanged his son because the latter had wished to enter the Catholic Church. Voltaire publicly exposed the crying injustice of this procedure, and soon after confirmed the more moderate sentiments which were beginning to prevail with reference to the Protestants. The government itself was now disposed to treat them with more leniency, and was only prevented by the vehement protestations of the clergy from doing more at first than to favor the indulgence to the Protestants. Finally, on January 29, 1788, a royal edict was issued granting them toleration, although only under certain limitations. They were allowed to engage in trade, their marriages were declared valid, and they were permitted to have their children baptized by their own clergymen. All public offices, however, remained closed to them. But during the Revolution they were placed upon terms of religious equality with the Catholics. This privilege was left undisturbed under Bonaparte, who provided for the Protestant worship as well as for the Catholic; gave the Protestants churches, assisted them in building new ones, and granted their clergymen the same support from the public treasury as was given to the Catholics.

5 By his *Traité sur la Tolérance*. [Jean Calas et sa Famille: Étude Hist. d’après les Documents, par Athanase Coquerel, Paris, 1858.]


7 *Annuaire*, p. 355, 409.

§ 63.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY IN THE FRENCH REFORMED CHURCH.

[A. Vinet, Hist. de la Prédication parmi les Réformés au 17ième Siècle, Paris, 1860. Vinet gives account of ten preachers: Du Moulin (who was an advocate for union, and went to England by invitation of James I. in 1615) published ten decades of sermons and sixty controversial treatises; Le Faucheur, eight volumes of sermons and twelve treatises; Mestrezat, several volumes of sermons and twenty treatises; Daillé, twenty volumes of sermons and thirty-five treatises; Amyrault; Gachez, one volume of sermons; Claude, three large volumes and nineteen detached sermons; Du Bosc, next to Claude in ability, and the first complete orator, seven volumes of sermons (rare); Superville, five volumes of sermons; Saurin, ten volumes of sermons and two treatises.]

The French Reformed Church, until it was forcibly suppressed by Louis XIV., always contained numerous learned theologians, who rendered valuable services in the cause of science. The following were distinguished at the beginning of this period: Samuel Bochart, preacher at Caen (d. 1667), a man of extraordinary learning, particularly in Biblical literature; John Daillé or Dallaeus, pastor of the congregation at Charenton, near Paris (d. 1670), an eminent scholar in the department of Church history. Although all his historical works are directed against particular errors of the Catholic Church, they are of great value on account of their profound and impartial research.¹

It has been already remarked that at an early period the French Reformed Protestants departed from the strict theology of Calvin. Moses Amyraldus (Amyrault), for example, taught in Saumur the universalismus hypotheticus. Claude Pajon, professor of theology at Saumur, deviated still more from Calvinism. He ascribed an important part in conversion to the human free-will, and was for this reason decried by many, particularly by the rigid Hollanders, as an Arminian and Pelagian. He therefore resigned his professorship and became a pastor at Orleans (d. 1685). He had many supporters among the French Reformed clergymen. The Hollanders stigmatized his doctrines as a peculiar heresy, and the exiled French preachers who came to Hol-

¹ His principal works are Phaleg et Canaan., and Hierozoicon de Animalibus S. Scripturae.
² De Pseudepigraphis Apostolicis; De la Créance des Pères sur le Fait des Images; De Poenis et Satisfactionibus Humanis; De Jejunibus et Quadragesimis; De Confirmatione et Extrema Unctione; De Auriculari Confessione; De Scriptis quae sub Dionysii Areopag. et Sancti Ignatii Nominibus Circumfertuntur; De Cultibus Religiosis Latinorum Libri IX.
land were compelled to give an express assurance that they were not advocates of Pajonism.²

A similarly moderate spirit was manifested by the contemporary professor of theology at Sedan, Louis Le Blanc de Beau lieu (d. 1675), a learned and profound scholar, and a modest, upright, and honorable man. He was extremely averse to the polemics of his day, and earnestly endeavored to unite the opposing parties. He even considered many of the points of controversy between the Catholics and Protestants unimportant, or else mere logomachy, yet doubted the possibility of a union. But for this very reason he advocated all the more zealously the union of the Evangelical and Reformed churches, inasmuch as their differences did not touch the foundation of Christian faith, and he wished to see all controversy between them banished from the pulpit. He was, however, accused by many theologians of his Church of lukewarmness and a Syncretism prejudicial to the truth. Not a few suspected him of secretly endeavoring to promote the union which Cardinal Richelieu had in mind. After his death, however, his merits were generally recognized.⁴

Among the exiled French clergymen were many others eminent in various respects. Jean Claude, pastor at Charenton, near Paris, was noted at the time of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes as a brave and sagacious defender of the Reformed, who were then assailed by many Catholic writers. He wrote an admirable Défense de la Réformation in reply to the Jansenist Nicole, and exchanged controversial writings with Arnauld on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Claude was regarded in his day as the soul of the Reformed party in France, and was consequently violently hated at the court. Accordingly, when the Edict of Nantes was revoked, Claude was brought to the frontier within twenty-four hours, while the other pastors were allowed fourteen days. He went to Holland, where he died in 1687. Mention should also be made of Pierre Jurieu, professor at Sedan, after his banishment professor and preacher at Rotterdam—a man of much sagacity and learning, but whose works

⁴ He wrote Theses Theologicae Varis Temporibus in Acad. Sedanens. editae, 1675.
⁴ (The first in the year 1645. They form a tolerably complete system of dogmatics.)
FOURTH PERIOD.—DIV. II.—A.D. 1648–1814.

were so passionate and almost fanatical in their treatment of all who differed from him as to be extremely prejudiced. He not only violently assailed Bossuet, Arnauld, and Nicole, but kept up a jealous watch for every deviation from pure Calvinism in his own Church, and was particularly hostile to Fajon and Bayle.

Jacques Basnage, pastor of the Walloon congregation at the Hague (d. 1723), was a very learned and discerning author, although he did not always study the sources with care. Samuel Basnage, pastor at Zutphen, in the Netherlands, a relation of the above (d. 1721). Jacob Lenfant, pastor and member of the consistory at Berlin (d. 1728). Isaac de Beausobre, after 1684 pastor and member of the consistory at Berlin (d. 1738). Jean Souverain, an advocate of Arminianism, for which reason he was deposed from his pastoral office in France several years before the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. He thereupon went to England, entered the Episcopal Church, and became a pastor again. He died at the close of the seventeenth century. David Ancillon, pastor at Metz, died as pastor of the French Church at Berlin, 1692.

The most distinguished preacher among the French Reformed Protestants was Jacques Saurin, who emigrated from France in childhood, studied theology at Geneva, and became pastor of the French Reformed congregation at the Hague (d. 1730).

After the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, by which all the Reformed Protestant clergymen were compelled to emigrate, there was of course no theological learning among the Reformed in France. It was only at the constant peril of their lives that individual clergymen ventured to visit the congregations. These were educated at Geneva and Lausanne; but after the safety

---

9 Wrote against Baronius, De Rebus Sacris et Ecclesiasticis Exercitationes Historico-criticae; Annales Politico-ecclesiastici to 1604, 8 vols. fol.
11 Histoire Critique de Manichée et du Manichéisme.
12 After his death, Le Platonisme Dévoilé was published, in which he demonstrated that the doctrine of the Trinity was formed under the influence of the Platonic philosophy.
13 Relation d'une Conférence qu'il eut en 1657 avec M. Bedacier, Évêque d'Aoste, Sedan, 1657. 4.; Apologie de Luther, de Zwingli, de Calvin, et de Bèze, Hanau, 1666. (Cf. Bayle's Dict. Niceron, pt. vili.)
14 See sermons in ten parts, also transl. into German.
of the Protestants had been secured by Napoleon, a theological school was founded at Montauban in 1809. For a long time, however, there was no theological literature in France.

§ 64.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY IN THE REFORMED CHURCH OF HOLLAND.

[Chr. Rahlenbeck, Rapport sur les Actes et Documents concernant le Protestantisme Belge depuis la Paix de Westphalie, Bruxelles, 1873.]

After the beginning of the seventeenth century, scholasticism found its way again into the Dutch Reformed theology, as it did into the Lutheran. The theologian who represented the extreme of this tendency was Gisbert Voëtius, from 1636 professor at Utrecht (d. 1676). He had been present at the Synod of Dort, and adhered with the greatest strictness to its doctrines, assailing with excessive violence every new opinion which seemed to be a deviation from them. He thereby acquired in Holland a reputation for the most rigid orthodoxy. In the philosophy of the Cartesians and the theology of the Cocceians, he found the two parties which were the particular objects of his attacks. In distinction from them, his followers were called Voëtians.

Voëtius assailed the Cartesian philosophy on the ground that it led to skepticism, pantheism, and even to atheism, and that it also unduly exalted the reason, while it held all knowledge derived from the senses to be deceptive and uncertain. The controversy began as early as 1639. Voëtius was supported by most of the Dutch clergymen, and he even succeeded in 1656 in obtaining from the States of Holland a law prohibiting the teaching of this philosophy and its application to theology. Nevertheless, until near the close of the seventeenth century, it still had many supporters in Holland.

Quite different was the theological party of the Cocceians, who were also assailed by Voëtius.

Johannes Cocceius (properly Cock), a native of Bremen, was professor of Hebrew at Franeker, afterward at Leyden (d. 1669). He attempted to reform both exegesis and dogmatics. Grotius, as he thought, assumed too much as a matter of course that the Bible was to be treated like any other book of human compo-

1 Benthem, ii. 57.  
2 Id. ii. 116.
Cocceius, on the other hand, began with the assumption that it was a book full of divine mysteries, and, in order to unfold them, laid down the principle that the words of the Scripture must always mean as much as it was possible for them to mean. By aid of this principle he endeavored particularly to establish a typical interpretation. He discovered every where types and figures of future events. In the Old Testament, according to his theory, Christ was chiefly prefigured; in the Canticles and the Apocalypse the whole history of the Christian Church was allegorically represented. With this peculiar exegesis he connected an equally peculiar theology. He wished to separate theology entirely from philosophy, and restore it to its simple Scriptural form. His fundamental idea was that of a covenant of God with men. He distinguished, in the first place, the Covenant of Works, or of Nature before the Fall, from the subsequent Covenant of Grace, and divided the latter into three economies—before the Law, under the Law, and under the Gospel. Under these main ideas he arranged the whole system of Christian doctrine, and carried the covenant theory into all the particular doctrines. For this reason, Cocceius introduced into his theology many illustrations taken from the science of law. This so-called Federal Theology, as well as the exegesis of Cocceius, found many friends in Holland. The strict Voëtians, however, opposed it, and various controversies arose between the two parties. The most violent had reference to the law of the Sabbath, the Cocceians asserting that it was binding merely upon the Jews, and that the Lord’s day was a voluntary Christian observance; while the Voëtians, on the other hand, insisted that the Sabbath law still applied to Sunday.

At first the Cartesians and Cocceians were in no way connected with each other, Cocceius himself having desired to separate theology entirely from philosophy. But the two parties found themselves outwardly brought together by the attacks of their common opponents, the Voëtians, and it was not long before the discovery was made that many of the Cartesian principles could be advantageously employed in support of the Cocceian theology. The teachings of Descartes respecting the uncertainty of human knowledge were quite to the point in opposition to those scholastic Voëtians who wished to demonstrate every thing. Accordingly, some of the Cocceian theologians began to introduce the Carte-
sian philosophy into their federal theology, and this gave more reason for regarding the Cartesians and Cocceians as allies.

At the close of the seventeenth century, however, the Cartesian philosophy encountered a decided reverse in Holland through the controversy originated by Balthasar Becker, pastor at Franeker and afterward at Amsterdam. He had been at an earlier period assailed on account of a catechism in which he had advanced some peculiar ideas. A still greater sensation was produced by his work The World Bewitched, 1691, in which he denied the influence of the devil and of demons upon the world and men. In support of this view he appealed to Descartes, who held that the essence of a spirit consists in the thinking, so that it can not operate in other substances. Accordingly, he argued that those passages of Scripture in which mention is made of the operation of angels and devils are not to be taken as literally true, and that the demoniacs of the New Testament are to be regarded as afflicted with occult diseases. He did not absolutely deny the existence of evil spirits, but treated it rather as an unsolved problem. He was consequently deposed and excluded from the communion of the Church. He afterward connected himself with the more liberal French Reformed party (refugiés), d. 1698. From this time the influence of the Cartesian philosophy declined in Holland. Becker's work obtained extraordinary celebrity, and was translated into several languages.

Among the numerous Cocceian theologians who distinguished themselves as learned exegetes, the following deserve mention: Hermann Witsius, successively professor of theology at Franeker, Utrecht, and Leyden (d. 1708), was at first a zealous Cocceian, but in his mature years opposed some of the doctrines of Cocceianism, although in general he remained faithful to that system. Campegius Vitringa, professor of theology at Franeker (d. 1722), with some limitations and modifications, followed the Cocceian principles in his exegesis. Friedrich Adolph Lampe, professor

---

* Similarly Ant. V. Dale, De Origine et Progr. Idolatriae, 1696. (See Wald's Progr. Congregationem S. Offic. Rom. etc. 1821, p. 19.)
* Into German by Joh. Mor. Schwager, with notes by Semler, Leipzig, 1781, 3 vols.
* His work on dogmatics De Oeconomia Dei cum Hominibus Libb. IV.; his Miscellanea Sacra, 3 vols. 4., contain many excellent exegetical and historical treatises.
* Comm. in Esaiam, 2 vols. fol.; De Synagoga Vete.
of theology at Utrecht, afterward professor of theology and preacher at Bremen (d. 1729). In addition to these, the following Dutch theologians may be mentioned: Frederic Spanheim the younger, professor of theology at Leyden (d. 1697), who wrote a Church History of the Old and New Testaments. Albert Schultens, professor of Oriental languages at Leyden (d. 1750), was a noted Old Testament commentator. He was the first to bring into general use, in the interpretation of the Hebrew, the kindred dialects, particularly, and indeed too exclusively, the Arabic language. Hermann Venema, professor of theology at Franeker (d. 1787), a very learned theologian.

In recent times Holland has done but little for the theological sciences. In the one department of exegesis, however, valuable contributions have been made, not so much by the production of new material as by the careful collection and elaboration of the old. The Dutch exegetical works are characterized, for the most part, by copious development of the passages from their philosophical and historical side; but, at the same time, familiar and irrelevant matter is presented in wearisome fullness, often with little evidence of thorough and critical linguistic knowledge or independent historical research. Moreover, the development of the thought and the argument is much neglected. Especial value is attached to good Latin style. The following deserve mention: Hermann Muntinghe, professor of theology at Gröningen; John van Voorst, professor of theology at Leyden; Jodocus Heringa, professor of theology at Utrecht, an acute dogmatician, who, however, was long suspected of neology; Elias Anton Borger, professor of theology at Leyden.

Passing to the other religious denominations in Holland, we

7 Comm. in Evang. Joh. 3 vols. 4.; very copious, but frequently goes too far in the attempt to discover profound mysteries.
8 Chiefly distinguished for his Geographia Sacra et Ecclesiastica.
10 Commentar. in Psalmos, 6 vols. 4.; Institutiones Historiae Ecclesiae Vet. et Nov. Test. 7 vols. 4.
11 Dutch versions of Job, the Psalms, and the Proverbs, also translated into German.
12 Author of several small works in New Test. exegesis—among others, Animadvers. de Usu Verborum c. Praepositionibus Compositorum in Nov. Test. Spec. II.
13 On the Right Use and the Abuse of Biblical Criticism; On the Teaching of Jesus and his Apostles with reference to the Religious Conceptions of their Contemporaries.
14 Interpretatio Epist. ad Galatas; De Mysticismo.
find the Mennonite preacher Anton van Dale, afterward a physician in the hospital at Haarlem (d. 1708), a man noted for his profound and varied learning.\(^{15}\)

The Remonstrants, likewise, have always had eminent scholars among them. Philip van Limborch, professor of theology in the Arminian gymnasium at Amsterdam (d. 1712), published the first complete Arminian system of theology.\(^{16}\) Jean Leclerc (Clericus), professor of Hebrew, philosophy, and Church history at the same place (d. 1736), by a great number of works enriched many departments of theology, particularly Biblical literature and Church history, and did much to produce a more independent criticism of the Bible.\(^{17}\) Johann Jacob Wetstein, deacon at Basle, lost his position because he was charged with Socinianism, and became the assistant of Clericus at Amsterdam, and after his death his successor (d. 1754).\(^{18}\) Paul van Hemert, professor at the same place, noted for an independent and acute work on the doctrine of Accommodation.\(^{19}\)

\[\text{§ 65.}\]

\textbf{HISTORY OF THEOLOGY IN THE SWISS REFORMED CHURCH.}


It has been already remarked in the previous period that there was a gradual decline in the influence of strict Calvinism in Switzerland, and even in Geneva, owing to the fact that so many of the young Swiss studied in French academies. They brought

\(^{15}\) De Origine et Progressu Idolatriae ac Superstitionum; De Oraculis Ethnico-rum; Dissert. super Aristea de LXX Interpretibus; Historia Baptismorum (against Pædobaptism).

\(^{16}\) Theologia Christiana, 4. and fol.; then an admirable defense of Christianity against a Jew, De Veritate Relig. Christianae; also a Historia Inquisitionis, which, until recent times, was one of the best; A. des Amorie van der Hoeven de Jo. Clerico et Phil. a Limborch. Amstel. 1848.

\(^{17}\) Ars Critica; Vetus Testamentum translatum cum Paraphrasii et Perpetuo Commentario et Dissertatt. Philologicc. 5 vols. fol.; Historia Ecclesiastica duorum Primorum Seculorum.

\(^{18}\) Nov. Test. 2 vols. fol., with an extremely rich apparatus of readings and a collection of explanatory parallel passages from the classical and rabbinical writers. His Prolegomena, valuable for criticism, printed separately by Semler, 1764.

\(^{19}\) On the Accommodations in the New Test. (also Germ. 1767).
Heinrich Heidegger, Hottinger's successor at Zurich (d. 1698); Johann Jacob Hottinger, son of Johann Heinrich, and successor to Heidegger (d. 1735); Daniel Wytenbach, deacon at Berne, then professor of theology and superintendent-general at Marburg (d. 1779); Johann Friedrich Stapfer, professor of polemic theology at Berne (d. 1775); Johann Jacob Hess, antistes (chief preacher) at Zurich (d. May 29, 1828); Johann Schulthess, professor of theology at Zurich.  

* Best known as a dogmatician by his Corpus Theologiae Christianae, 2 vols. fol.; also his historical works, Historia Patriarcharum.  

* Helvetische Kirchengeschichte, 4 vols. 4.  

* He applied the Wolfian philosophy to theology. Tentamen Theologiae Dogmaticae, 3 vols. 8.  

10 Author of several valuable works. Popular dogmatics: Grundlegung zur wahren Religion, 12 vols. 8.; Sittenlehre, 6 vols. 8.; Institutiones Theologiae Polemicae Universae, 5 vols.  


FOURTH PERIOD.

THIRD DIVISION.

HISTORY OF THE MODERN CHURCH FROM 1814 TO THE PRESENT TIME.

§ 1.

GENERAL VIEW OF THE CONDITION OF THE CHURCH DURING THIS PERIOD.

The French Revolution in 1789 introduced a time of subversions in Europe which has not yet come to an end. These revolutions commenced, indeed, on political ground, but soon extended to all social relations, and to ideas and opinions as well; and thus, in particular, religion and the Church were likewise affected by them.

It is always extremely difficult to gain a perfectly correct and unprejudiced view of the intellectual condition of our own time. Partly, the individual standpoint is too limited to make it possible to recognize, comprehend, and rightly classify the multitude of phenomena which appear; partly, the most important portion of this condition—the ideas, principles, and sentiments—lies hidden in the interior of millions of intelligences, so that it is difficult to distinguish it. Add to this the inevitable partiality of each individual, who necessarily has his own standpoint from which he observes and judges, his peculiar ideas and principles according to which he forms his opinion, and it is evident that no view of the times can be entirely unbiased.

In spite of this difficulty, however, we should not shun the effort to comprehend the age in which we live; for it is this knowledge upon which chiefly depends our working efficiently, and doing our share of good in our time. We therefore seek to un-
derstand, also, the state of ecclesiastical affairs in our age as the result of former developments, in order, partly, to recognize in the whole course of these developments the wise guidance of Providence, and partly to gain courage and firmness for our own work in the Church and for the Church.

The European monarchies, with the sole exception of England, had in modern times assumed an absolute character. Formerly they had been limited by estates, which were formed chiefly from the nobility, the clergy, and cities; but various causes had combined to deprive these estates of their power, and thus they were, in some countries, no longer assembled, while in others they had become a mere empty form, and in fewer still had preserved some very insignificant rights. At the same time, however, the nobility and the clergy still remained privileged estates, and were considered the supports of the throne; but they had no public sphere of activity except in the service of the sovereign—the nobility as officials in the State, the clergy as officials in the Church.

Thus, great and well-intentioned monarchs, with their absolute power, found it much easier than it would have been in conjunction with estates to make certain beneficial dispositions and changes, as did Frederic II. in Prussia and Joseph II. in Austria. But as great men are rare everywhere, and none the less so on thrones, it more frequently happened that the absolute monarchs abused their power, in order to follow their inclinations or satisfy their lusts; or, even if they were kindly disposed toward their subjects, did not recognize the real wants of the latter, but were led astray by their advisers, so that in this manner the people were oppressed in various ways.

This oppression was nowhere felt more strongly than in France, where the reigns of Louis XIV. and Louis XV., by their unbounded extravagance, had laid a fearful burden of debt upon the land, while the nobility and the clergy, notwithstanding that the greater part of the national wealth was in their possession, yet contributed little toward the taxes, so that the whole weight of the latter rested upon the citizens and the peasants. Louis XVI. was a very benevolent monarch, but too much biased by the prejudices of the day, and too weak to take the necessary decisive steps; and matters finally went so far that, in the Revolution, the people sought to help themselves.

But this first Revolution, like all subsequent ones in France,
received its impulse and its character in the capital of Paris. In this enormous city there is living, in quiet times, a large mass of people in extreme destitution, in the depths of misery, indeed, who can lose nothing by any change of affairs, but, on the contrary, may gain thereby. Thus, there exist here a multitude of people who are at all times inclined to revolt, and willingly offer themselves as tools for the leaders of political factions. Now it was in Paris, under the influence of the parties prevailing there, that all changes and all new constitutions were consulted and decided upon, and it was incumbent upon the central power which had its seat in that city to insure the recognition of these resolutions in the whole of France. Thus it happened that by a few firmly united parties, which counted hardly a hundred thousand truly devoted members, several millions of people were ruled.

In particular, it was the impiety prevalent in Paris, which had gradually been communicated by the higher to the lower classes, that influenced the Revolution and gave it its terrible character. The renouncing of Christianity and all religion, the theatrical festivals of Reason, the absurd resolution of the National Convention that the French nation recognized a Supreme Being—all these could only take place in Paris. And even though this impiety found favor in many cities in the north and east of France, and took root there, yet in the south and west it wounded the numerous zealous Catholics all the more deeply, although they, too, were obliged to submit outwardly, and hold their services in secret. But it was this ungodliness which alone made it possible that the Revolution assumed so horrible and bloody a character, and that the different parties did not hesitate to sacrifice their real and supposed opponents to their political designs by condemning them to the scaffold.

When the Revolution commenced, it found great sympathy with other nations, particularly among the educated classes; for at that time the lower grades of society received little connected intelligence of these great events. The attention of all was directed to the government abuses of their own countries, and the wish was often loudly expressed that they could be corrected like those in France. But, on the whole, the nations were too closely bound by the fetters of habit and usage for such wishes to meet with general response. Moreover, the Revolution soon lost the sympathies it had awakened when
the constitutions and governments in France began to change rapidly, when thousands of political victims fell upon the scaffold, and when the impiety referred to continued to assert itself more and more shamelessly. It was acknowledged that a republican institution was not suited to a large European country, because it was constantly inciting the ambition to rebellion and revolution; and the other nations began to feel more contented with their own government, however much it left to be desired, because it afforded them safety, than with another which, under the name of liberty, practiced tyranny, and which itself possessed as little stability as it could give the citizens security for their persons and property.

At the same time, however, the French Revolution made a deep religious impression upon the nations of Europe, as, indeed, no great event which convulses the world can fail to have such an effect. It was acknowledged that no relation could be firm, no connection secure, no state lasting, without a religious foundation; that, therefore, the religious education of the people was the condition of all development and all happiness of the nation. And hence the written attacks against religion and Christianity were discontinued, while, at the same time, the higher classes ceased to display their irreligious principles.

The French Revolution could be subdued only by military force, and this was effected by Napoleon Bonaparte. With an iron arm he suppressed all revolutionary agitations, and restored order and quiet. As he recognized fully that religion was the main prop of all civil order, it was one of his first acts to cause the churches to be reopened. He promised liberty to all confessions, but insured by laws the authority of the state over them.

Bonaparte’s rule, both as first consul and as emperor, was entirely absolute, although he suffered certain forms of the republic to remain intact in order to keep up the appearance as if the people, through their organs, were still allowed to express their will. The majority of the nation were content with this change, as it relieved them of the uncertainty and the disorders of the Revolution. But, on the other hand, there were still many secret republicans, who regarded the new government with displeasure. In order, therefore, to render impossible any attempt at rebellion, Bonaparte was obliged to maintain a numerous army, and strive, by successful wars, to have it supported by foreign governments.
In this army, moreover, he gathered together all the ambitious spirits which elsewhere might easily have endangered the internal peace by exciting new disturbances and revolutions; he thus opened to them a way to glory and honor, and rendered them harmless for the internal peace of the country. In this way the vigor of the nation was fighting under his banners, and was there bound to him by the attachment invariably felt by successful armies for the commander who leads them to victory. Against such a military force any attempt at insurrection was impossible, particularly as there was but a small number of Frenchmen outside of the army who were fit for service. Then, too, by the successive victories of Napoleon, the French were kept, as it were, in a constant state of intoxication; and with a nation so vain as the French, the glory of these victories served to secure more and more the power of their leader. And, finally, great stores of wealth of all kinds were brought into France, and particularly to Paris, as booty taken from the conquered nations, and had the effect of rendering the French content with their government.

Thus, Bonaparte would have been forced to make war by the internal relations of France alone: the occasions for doing so were not wanting, as the old governments were quite as averse to the new dynasty as they regarded the constantly increasing power of France with anxiety and suspicion.

The military successes of Bonaparte were truly marvelous: states which had existed for many centuries crumbled to dust before his sword, while others sank into insignificance. From the conquered countries he formed new states with princes of his family at their head, by which France, already extended immoderately, was surrounded as by bulwarks. It seemed as if nothing could resist the mighty emperor: every obstacle was surmounted by him almost at the moment at which it presented itself.

Heavily the oppression of the conqueror weighed upon the conquered nations. They were forced to place life and estate at his disposal to aid him in subduing other nations, while all the glory of having done so fell to the so-called Grande Nation. At the same time they were regarded with suspicion, the French pushed their way to all higher offices; secret informers kept watch over all circles of society, and every expression of dissatisfaction was harshly and severely reprimanded. Moreover, no
regard was paid to the different nationalities, but, on the contrary, every thing was done to suppress them, as they were supposed to interfere with a close union with France. The French code of laws was introduced every where, the higher authorities made use of the French tongue, and in the subjected portions of Germany the intention was plainly expressed to make French the prevailing language. The nations were impoverished by the heavy tribute which they had been obliged to pay on being conquered, by the French generals being every where endowed with rich estates, the income from which went to France, and because the Continental system caused all commerce to stagnate.

In these times of deep humiliation, heavy oppression, and incessant danger, when human vision could nowhere discover help and deliverance, the eyes of men were once more turned upward toward God. Many, indeed, were infected by the frivolity of the foreign oppressors, many sank into dull indifference, but a far greater number, who previously had become estranged from religion, were induced by the state of the times to seek and find consolation and courage in drawing near to God.

Then came the great years of deliverance. Marvelous as had been the victories of Napoleon, his fall was equally marvelous. When, in 1812, he entered upon the campaign to Russia, he was at the height of his power. He was followed by a brave, practiced, admirably equipped army, more numerous than any which modern history had shown until then, and apparently powerful enough to conquer the whole earth. The enemy, moreover, could offer him no resistance, and the vanquisher advanced without a check to Moscow. But here he was stayed by an arm mightier than his own. The winter destroyed his troops, and the army which human power had never yet conquered was struck down and crushed by God's omnipotence, so that only a few feeble remnants of it returned.

This event had a magic effect every where. The conquered nations took new courage: it seemed as if God, who had now vanquished the mighty and laid low the proud, were giving them a sign to cast off their fetters, trusting in his aid, and to drive out the hated oppressors entirely. It was Prussia, and Protestant North Germany in particular, that now rose enthusiastically and joined the Russian troops which followed in pursuit of the French army. In 1813, indeed, Napoleon appeared
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in the field once more with a superior force, and, at first, obtained many advantages; but after Austria had joined the allies, the odds were on their side. Napoleon was repulsed, and the great battle of Leipsic (October 16–18) forced him to leave Germany forever. March 31, 1814, the allies entered Paris; on the 6th of April Napoleon signed his abdication, in consequence of which he was obliged to retire to the island of Elba, while Louis XVIII. ascended the throne of his fathers. True, Napoleon landed on the French coast once more on March 1, 1815, and brought the whole of France under subjection to himself with very little trouble; but in consequence of the battle of Waterloo, June 18, he was soon obliged to surrender again, and ended his life as a prisoner at St. Helena, May 5, 1821.

These momentous changes could not but seize upon all minds with intense power. The mighty hand of God had worked too visibly for the salvation of the nations in this case not to incline them to acknowledge and revere it. Thus the infidelity of the eighteenth century disappeared entirely in the refining fire of these times, and faith and piety revived with new vigor. The sovereigns, too, openly expressed their conviction that God alone could have helped, and that he only had helped; and set their people the best examples of pious humility toward God and of fervent religion. While formerly a coarse, ungodly spirit had prevailed in the armies, in many of them, particularly in those of Prussia, a serious, pious tendency now gained the upper-hand.

It seemed, therefore, as if a better time were beginning for religion and the Church too. But two difficulties here presented themselves which had to be conquered. Firstly, even though the general condition of mind was favorable to piety, it was yet evident that in the majority this piety was no longer connected with the symbolical system of the churches, and that it would therefore become necessary, in course of time, to bring the Church system into harmony with the actual living consciousness of faith in the congregations. And, secondly, it was necessary every where either to restore the ecclesiastical institutions and ordinances, because they had been disturbed by the disorders of the period, or, because they had been too long neglected, to remodel them with reference to the demands of the times. Now these conditions and relations of the Church were in close connection with the political affairs of the country, and hence the
political views of the rulers of the states also influenced their treatment of ecclesiastical matters, while the moods of the people with regard to the latter were equally affected by the prevailing political opinions.

The nations were strongly excited by the wars of deliverance: in place of the former indifference to political matters, there had now arisen a lively interest in public affairs. Particularly strong was the desire for a national development, which had just been in danger of being entirely destroyed by foreign oppressors, and for a constitution by which the rights of the people would be insured against arbitrary power. This desire was based on former experiences of such arbitrary authority, for even under the Bonapartist rulers the nations had frequently had occasion to realize how often sovereign power, by abuse, can become despotism. Added to this, the nations had acquired a consciousness of their own power; for it was their heroic exertions which had driven away the oppressors, and the sovereigns themselves were forced to acknowledge that they owed the restoration of their authority to these extraordinary manifestations of power on the part of their peoples. And for this reason the latter thought themselves all the more entitled to be exempt from all arbitrary rule in the future, and to receive the liberty and support which they needed for a national development.

As was but natural in such a time of excitement, the wishes for the future took a variety of forms. Individuals may even at that time have thought of republican constitutions; the example of France, however, in this respect, was too discouraging. It was acknowledged that republicanism could not prosper in the large countries of Europe, and that the example of America could not be decisive in this case. For in America the aim which the striving power has in view is gain and possession, while in Europe it is public offices. There, again, an enormous field of activity is still open to the acquisition of property, which is sure to yield fruit to every one who is willing to work, while political activity holds forth no outward advantages, except, perhaps, the satisfaction of ambition. In the European states, however, the acquisition of property is rendered very difficult by the density of the population: here it is particularly successful political activity which promises honor and gain, and thus a republican form of government would lead the popular
ambition as well as love of gain to constantly renewed disturbances, and every attempt of the kind would find adherents among the great number of those destitute of property, who can only gain, but never lose, by any change.

Hence no secure and untroubled permanency could be expected for a republic in Europe, but only a constant struggle of parties, led by shrewd and ambitious demagogues. Amid such conditions, however, no true individual liberty could flourish, for experience has shown that political factions among the people are far more despotic in their endeavors to control the public speech, and even sentiment, than the most despotic prince. This difficulty of maintaining a republic on European soil has been proved by the modern history of Switzerland, although in that country the circumstance that it is entirely surrounded by more powerful monarchical states holds in check somewhat the tendency to revolutions.

The general voice, therefore, inclined toward the desire for constitutional monarchies, in which the rights of the people were represented by states, particularly in the passing of laws and imposing of taxes, and the sovereign would be restrained by these states from arbitrary decisions and despotic measures, while at the same time each individual would be allowed every liberty not prejudicial to the whole for his own actions and development. That party which desired, in this way, to secure to the people the greatest possible liberty, and with it the foundation of a vigorous national consciousness and a successful development, was called the Liberal party.

Opposed to this another party grew up, which was in favor of restoring the state of things existing before the modern revolutions, with some modifications. It saw much cause for anxiety in the popular agitation of the newest times, and believed that if it was encouraged, by according new rights to the people, the latter, in the consciousness of their power, would go farther and farther in their demands, and finally reach an actual republic. This party, therefore, desired to preserve the sovereign rights intact, and were even in favor of now and then extending them to absoluteness, where this did not already exist. The adherents of this party were called by their opponents Serviles, Absolutists, while they named themselves Monarchists. They belonged chiefly to the privileged classes, who had reason to fear, from a
constitutional form of government, the loss of their privileges, i.e.,
the nobility and the clergy, as far as they still possessed any privi-
leges; consequently, they were also called the Aristocratic party.

It must be acknowledged that the sovereigns, placed between
these two parties, had a difficult task. They could not hope to
satisfy both. It is but natural that they inclined more toward
the Absolutists, who would have left the sovereign rights intact,
than toward the Liberals, who strove to limit their power. More-
over, at the very beginning of this newest period, the sovereigns
formed, with reference to common principles of government, the
so-called Holy Alliance. The idea of the latter originated with
the Emperor Alexander of Russia; the alliance was formed by
the three sovereigns of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, during their
second meeting in Paris, on September 26, 1815, and, contrary
to the usual custom, the matter was arranged by the monarchs
themselves, without the intervention of ministers. In this Alli-
ance the sovereigns pledged themselves to make the teachings
of Christianity their sole standard for their course toward their
own people as well as toward foreign powers, to maintain a pa-
ternal relation toward their subjects, and at the same time to re-
gard all Christian nations as one great family and themselves as
appointed by Providence to govern certain portions thereof as
servants of God, who alone was the true Ruler. They resolved,
moreover, to admit to the Alliance all sovereigns who desired to
join it, and were willing to agree to its principles. It was not
long before all the sovereigns of Europe joined the Holy Alli-
ance, with the exception of the King of England, who was not
at liberty to sign any state document without consulting a re-
sponsible minister, and the Pope, who was of opinion that no
other holy alliance was admissible beside the Romish Church.

It was undoubtedly a beautiful and exalted idea which was
represented by the Holy Alliance, and it can not be doubted
that the sovereigns who formed it, deeply and fervently moved
by the great events of the time, really had, in so doing, the in-
tention of proving their gratitude for the gracious aid of God,
who had given them the victory, by thus giving formal expres-
sion to the principles of a government acceptable to Him, and
conducive to the happiness of the people, and pledging them-
selves to carry them out.

Nor can it be denied that the principles of this Alliance had a
beneficial effect on the dealings of the governments with each other. They became franker, truer, and more honest, and showed plainly the intention of avoiding all controversy and strife, or of reconciling the points of difference between them by amicable discussion. The policy of the states toward each other ceased to be one of craft and deceit, and the Holy Alliance was followed in Europe by a longer term of peace than had ever before been known there.

But, on the other hand, the principles of the Alliance with respect to the government of the people were less satisfactory. There was no fixed system of government for all the states prescribed, nor was this possible, as the conditions and requirements of the latter were so different. The promise to rule according to the tenets of Christianity was of course qualified in each sovereign by his conception of Christianity, and his views regarding the true requirements of his subjects as well as the means of promoting their prosperity. In this way, some members of the Alliance could follow the strictest absolute system, while others introduced the constitutional form of government into their states. But inasmuch as the Alliance declared the sovereigns to have been appointed by God to rule over their subjects as fathers, it pronounced itself in favor of a patriarchal system, one which, indeed, seeks the good of the people, but at the same time assumes that the latter are not capable of judging what is truly beneficial or what hurtful to them, and that therefore the sovereign must do everything for his people, but nothing through them. At the same time, the principles of the Alliance comprehended the idea of legitimacy, or the position that the sovereign was not appointed to government by the people, but by God, and was therefore responsible to Him alone, and not to his subjects, and that the latter were therefore under obligations to obey unconditionally. Moreover, that any government appointed by insurrection, or in any way contrary to law, was illegitimate, and ought, therefore, not to be recognized.

These principles, however, were opposed by the liberal party with the assertions that the power of the sovereign was rooted in the people alone: that the latter were mature enough not to allow themselves to be led like children, that they knew their own requirements best, and ought therefore to have opportunity given them, through the intervention of states, to make them known.
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Thus the whole modern time has been filled with struggles between the patriarchal government system of the sovereigns and the demands of the Liberals. To these were united suspicion of the government toward the people, a jealous watching of the latter, and curtailment of their liberties. Among other things, the police system was developed in every direction to a power hitherto unknown.

The struggles referred to were carried on with the greatest vehemence in Spain, Portugal, and Italy. As long as the sovereigns of these countries had absolute power, their government was totally despotic, and caused all Liberals to be persecuted with the greatest cruelty. In France, Louis XVIII. rather kept the middle between both parties, but Charles X. inclined decidedly to the Absolutist side. In Germany almost all the smaller states received constitutional governments: the two largest countries, however—Austria and Prussia—retained their absolute systems, Austria evidently resisting all modern tendencies, and anxious to restore the old conditions existing previous to any revolutions, even before the innovations of Joseph II.; Prussia endeavoring to content the nation by furthering its prosperity. Strengthened by their alliance with these two great monarchies, the German constitutional governments now also sought to elevate and fortify the sovereign power as opposed to the states, and thus they too were involved in an incessant struggle between the government and the latter. The constitution of the Germanic Confederation was used almost exclusively to combat the Liberalism considered so pernicious. Fears were entertained of weakening the sovereignty of the individual monarchs by transferring single portions of it to the Confederate Convention: the latter, therefore, remained weak and impotent when the question was to uphold the honor of Germany against foreign states, or to assert the rights of the people against the princes, while, on the other hand, it served as an organ for the proclamation of all the restrictions of liberty by which Liberalism was combated. The sovereigns hoped, by uniting in measures to this effect, to enhance their power, while at the same time the individuals could thereby evade the odium of these measures and cast it upon the Confederate Convention.

The French Revolution of July, 1830, introduced a new period of political tendencies and struggles, by which those of the Church were also seriously affected.
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France, since its Revolution in 1789, had constantly communicated its political ideas and agitations to the rest of Europe, and this was now also the case. The principles of the Holy Alliance were very much weakened; for as it became necessary to recognize Louis Philippe as King of France, and, soon after, Leopold as King of Belgium—both of whom had been chosen by the people after the expulsion of the former regents—this was a swerving from the principle of legitimacy. By degrees many conditions came to be looked upon as right merely because they existed, and the *fait accompli*—the accomplished fact—as legitimate just because it was accomplished. In France, moreover, the sovereignty of the people was declared, as well as the principle asserted that the kingdom was to rest on a democratic basis, the King to be at its head, without, however, governing in person (*le Roi règne, mais il ne gouverne pas*). The government was to be in the hands of the responsible ministers, but they were only to carry out the will of the people (which was to be made known to them by the representatives of the latter), and to resign immediately whenever they had lost the popular confidence.

The natural consequences of this system could not fail to show themselves. The Deputies were chosen only among the payers of heavy taxes; it was thought that this would offer a security for the chambers being conservative. For the same reason, the King sought to retain the favor of the wealthy commonalty, which he looked upon as the main-stay of his government.

The voters, however, had always a great number of particular requests to make of the government: the voters of each place desired peculiar privileges for their district, and made their election of a Deputy in favor of the government dependent on the granting of these privileges. Likewise the Deputies entertained, both for themselves and their friends and relatives, many wishes which the government could not leave unregarded if they wished to retain the majority in the Chamber of Deputies.

Thus the government was constantly forced to bribe both voters and Deputies in various ways in order to secure their favor, but made itself thoroughly contemptible by this system of corruption.

At the same time, the interests of the moderately rich and the wealthy were obviously favored, while those of the poorer classes
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were neglected. The government, therefore, could not venture to reduce the rate of interest on the public debt, even though the finances would have admitted of it; nor could it lower the indirect taxes, by which the first necessities of life were rendered very dear for the poor, in order to increase the direct taxes instead, because, by so doing, the wealthy classes would have been more heavily burdened.

In this way the government drew the aversion of the lower needy classes upon itself, and thought itself firmly supported by the commonalty, without considering that the excited proletarian, who has nothing to lose, will much more readily risk his life in revolt than the citizen, who loves peace and security, will endanger it in defense of the government.

The posts of ministers were much desired by ambition and avarice, and frequently changed occupants. When they had been filled for a while by one party, another tried every means to supplant it, for no one was suffered to remain minister for more than a few years without being severely attacked. At such times attempts were made in the Chambers to rob the ministry of the majority, and the incumbent was forced to resign and leave his place to another party. The new ministers then dismissed a number of officials, in order to make room for their own creatures; for the principle prevailed that the ministers, who were to be responsible for everything, also for their subordinate officials, must also have these officials entirely in their power, and be entitled to appoint and dismiss them. Journalism became the usual preparatory step for the ministry. The newspapers, through their influence on the people, became a political power; and thus the most distinguished journalists very often were appointed ministers, because it was thought advisable to secure their influence in favor of the government.

By this frequent change of ministry the government acquired an unstable character, and could not gain, either at home or abroad, any firmly rooted confidence. All improvements which could only be effected by carrying out the same plan for years had to be discontinued, for each successive ministry generally dropped that which the preceding one had commenced, and undertook something new, which again it was obliged to leave unfinished to its successors. Great sums were in this way spent unnecessarily. Thus it happened that nothing radical was done
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for public instruction, however necessary this was, because improvements of that kind need time. By the constant changes which took place among the officials, they were corrupted and induced to make themselves agreeable to the minister of the day, even at the sacrifice of their convictions and loyalty. On the other hand, undue importance was attached to journalists, men who, without a thorough knowledge of the particular conditions in the great kingdom of France, or of the actual requirements of the whole as well as of its different parts, could only advance general ideas upon government systems.

The consequence of all this was a universal dissatisfaction with the government, which was far more expensive than the former ones, without, however, bringing about any special advantages for France. And, moreover, it drew upon itself the general contempt by its want of power, and the bribes which it was obliged to practice in order to maintain itself.

This new change of government, therefore, had also disappointed the hopes that it would insure the happiness of France; there were many malcontents (and their number was constantly increasing) who held a new revolution to be desirable, and sought to effect it. Among them, however, the opinion gained more and more ground that a mere change of government would not suffice to bring about a happier state of things, but that a revolution of all civic conditions was indispensable. The existing inequality in property seemed to them an injustice, as all men were alike entitled to participate in the world’s possessions. They considered a change necessary in this respect, not being satisfied that a small portion of humanity, born to wealth, should live in idleness through no merit of their own, while the greater part were in want of the necessaries of life. With regard to the manner of effecting this change, various systems were formed, which either, as Communism, demanded complete community of all property, or, as Socialism, desired the establishment of a relation between the property-holders and those who possessed nothing, which would enable the latter to share in the privileges of the former.

These ideas naturally found much favor with the great number of those destitute of property, particularly in Paris, where many thousands who were living in bitter want were constantly forced to witness the greatest extravagance in their close vicinity.
But as these systems affected the moral principles upon which society is based, by no longer recognizing the right of property, so, too, they could no longer admit of the existence of religion. They therefore taught undisguisedly that there was no such thing as faith in God or in immortality; that it was merely upheld by the deceitful priests, who, sharing the interests of the rich, sought to console the poor, by empty promises of a hereafter, for the unjust deprivations which they had to endure at present, so that they themselves might revel in affluence with the other privileged classes.

These political and social ideas and movements in France were re-echoed in the whole of Europe; most loudly in Italy and Germany.

Italy was divided among several governments, some of which were really bad, and did nothing whatever for the welfare of their subjects. The worst was the clerical government in the Papal States; but in the other Italian states, too, the priests had great power and influence, both openly and secretly. Italy therefore demanded the abolishment of the clerical rule in Rome, and of all temporal power of the Church; the union of the whole country in one powerful, respect-compelling state, in which the will of the people would be consulted and their privileges guarded; and the removal of the Austrians, who held so large a part of Italy under their foreign yoke.

In Germany the happiest results had been expected from the wars of deliverance. It was hoped that the nation would be united in all points affecting the common interests, and, powerful and respected in this union, would assert itself against the foreign powers, while internally the greatest possible liberties were to be allowed. The union was to be based upon the act of confederation, and the latter also held out the prospect that all material interests should be furthered by common measures, by common duties, by common protection of manufactures and commerce with reference to foreign states, by unity of weights, measures, currency, etc. But all these hopes remained unfulfilled, because the individual governments would not be subordinate to the whole, nor sacrifice any part of their sovereignty, but preferred to remain independent. Thus, Germany was not represented as a unity with regard to foreign powers, and was so little esteemed that, for instance, in the settlement of affairs
between the kingdoms of the Netherlands and Belgium, it was
again forced to sacrifice the half of Luxemburg and accept
Limburg in compensation, just as it had formerly always been
obliged, at the end of wars, to cede one or the other of its terri-
tories. For the common interests the Diet seemed not to do
enough; to military affairs it paid great attention. Complaints
made by the countries against their sovereigns it rejected, declar-
ing itself incompetent; of an imperial court, which would have
been so necessary, there was no question. On the other hand,
the Diet was used more and more for making general police reg-
ulations, the individual governments thereby transferring to it
the odium naturally resting upon such measures.

When, therefore, the movement of the French Revolution of
July communicated itself also to Germany, this gave the Diet an
occasion for new police measures, without any thing being done
immediately to accede to the just wishes of the people. In con-
sequence, a bitter displeasure began to show itself more and
more, and frequently to pass all bounds. The first manifesta-
tions of this kind occurred in the Chambers of the South-German
constitutional states. Here the opposition imitated closely that
of the French Chamber of Deputies, and made similar demands
of the governments. The latter endeavored to satisfy these de-
mands as much as possible, but were greatly hindered in so do-
ing by the limits set by the Diet and its decisions, as well as by
the necessary deference to the remonstrances of the two great
powers, Austria and Prussia. They found themselves in a wrong
and weak position, and were constantly attacked most bitterly
and vehemently by the opposition. Thus they lost the respect
of the people: mostly led by the opposition, the latter thought
the government capable of every thing bad, and attributed to it
all existing evils. In consequence, these governments became so
weak and unsteady that some of them entirely succumbed to the
storm of 1848, and others narrowly escaped doing so.

Furthermore, the opposition made itself heard in the newspa-
pers. The example of France, in which the journalists occupied
so prominent a position, and formed the preparatory school for
the highest State offices, had an effect also on Germany. As,
after the conclusion of peace, the throng of students at the uni-
versities had become excessive, inasmuch as many more were
studying than could ever obtain appointments, and consequently,
in all departments, those capable of appointment were obliged to wait many years for a position, there arose among them a large number of malcontents, and of these the more active spirits began to turn their attention to literature, both in the department of belles-lettres and that of politics. In consequence, a peculiar class of authors sprang up in the large cities, who called themselves by the old, long-disused name of literati. They had only some very general ideas about politics, and made it a point to be dissatisfied with the existing order of things; but they were entirely lacking in the thorough acquaintance with the prevailing conditions, without which a correct judgment is impossible. These literati took the French journalists for their models, desiring above all things to make the career of their class as distinguished as it was in France. They brought into vogue again an aping of the French, which, after the war, had for a long time been regarded as unworthy and reprehensible. And as, through them, all political reasoning which arose in France was transferred to Germany and its conditions, so, too, they disseminated the modern French atheism more and more distinctly and decidedly. In this the pantheism of Hegel came to their aid, which in many circles was the more looked up to as the acme of all human wisdom the less it was comprehended. The development of the Absolute which it taught could, to the popular comprehension, be nothing but the ruling of a blind necessity, to which man was forced to bow without being inspired by it with love and confidence, even though he called it God. Thus, in numberless writings, religion was scoffed at, and men were advised to enjoy to the utmost the present life. Particularly prolific in this direction were the Jewish literati. In modern times an unusual number of Jewish youths from wealthy families had attended the universities. Being excluded from most government offices, many of them subsequently joined the literati. Altogether, at the present day, the attachment of the Jews to their religion has greatly diminished, its tenets being too much in opposition to the culture of the times; but the consequence has been that a large portion of the wealthy Jewish youth have grown up without any religion whatever. This manifested itself particularly in the Jewish literati. Added to this was the deeply rooted bitterness implanted in this people by the oppression of many centuries, and thus it was chiefly the Jewish literati who at-
tacked the existing conditions in the most cutting and derisive manner, and at the same time scoffed at all religious faith most insolently. The governments, indeed, opposed these manifestations, and thus the attacks upon them were obliged to preserve certain limits, or so to disguise themselves that their authors could not easily be called to account; but, in consequence, the ecclesiastical department, which admitted of more liberty, became all the more the field of action for the worst passions. Attacks were made upon religion in general and the established churches; unconditional religious liberty was demanded—i. e., liberty to have no religion—and advantage taken of every occasion to disturb the existing ecclesiastical conditions. By means of popular writings, even in the form of tales and poems, this tendency penetrated deep into the people, and, in many of its classes, destroyed all religious faith.

Meanwhile political liberalism made rapid progress. In Spain and Portugal it predominated, in Italy it had begun to gain the ascendant since Pius IX. had placed himself at its head. In Germany it asserted itself more and more. The sovereigns made it some concessions, in particular the new King of Prussia, Frederic William IV.; but it required entire compliance with its demands, and thus its struggle against the old system became more and more vehement.

At this time, however, it had no longer much occasion to combat absolutism, for the latter had been given up almost everywhere, with the exception, perhaps, of Russia and Austria. But as liberalism very frequently degenerated into radicalism, the tendency which advocated a thorough revolution, the destruction of that which existed, and an entire reconstruction for the future, there was formed, keeping the middle between absolutism and radicalism, a conservative party, which desired the preservation and improvement of the existing conditions. This party naturally contains many grades, as the opinions as to what improvements are necessary, and how far they may go, vary considerably.

All these struggles seriously affected the condition of the Church during this time. The governments justly regarded the religious culture of the people as the firmest support of all order, and therefore honored and favored the Church as the promoter of that culture. But they generally overlooked the fact that
true religiousness thrives only in freedom, and is not furthered by outward favors, the only ones which the governments can confer upon it. While, then, the latter befriended their national churches, and at the same time sought to preserve them unchanged in their systems and in their ordinances, because any change in ecclesiastical affairs seemed to incline the people to political reforms, they only drew upon themselves, by this, the suspicion of the liberals. The latter began to look upon the Church and the clergy as the tools of despotism, by the aid of which the foundations of the throne were to be strengthened by the altar. In particular this was the case in Catholic countries, in which, in fact, a powerful hierarchy not only itself practiced spiritual despotism, but was also the natural ally of temporal despotism. Hence the result that the favors of the government were only prejudicial to the Church, and that, on the other hand, the latter increased in spiritual influence wherever these favors were withdrawn. This was peculiarly manifest in France. Under Louis XVIII., and still more under Charles X., there arose among the liberals an open opposition to the favored churches which even sometimes increased to furious hatred. The latter manifested itself, particularly after the Revolution of July, in the demolition of crosses, the destruction of a church, and the open persecution of the clergy. And, on the contrary, when, under Louis Philippe, the favors shown to the Church had ceased, even those journals which previously had been most inimical to religion and the Church, began to acknowledge the necessity of religion for man, and to recommend it. In Spain and Portugal the liberals had more reason to fear the mass of the people, who were firmly attached to the Catholic Church; but they secretly entertained the most violent hatred against the Church, which often led them to a total rejection of all religion. This hatred was shown by the persecution of monks in a large number of Spanish cities in 1835, when many of them were assassinated. A similar state of things exists in Italy, where the hatred against all spiritual despotism and secret oppression of conscience has manifested itself, in particular, in the expulsion of the Jesuits.

No such phenomena could appear in Protestant countries, as there existed in them no hierarchy which held sway over the consciences of men. But, on the other hand, the Church was there directly under the administration of the State, and thus
gave the liberals cause for anxiety. Thus Protestant Germany, in particular, witnessed various agitations on ecclesiastical questions. The liberals desired a free development of the Church. It was to be released from the tutelage of the State, and govern itself in synods. Its doctrines, moreover, were to be brought into unison with the consciousness of the people; and the falsehood was no longer to be upheld that the symbolical books were still retained and the clergy pledged to them, while their teachings had become quite unfamiliar to the congregations.

It was only in a few countries, and particularly in Nassau, Baden, and Rhenish Bavaria, that these demands were more or less acceded to. For the most part, the governments were averse to ecclesiastical changes, because they dreaded the agitations which were necessarily connected with them. They did not, indeed, agree to the demands of the ultra-orthodox party—that the old Church doctrine should be restored by outward force—but on the contrary showed indulgence to the dissenting forms of religious conviction; but they nevertheless favored—and this was particularly the case in Prussia—those who adhered to the old faith, and either permitted no alterations at all in the Church systems, or only such as did not interfere with the authority of the State over the Church.

This state of things prejudiced even the better disposed against the existing ecclesiastical conditions. The less they were allowed any opposition in political matters, the more they now threw themselves into the less dangerous opposition against the Church, against the servitude in which it was held by the State and abused for the purposes of the latter, and against the inner want of truth which was manifest in the relation between the religious confessions and the faith actually held by the members of the communions. Aside from this, the voice of derision pointed to the fact that the State was constantly referring its citizens to the blessedness awaiting them in the other world, so as to console them for the deprivations of this life which its own administration entailed upon them, and fantastic doctrines were taken up by this opposition and developed into perfect atheism and materialism.

These attacks upon the Church would hardly have called forth general approbation had they not been met by the prevailing political dissatisfaction. As it was, however, there was a general
inclination to look upon the Church as merely a State institution for the support of despotism, and to give up, together with the Church doctrines, the greater portion of all religion. In this way alone it can be explained that, after the deep religious sentiment prevailing subsequent to the wars of deliverance, an utterly irreligious tendency could develop and find general favor, so that the Independent Congregations which have separated from the great Church partly retain only a minimum of religion, partly confess to open pantheism.

Such was the condition of affairs when, in the year 1848, the new revolution in France took place. The great majority of the people desired no change of government, and had not thought of any. Notwithstanding they felt no attachment whatever, but only indifference, to the ruling sovereign, they were yet aware of the injury to all civic relations involved in a revolution. But the Paris mob, led by men in part ambitious and in part enthusiasts for impracticable ideas, began the revolt; and that ended, unexpectedly even to Paris itself, with the deposition of the King and the proclamation of a republic. What had been determined upon in Paris was accepted also by the provinces. The republic, indeed, was by no means greeted with enthusiasm; but as it had once been declared, it was thought due to honor to retain it. In this case, too, it was a small but firmly consolidated party which dictated a new constitution to the immense majority and assumed the authority. In this party the most decided impiety and the most open atheism soon asserted themselves. But as it was not satisfied even with the new government (as, indeed, it can never be content without a social subversion which would lead back to perfect barbarism), and as, in consequence, it repeatedly began new agitations, the conservative elements awoke more and more, and united in resisting the opposing element. The President, Louis Napoleon, by making himself the centre of this conservative party, and at the same time expressing the intention of ameliorating the condition of the lower classes as much as possible, gained the immense power which enabled him, on December 2, 1851, to overthrow the existing constitution and replace it by another prepared by himself. The constitutional form of government, which formerly had been so highly esteemed in France, had also lost the sympathy of many. It has been recognized that a government which is too much limited by estates
can never steadily pursue an aim, but is too dependent on momentary moods; that it is often led to procure for itself the necessary assistance by bribery and indirect means; that it is unstable and expensive; and that, finally, it promotes immorality.

The spark which, struck at Paris, kindled the flame of revolution all over France, found combustible material also in Germany in the uneasiness and dissatisfaction which was caused chiefly by police regulations, and nurtured by the opposition in the Chambers and by journalism, and which had reached its highest point in Southern Germany. The people, left to themselves, would not have been able to give a common expression to this discontent in special demands: each village would have asked something different, according to its circumstances—one thing, the other another. The Baden opposition, therefore, gave vent to the general dissatisfaction in a series of demands which were soon repeated through the whole of Germany, and laid before the governments in a more or less defiant manner, so that the latter were forced to accede to them. These demands had by no means originated with the people; they were, in part, quite incomprehensible and indifferent to them. But they immediately awoke the confidence that if they were fulfilled, all annoyances would immediately cease, and all wishes be granted, and thus the people allowed these demands to be attributed to them, and made them their own. Among them was, in particular, the separation of the Church from the State, and of the schools from the Church. If the people had recognized the significance of this last demand, they would have rejected it indignantly, wherever there was any regard for religion left. For the sense of this demand was no other than that the religious element should no longer take the first place in the education of youth, but that the latter should be conducted on political, i.e. democratic, principles. This tendency was very prevalent among the school-teachers in Baden and in the Palatinate. Many of them actually opposed all religious education among their pupils, and themselves took an active part in the revolution.

At this time the democratic party in Germany, which had chiefly literati and Jews as its leaders, gave expression to its atheism and impiety in the most insolent manner; but just by this it alienated the people from itself most decidedly. Altogether, the latter recognized, during the years of disturbance,
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that the above-mentioned movement of the radical party had availed it nothing. Hence the conservative tendency has increased quite as much as the abhorrence of the want of religion which showed itself so openly during that time.

The February revolution found an echo also in Italy. Here, too, there was a general revolt, not only against the foreign Austrian rule, and against the evidently bad governments of Naples and Rome, but even against that of Tuscany, which was humane and favorable to the people. Hatred against the clerical rule and influence manifested itself more openly here: the highest aim was the political unity of Italy, if possible in the shape of a republic, but at any rate as a monarchy on a democratic basis. In connection with this, it became most obvious that among the educated classes the general aversion to religion had been the result of the obligatory piety hitherto enforced. The force of arms has restored things very much to their old condition in this respect, but the popular demonstrations have only been repressed, not put an end to. And hence, too, the irreligious tendency referred to has not disappeared, and, if the governments do not assume a more liberal character and take better care of the popular education, will in secret have all the more terrible consequences.

The revolution of February, 1848, marked a new era for European progress. It is only to be desired that, besides the further development of the new liberty, law and order may also become firmly established, and that the governments may never lose the power of protecting them.

It is probable that a new era will now also begin for the churches. As promoters of religious education, they will, indeed, always be of importance to the states, and the latter will have a care for their preservation. But there will be an end of that unnatural connection between the Church and the State in which the State made use of the Church for positive aims and for the support of political systems, or in which it had the government of the Church in its own hands. It will continue to respect and assist the Church, but will suffer it to develop freely, and offer no impediment when those who no longer feel satisfied in the old Church form new communions.

Thus all the churches will enter upon a new course. In this there will be most danger for the Catholic Church, which, from
its nature, pretends to be unchangeable, and, therefore, can not fulfill the demands for a progress consistent with the times. Its head, the Pope, will unquestionably sooner or later lose his temporal power; but in that way the firm central point of this Church, by which its immobility is sustained, will, to say the least, be very much weakened; and various differences will arise, which will doubtless also lead to schisms.

The Protestant Church need not fear the new developments which await it, as, according to its principle, it neither will nor can shut itself off from improvement. The first consultations, indeed, to which the people lend their voice, where this has not been done before, will lead to much discord; nor is it improbable that sundry different parties will be formed. But, on the other hand, it is to be hoped that irreligiosity will disappear more and more in a state of freedom, if it be deprived of its nourishment from the political conditions. And the relations between the Protestant parties will gradually become friendly again, even though it should be inimical at first, if theological science only remain active, and teach more and more effectually the distinction between the essential and the accidental. For the chief cause of religious hatred—the delusion of the parties that they alone were on the right road to salvation, and that all the others were doomed to perdition—can no longer find general favor among the Protestants of the present day.

§ 2.

HISTORY OF THE PAPACY.


Popes:—Pius VII., d. August 20, 1823; Leo XII., d. February 10, 1829; Pius VIII., d. November 30, 1830; Gregory XVI., from February 2, 1831, d. June 1, 1846; Pius IX., elected June 16, 1846.

After the allies had entered France in January, Napoleon gave orders to have the Pope taken back to Rome; but this was done very slowly, so that he was delivered over to the Austrian troops in Italy only in March. On the 24th of May he made his formal entry into Rome.
Universal esteem and sympathy accompanied Pius VII. on his return from captivity to his capital: not only the Catholics, but also the Protestants unanimously applauded the firmness with which he alone had resisted the mighty Emperor, before whom all had bowed. This disposition in favor of the Pope would have much facilitated the difficult task which undoubtedly awaited him, if he had only in some degree understood the requirements of the time and paid any regard to them. But, however firm Pius VII. had been as a prisoner, after he had resumed the government of the Church and of the Papal States he showed himself very weak and vacillating, and liable to be swayed by foreign influence.

The fundamental character of Romish policy has always been to at least keep up the appearance of an utter immutability of principle. For it is this immobility which makes every controversy with Rome terrible, and gives to its faithful adherents their firm faith and confidence of action, as they can count upon not being deserted by it if they follow its well-known principles. At the same time, the believers look upon this immutability as a proof of the divine appointment of the Papacy, and of the assistance of the Holy Ghost. But many of the old maxims of the Curia are in such direct opposition to the present state of enlightenment, as well as to the universally acknowledged state rights, that it is an utter impossibility still to enforce them, and that any attempt at doing so would be highly detrimental and dangerous to the Curia; as, for instance, the right asserted in the Middle Ages of deposing disobedient princes, and absolving their subjects from the oath of fealty. These rights have, indeed, never been renounced by the popes of modern times, because by so doing they would have convicted those of their predecessors who had established them of error; but they have silently dropped them, and ignored whatever occurs in contradiction to them. In connection with this subject, two parties have arisen in the Papal Court. One of these is the bigoted orthodox party, which still looks upon those superannuated claims as a divine right, would retain the old state of affairs, and will not agree to the least concession, even though it be willing occasionally to let the claims in question rest, on account of unfavorable times, until better conditions arise, when everything can be regained. The other is the politically wise party, which recog-
nizes, indeed, the discrepancy between many maxims of the Roman See and the conditions and requirements of the present, and is more inclined to concessions, but makes the latter so cautiously that the semblance of the Papal immutability, upon which rests the Papal power, is not destroyed thereby. The former are called in Rome the *zelanti*, the latter the *liberali*.

Under the oppression of Napoleon, from which, like the Pope, the members of the Curia had suffered particularly, bigotry and the hatred against every thing new had been strengthened considerably in the latter; and when the Pope assembled his court around him once more, the bigoted adherents of the old conditions had by far the majority. One of their most distinguished heads was Cardinal Pacca, who enjoyed to a high degree the confidence of the Pope. The politically wise party, which recognized that, in view of the altered conditions of the times, much would have to be yielded in the Church ordinances and changed in the constitution of the Papal States, had, indeed, a distinguished leader, Cardinal Consalvi, who, owing to his great political shrewdness, also stood very high in the confidence of the Pope, and had received the important appointment of secretary of state. This party was, however, too weak to withstand the reaction which was beginning to show itself; and as Consalvi was soon obliged to repair to the Congress at Vienna, there to represent the Papal interests, the *zelanti* had, for the moment, free play.

The task which awaited the Pope immediately upon his return, i.e. the reorganization of the Church, as well as of the Papal States and their government, was, in fact, no small one. As, in consequence of the great revolutions, many Episcopal dioceses were broken up, many sees vacant, and, aside from this, there had been important changes also in temporal governments, it was necessary to make new concordats with many powers, in order to reorganize the dioceses, and, if possible, to determine the relations between Church and State. The government of the Church, moreover, had become especially difficult, because of the manifold tendencies which the revolution had developed in the latter. The contempt and the persecution which Catholicism had suffered from the political agitations had excited the most vehement fanaticism in its zealous adherents. These, who were most numerous in Portugal, Spain, and Western and Southern
France, desired that the whole ultramontane system of Church doctrine and Church government should be retained in its entire force. On the other hand, the Revolution, favored by the then existing impotency of the hierarchy, had spread abroad many doctrines inimical to the Church, even in countries which had formerly held them off by the Inquisition, i.e. Spain, Portugal, and Italy. They were partly those opinions of the so-called French philosophers which annihilate all religion; partly milder, more liberal ideas, which had for their aim a rational reconstruction of Catholicism, its insurance against the arrogance of the hierarchy, and, to that end, a limitation of the latter. Among the German Catholics, finally, a certain enlightenment had developed since Joseph II., and been supported and disseminated particularly by theologians, which now, when a large portion of the German Catholic states had fallen to the share of Protestant princes, could hardly be suppressed. This variety of opinions made the task of the Pope very difficult, and the most contradictory claims were made and expectations entertained with regard to him; but he could not satisfy the desires of one party without offending another and exciting it against him. If he acceded to the claims of liberalism, he would give offense to his most zealous adherents, the bigoted party; if he yielded to these, he would make the liberals his opponents.

No less difficult were the questions which presented themselves to the Pope in respect to the Pontifical States. In consequence of successive wars, and the cessation of the foreign contributions which had formerly flowed together there from all Catholic countries, these states had become impoverished, and had received a thoroughly French constitution. Through the latter, the old privileges of the clergy and the rights of the Church were, for the most part, abolished; but, on the other hand, it was much more favorable for the subjects. It had insured public order and safety by a vigilant police and an active administration of justice; had encouraged commerce, agriculture, and manufactures, and admitted laymen, without distinction, to all such offices as had, under the Papal rule, been reserved for the clergy alone. It evidently seemed prudent to retain such features of the new constitution as had proved beneficial; but the zelanti looked upon that constitution as a product of liberalism, and regarded all compliance in relation to it merely as a concession made to the latter.
At that period it became very perceptible how far the Papacy had remained behind the progress of the times. During the Middle Ages it had obtained its power by possessing itself of the direction of the ruling opinions. The tendency of the Middle Ages was chiefly ecclesiastically religious, warlike, and inclined to adventures. It was seized upon and made use of by the Pope, inasmuch as he exalted himself, as Head of the Church, above all secular heads of states, and constantly satisfied the martial spirit of the age by proposing warlike expeditions for the glory of God and the Church. At the same time, he supplied the deficiencies of the then existing governments by placing a check on the looseness of morals by spiritual weapons, and promising assistance and relief to all the oppressed who applied to him. Thus the Papacy in the Middle Ages favored the people, and was for that very reason powerful. But as the Pope desired to be considered the representative of God on earth, and on that account was obliged to lay claim to immutability in his decisions and actions, the Papacy was forced to relinquish the mobility which was requisite in order to follow the new developments of the nations, and, always taking the lead, to direct them. It could not, without shaking the confidence of its most faithful adherents, positively give up one of all the principles it had once adopted, even though they might be universally acknowledged, by intelligent contemporaries, to be the grossest errors and the most serious delusions. The farther, therefore, enlightenment progresses, and the more generally it penetrates the people, the more Papacy will lose its power over the popular mind, and finally become entirely superseded. It is already now far behind the times, and is kept by its old errors always in the same spot, without venturing to take a single step forward. The curse of falsehood rests upon it, and can not fail to lead to its final extinction.

It would seem that on the occasion in question, when the Pope returned to Rome, he might have seized the opportunity to place himself, like his predecessors in the Middle Ages, at the head of the national agitation, and thus regain the old influence and the old power. At that time the people in all the states began to demand constitutions and national representation. If the Pope had joined this movement, and, as Head of the Church, had enjoined upon the princes the fulfillment of these requests, he would un-
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doubtedly have made a deep impression, favorable to himself, upon the nations, and perhaps have led the agitation among them in like manner as the popes of the Middle Ages availed themselves, with great success, of the feeling of the people against the princes. However, the Pope could hardly think of playing such a part at the time of which we are speaking. Liberalism was closely connected with freer religious opinions: by favoring it the Pope would have alienated his most faithful adherents, the blind believers, without finding compensation for them among the liberals; for the latter might have welcomed the Pope as a political ally, but would hardly have consented to an unquestioning obedience to him. Nor could the popes expect any result favorable to themselves from liberal political constitutions. The enjoyment of political freedom leads to the desire for religious liberty also; and a nation which has, in its representatives, organs by which to limit the absolute power of princes will likewise endeavor, by means of them, to confine the hierarchy within certain bounds. Altogether, it is not possible to set a limit to progressive enlightenment among a free people, and it is that which the Catholic Church has most to fear with regard to its doctrine, and the Pope with regard to his power.

Pius VII. therefore resumed his reign with the resolve to obliterate all traces of the Napoleonic rule, which had brought so much misfortune upon him and the Catholic Church, and to entirely restore the old state of things in every respect. In this intention he was strengthened by those surrounding him; the only man who recognized that some allowance ought to be made for the change in the times—Cardinal Consalvi—had been sent to the Congress of Vienna, and could not exercise any immediate influence upon the Pope.

By the Congress of Vienna the States of the Church were restored to the Pope, with the exception of a small portion of the legation of Ferrara which lay on the left bank of the Po, and fell to Austria. Consalvi, as Papal legate, was obliged to protest (June, 1815) against this withholding of a part of Ferrara, as well as against that of Avignon and Venaissin, which were retained by France—although the Pope, at the Peace of Tolentino, in 1797, had relinquished much more—and likewise to declare himself against the settlement of German affairs so long as the ecclesiastical principalities were not restored, and the con-
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fiscated ecclesiastical property not given back. These acts, which naturally remained without result, implied sufficiently that the Pope was determined to restore the conditions existing before the French Revolution, and to do away with all the effects of the latter. And this was the aim which he pursued as well in the new organization of the Church States as in the government of the Church.

Under the French rule the finances of the Pontifical States, which had for a long time past been in a constant state of derangement, had been improved, particularly by the confiscation of cloister property. The severe measures connected with this confiscation were forgotten; the people had become accustomed to the new order of things, and so it would have been only natural to retain such features of it as were expedient and advantageous. But the man who alone would have understood how to consider the claims of the age in the reorganization of the Papal government was in Vienna. The Pope, chiefly guided by Cardinal Pacca, restored all chapters and cloisters; returned to them such of their property as had not been disposed of; and for the remainder, sold by the French, gave them State bonds, at an interest of five per cent. In this way the States of the Church were deprived of a considerable revenue, laden with a new burden of debt, and involved in financial embarrassments from which they will never be able to extricate themselves. In like manner, the French legislation and administration were abolished, and the clergy and the nobility were restored to their old rights. There was but one change which Consalvi succeeded in effecting: by the motu proprio of July 6, 1816, all separate constitutions of provinces and municipalities were abolished, and a uniform administration decreed. The states were divided into seventeen delegations, at the head of each of which a priest was placed as delegate, or, if a Cardinal, as legate, who was assisted, indeed, by a government assembly; but the latter was merely advisory, while he alone had to decide. Formerly the provinces, and even the municipalities and baronies, had had their own peculiar constitutions and prerogatives, which destroyed all unity in the states; but by these prerogatives the Papal government was limited, and a large share in the government secured to the laity, so that, for example, the Senate of Bologna maintained considerable independence. Now all these privileges were lost, and the
government fell exclusively into the hands of the clergy, which, of course, could not but excite great dissatisfaction among the corporations. It was not long, therefore, before the former conditions were restored: banditti, open derision of the law, and assassinations again became the order of the day, after the police had lost its power, and justice had fallen back into its old, dilatory course.

The same principle of returning to the old ways guided the Pope with regard to the government of the Church. This tendency showed itself most plainly in the restoration of the Order of the Jesuits, which was effected by the Bull *Sollicitudo Omnium*, of August 7, 1814. Pius VII. shared with all the Catholic opponents of liberalism the opinion that, by the abolition of that order through Clement XIV., a sacrifice of weakness had been made to liberalism, and he therefore considered that he could best mark an utter return to the old conditions by such a restoration, and begin most vigorously with the assistance of an order which had formerly been so firm a support of the Papal system. The result, however, did not justify these expectations. Even the name of the Jesuits awakened the old mistrust, as well in the secular clergy and the other orders whom the Jesuits, supported by their privileges, had endeavored to subject or to supplant in all their activity, as in the nations in which the striving after liberty had taken root, and which looked upon the Jesuits as the suppressors of all intellectual freedom. In Rome the hatred against the newly restored order immediately manifested itself in the most undiscguised manner among the entire clergy. In France and Germany the most decided disapprobation of this revival was loudly expressed. The motive universally attributed to the Pope was that he merely intended to secure for himself, in the Jesuits, tools for a complete re-establishment of the pristine order of things. And this, too, was the view which the new Jesuits took of their task: but for its successful accomplishment they were lacking in the means which the former brethren of their order had possessed; for the latter, as the education of youth was in great part intrusted to them wherever they had establishments, were able without difficulty to select and train the most eminent talents for their order. But the reviving order was obliged to receive whatever offered itself to them, and therefore gathered together more of fanaticism than of intellect. Added to this,
the wealth of the old Jesuits, which had also contributed much to their influence, had mostly disappeared. The new Jesuits, therefore, were by no means that which the old ones had been. They harshly and fanatically resisted all innovations, and thus placed themselves in direct opposition to all the ideas and demands of modern times. The old Jesuits, too, had shown the same opposition to the Reformation and the new ideas which sprang from it; but they had done this in a shrewder and more cautious way, by pretending to be willing to satisfy all just demands of the spirit of the age, and that in a better and more acceptable manner than was done by the innovators, and by allowing the people to retain that to which they had become attached, but imperceptibly winning over the interest directed toward these things to themselves and to the Catholic Church. The new Jesuits attempted, indeed, to imitate this artifice, by pretending to raise the youth of their educational establishments to a level with the times; but the deception soon became evident. In fact, the new Jesuits could find nothing better to do than to restore the order with all its old institutions, and even its old faults and weaknesses. Thus, in their works of instruction, the old Jesuit ethics reappeared with all their immoral doctrines, and formed a glaring contrast to the moral consciousness of modern times. In Fribourg, Switzerland, a work appeared\(^2\) in which the old doctrine of Moral Probabilism was once more set forth, without alteration, and with it many other objectionable tenets of the old Jesuits: for instance, that whoever had merely pretended to take an oath was not under any religious obligation, because he had not sworn a real oath; that he was merely bound by justice to fulfill what he had sworn only apparently. If a creditor secretly takes as much of his debtor's property as the latter owes him, this is not stealing. Those who transgress against the custom laws do not sin, for the custom laws are intended to be observed only from fear of a penalty, without at the same time laying any obligation upon the conscience.\(^3\) In this way, therefore, the new order stood in direct contradiction to the present and its claims, and could not, therefore, acquire any important influence. In Sardinia and Piedmont, indeed, as well as in Spain and in the Valais, the Jesuits met with a favorable reception; in the canton of

\(^*\) Compendium Theologiae Moralis, by J. P. Mouillet, 1834, 2 vols. 8.
\(^1\) Archinard, Les Origines de l'Église Romane, l. 170.
Fribourg, too, they were reinstated in September, 1818, after violent opposition; but from the other states they were, for the moment, still banished, and Portugal even declared itself most decidedly against their restoration. Under Dom Miguel, however, in 1832, they were also admitted to Portugal; but as soon as the liberal party gained the mastery in that country and in Spain, they were forced to withdraw from both countries. In France, although the government favored them highly until 1830, they could only gain admittance under a false name. In Russia, where the Jesuits had always continued to exist as of old, they were, because of their attempts to make converts in their educational establishments, sent away from St. Petersburg as early as 1815, and banished from the whole empire in 1820. Many of them went to Galicia, and finally succeeded (in 1823) in obtaining admission there and being allowed to found educational institutions. In the year 1839 they also established a college at Innsbruck, in the Tyrol.

Equally characteristic of the course pursued by Rome was its violent opposition to the Bible societies, which spread from England over the whole Continent, notwithstanding they disseminated among the Catholic people none but Catholic translations of the Bible. As, in the beginning, Catholic priests frequently joined these societies, Pius VII. issued a letter to the Archbishop of Gnesen, June 29, 1816, in which the Bible societies are denounced as a *pestis*, as *impie novatorum machinationes*, as an *inventum*, *quod ipsa religionis fundamenta labefactantur*, and which declares that translations of the Holy Scriptures do more harm than good, and that no translation should be tolerated which had not been approved by the Apostolic See, or was not furnished with explanations from the Church Fathers. A brief to the same effect to the Archbishop of Mohilev appeared September 3, 1816.

Soon after the return of the Pope, negotiations were commenced with the secular princes concerning the restoration of the national churches, which had suffered great changes through the political subversions. These negotiations gradually gave rise to a succession of concordats, of which more particular mention will be made in the history of the individual national churches. They, too, were distinguished by the circumstance that Rome strove to retain its older claims with iron firmness, to restore ev-
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very thing old, and reject all that was new. In connection with this, the conduct of the Curia toward Baron Wessenberg was in many ways very remarkable. He had been, since 1802, Vicar-general of the bishopric of Constance, and had supplied the place of the bishop, Carl von Dalberg, Prince-primate, who was almost constantly absent, in an admirable manner. Without deviating from Roman Catholic orthodoxy, he had combated superstition, had promoted the mental culture of the clergy, had striven to make public worship more edifying, and enjoyed universal love and esteem among the clergy as well as the laity of his diocese. On Dalberg's death he was to succeed him; but the Roman Curia opposed him most decidedly, and declared that it would neither recognize him as Vicar-general nor sanction his election to the office of bishop. Wessenberg went to Rome in person in 1817, in order to defend himself; the enlightened Cardinal Consalvi, who was to confer with him, is said to have been his personal friend, and often to have complained to him that his office obliged him to act such farces; but, nevertheless, Wessenberg did not gain his end of conciliating the Curia. The chapter of Constance, however, also remained firm, nominated him administrator of the bishopric, and he filled this office from 1819 to 1827, when the See of Constance was abolished, and a new distribution of dioceses took place. During this time the Curia did not acknowledge him in the least, though it did not venture upon any further steps against him, but utterly ignored the hated administrator of the See of Constance, who continued unwaveringly to pursue his former course of spreading culture and unanimity, and awakening true piety, in his diocese. This case not only proved plainly how inimical Rome was to all religious enlightenment, but also how much its authority was diminished in many parts of the German Catholic Church.

So long as Pius VII. was alive, his shrewd secretary of state, Cardinal Consalvi, prevented at least the overstepping of certain bounds in the assertion of the Roman claims, which the party of the zealanti now renewed without limit or moderation. One of the most fanatical Papists was Carlo Fea, known as a philologist. He was custodian of the Capitoline Museum, and librarian of the Chigi Library, and was quite as zealous an advocate of the infallibility of the Pope in matters of faith as of his supremacy over crowned heads. It had long, indeed, be-
longed to the policy of the Roman Curia not to give an opinion itself with regard to these doctrines, which had been opposed for centuries past by the Gallican Church, but, on the other hand, to favor those who defended them; and hence Fea was permitted to advocate the infallibility of the Pope to his heart's content in the *Effemeridi Letterarie di Roma*. So long as Consalvi had the direction of the government, however, Fea could not obtain permission to print any writings in which he attempted to prove the dependence of the princes on the Pope in secular matters. But this was changed when Pius VII. died (August, 1823), followed very soon (January, 1824) by his secretary of state, Cardinal Consalvi, and Annibale della Ganga ascended the Papal chair as Leo XII. In former times the latter had repeatedly been active as Papal nuncio, and had the reputation of possessing great shrewdness and ability, as well as a sensual love of pleasure, which many even called low immorality, and a degree of enlightenment which held nothing sacred. After the restoration of the Papal See, he nevertheless joined the party of the *zelanti*, and remained true to it even as Pope. Immediately after his accession there appeared a pamphlet by a Dominican, Phil. Anfossi, Magister S. Palatii, which he had not obtained permission to print during the lifetime of Consalvi, but the publication of which was now directly sanctioned by the Pope. It was entitled "On the Restoration of Ecclesiastical Property, as Necessary to the Salvation of those who have gained Possession of it without the Sanction of the Papal See." And not long after, Fea also came forward (1825) with his ultimatum for the indirect supremacy of the Apostolic See over secular powers. Nothing could be more mistimed than these writings. They excited the unbelievers to derision and hatred, but they also directed the attention of the governments to the fact that Rome had not given up its former principles, and caused them to regard the Curia with distrust, and to treat it with suspicious caution. Leo XII. acted as much as possible in the spirit of the *zelanti* also as Pope. He favored the Jesuits and the cloisters, and revived processions and all kinds of superstitious devotional

* See Vater's Archiv, 1823, i. 118.
* Pope Leo XII., by Theo. Scherer, Schaffhausen, 1844.
* Extract in Paulus's Beiträge zur Dogmengesch. p. 179.
* Transl. in the Sophronizon, VII. vi. part 2.
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exercises. He caused the jubilee of 1825 to be celebrated in Rome with all the splendor and pomp imaginable, and at a great expense, and then extended the indulgences issued on that occasion, also for other countries, to six months of the year 1826, as the post-jubilee year. Solemn canonizations were also resumed; and among these the beatification of Julianus, a Spanish Franciscan monk (1825), roused the particular indignation and derision of the enlightened classes, because one of the pictures of the authenticated miracles of the new saint which were displayed at the ceremony represented Julianus as removing half-roasted little birds from a spit and restoring them to life.

Very dangerous for the Papacy during this whole time was the political condition of Italy, which was kept in a constant state of excitement, chiefly by the secret society of the Carbonari. The latter had its real origin in France. When Napoleon had accepted the imperial crown, and thus re-established an absolute monarchical government, there were many, particularly among the zealous republicans, who were dissatisfied with this step, but did not venture to manifest their dissatisfaction. From among these malcontents there was formed, in Eastern France, the secret society of the Charbonniers (charcoal-burners), which called its secret meetings sales (ventes), and extended from the Jura to Picardy. When Naples had become a kingdom dependent on France, the Charbonniers (in Italian carbonari) made their appearance there, after 1810. Their principal vendita was in the city of Naples, and they soon spread over the whole kingdom, with the secret aim of putting an end to the then existing oppression of Italy. When the King of Naples, Joachim Murat, took up arms in 1815, announcing his intention of restoring the unity of Italy, he likewise entered into connection with the Carbonari. From this time they emerged from the obscurity in which they had hitherto held themselves, and spread, by means of Murat's troops, also over the Pontifical States. Murat was soon defeated and dethroned; but through him the secret societies in Italy had received a powerful impulse, and it has proved impossible to uproot them since. In Upper Italy, too, in consequence of the general dissatisfaction with the Austrian government, secret societies were formed, the most important of which was that of the Guelfs, which had its chief seat at Milan. These societies entered into relations with the Carbonari, and thus the whole of
Italy was soon overspread with *vendite* as with a net. They all united in the dissatisfaction with the then existing condition of Italy, and desired to see their country independent, mighty, and flourishing; but, on the other hand, they were less unanimous in their views as to the constitution to be desired for it. A portion were in favor of a republic, others would have wished, in consequence of the impulse received from Murat, to see all Italy converted into a single constitutional monarchy. The perverse course of most of the Italian governments naturally increased the prevailing dissatisfaction, and, consequently, the number of the Carbonari. And this was also the case in the States of the Church. Pius VII., indeed, renewed, in February, 1815, at the time when Murat began to act in concert with the Carbonari, the bull of excommunication against Freemasons and all similar secret societies; but this excommunication remained all the more ineffective that the mistaken government measures and the sad condition of the Church States constantly increased the dissatisfaction in the latter.

All the higher offices, as well as the positions of ministers and governors of provinces, were filled only by the clergy. The latter, for the most part, entered upon their duties with no other education than they had received in seminaries and cloisters, therefore knew nothing about administration, and frequently had no other end in view than to enrich themselves and their relatives. Trade and manufacture received no support whatever; the taxes weighed heavily upon the people, as the great amount of ecclesiastical property was free from taxes. By the unwise restoration of all chapters and convents, the State had assumed a burden of debt which increased with every year. To extricate itself from this difficulty, it leased out the greater part of the revenues, and often collected the rent years in advance. In like manner the maintenance of prisoners, and even of soldiers, was leased out to certain contractors, who furnished the promised supplies as poorly and scantily as possible—so that the men depending upon them actually suffered want—and enriched themselves immensely at the expense of the State. Altogether, the frauds against the latter were carried on in the most shameless manner. In the year 1817 a band of counterfeiters was discovered who had forged orders on the public treasuries for gratuities and pensions, which they had drawn, and had remained for a long
time undetected—a proof of the utter lack of supervision in the treasuries. The administration of the police and of justice were in an equally bad condition. The French laws, as well as all provincial statutes, had been annulled. It was intended to re-establish the common law, modified by the canon law and by the Apostolic Constitutions; and as these constitutions, in particular, were innumerable, and frequently contradicted each other, the result was a terrible confusion and uncertainty in the administration of the law. New codes were promised, but never appeared. Added to this were the venality and impotence of the courts of justice. As the will of the Pope was an implicit law, his mercy was appealed to in all cases; and, by the immoderate bestowal of grazie speciali, the decisions of the courts were rendered ineffectual, so that cases occurred where persons had eight decisions of like import in their favor, and yet could not obtain their rights. Like every thing else in Rome, the administration of justice, too, was dependent on influential protection: even convicted thieves were liberated if they could obtain powerful intercession. The weakness of the government occasioned a fearful increase in the number of the robbers and banditti infesting the country. Robberies frequently occurred in the immediate neighborhood of inhabited places. In Tivoli a citizen was attacked by brigands and murdered, in the midst of the town. As there was no other means of exterminating the banditti, Cardinal Consalvi, in 1818, commenced negotiations with them. The greater number gave themselves up to be put in prison for a year, and the government promised, in compensation, to grant them the means necessary for leading a quiet and peaceful life in the future.

Thus it could not be otherwise than that a general dissatisfaction should prevail in the Pontifical States, inasmuch as, under the French rule, the people had become acquainted with a sensible and vigorous administration, which understood maintaining order, established a uniform and definite law for all, and forced the hierarchy to keep within due bounds.

When, therefore, in 1820, the revolution broke out in Spain, and shortly spread, first to Naples and then to Piedmont, fermentation began also in the States of the Church. Even among the cardinals there were some who were not averse to a revolution; for the government was so exclusively in the hands of
Consalvi that the other cardinals were no longer consulted with at all, and, consequently, entertained the most decided hatred to the existing administration. Thus, not a few of the cardinals are said to have lent a willing ear to the plans of the Carbonari, and to have vainly hoped that their College would one day play an important political part as the Senate or Upper House of Italy. But no revolt ensued in the Church States on this occasion, because the Austrians sent troops to their aid, and these soon after suppressed the revolutions in Naples and Piedmont. The great powers at that time thought it incumbent upon them to send, in May, 1821, a common message of advice to the Italian courts, in which they openly censured the defects of government and administration existing in Italy, and proposed appropriate improvements. But these counsels had less effect in the Church States than elsewhere; even Consalvi felt highly offended by them, and there were too many difficulties thrown in the way of all improvements by the weakness of the government and the diversity of parties. The plan of forming an Italian confederation like that of Germany, which was proposed, was rejected because it was feared that the States might thus become a vassal of Austria.

Leo XII., who, as cardinal, had blamed most loudly the former administration and the exclusion from it of the cardinals, began by admitting the College of Cardinals to the business consultations; but the measures which resulted therefrom were contradictory and not to the purpose. Then he attempted to govern alone; but, in spite of his indefatigable industry, matters fell into still greater confusion, the general dissatisfaction increased, and Leo XII. drew upon himself the bitterest and most universal hatred.

When, finally, in July, 1830, the French Revolution threw all Europe into excitement, the Pontifical States were particularly affected by it. Immediately after the accession of Pope Gregory XVI., disturbances broke out in Bologna, February 4, 1831, excited by the revolt which had taken place in Modena the day before. Many other cities soon joined in this movement, and an alliance was formed in the whole northern part of Italy, the object of which was emancipation from the temporal rule of the Pope. The insurrection was soon subdued, indeed; for the Austrians immediately entered the rebellious provinces, without the
least attempt at resistance on the part of the insurgents, and subjected them to the Pope once more. But it was now important to employ measures to prevent a recurrence of similar events. The Pope had made a good choice for this purpose when he appointed Cardinal Bernetti, a very judicious and discerning statesman, secretary of state, and the latter did every thing which it was possible to do in Rome, where the best projects were always paralyzed and curtailed by party opposition. Much was done for the administration of justice. In order to regulate the finances a sinking-fund was established, as well as an auditing bureau for the control of the administration. The principle that the whole superior administration must be in the hands of the clergy was modified, and several secular prolegates were appointed in the place of ecclesiastical delegates. And, finally, an edict of July 5, 1831, decreed the appointment of municipal and provincial councilors. The municipal councilors were to be nominated by the delegate of the province, and were then to propose candidates from whose number the secretary of state was to choose and nominate the provincial councilors. The latter were to direct the provincial budget, determine the expenses and receipts, and appoint a commission for their administration. Although these arrangements gave to the laity a greater share in the administration than they had had before, they did not by any means restore to the municipalities their old liberties; the latter were therefore highly dissatisfied with the new order of things, and Bologna even entered a solemn protest against it. The liberal party in the Church States demanded that the temporal administration of the latter should be entirely separate from the spiritual government of the Church, and that it should be intrusted to secular rulers alone; that the municipal councilors should not be appointed, but should be chosen by the communities; that from the deputies freely elected by them the provincial councilors should be taken. Further, that a council of state should be formed from individuals chosen by the provincial councilors, whose assent should not only be necessary for the passing of laws and the determining of taxes, but which was also to appoint commissions for the remodeling of the departments of police, justice, and finance; and, in addition, should regulate and supervise the ministries.

Although these propositions were entirely justified by the con-
ditions which had existed until then, the Pope could not accede to them without at the same time seriously endangering the position which the Papacy had hitherto maintained. The large revenues which the Curia formerly drew from other countries had, for the most part, ceased, and consequently the cardinals, as well as the countless other prelates who belonged to the Curia, depended for their income chiefly upon the States of the Church, and mostly owed their main support to secular offices which were conferred upon them. The changes in the administration demanded by the liberals would therefore have diminished considerably the number of the curials, and thus the Papacy would have lost not only its outward splendor, but also its old vigor, which showed itself particularly in its tenacious adherence to the old conditions. For that vigor is essentially maintained and strengthened by the number of individuals who, united by similar interests, remain true to the same principles. Another consequence of the changes proposed would have been that the national churches would have been more successful in asserting and maintaining religious liberty with reference to the Papacy, without having to fear the obstinate resistance of Rome. And, moreover, there was something inconsistent in the idea that the Pope, God's vicar on earth, should be limited by a constitution.

As the wishes of the liberal party were not fulfilled, great dissatisfaction continued to prevail; and the Austrians had hardly withdrawn from the country, when, in January, 1832, new troubles arose in the Pontifical States. The Papal troops, consisting of vagabonds and adventurers, were not capable of restoring order, and, consequently, the Austrian troops were obliged to return; while, at the same time, the French occupied Ancona in order to prevent the Austrian influence in Italy from becoming too powerful. This occupation of the disturbed portions of the country lasted till the end of the year 1838. The tendency to insurrection seemed to be stifled at that time; but a few years later, dissatisfaction broke out anew, and vented itself in riots, assassinations, and other disorders. A large number of disaffected Italians, who, scattered abroad in foreign countries, sought to bring about a new state of things for all Italy—the so-called Young Italy—contributed to keep up this excitement. The condition of the Church States was, therefore, constantly very precarious.
The finances were so disordered that they could be regulated only by the confiscation of the clerical property. Justice, the police, and the government could not prosper until they were transferred from the hands of the clergy to those of men who had gone through a thorough preparatory training for these branches of the administration. There was no doubt that the temporal power of the Pope must come to an end at some future day, but when this was to be could not be foreseen.

The opinions and intentions of Gregory XVI. were first expressed in an edict, on public instruction, of September 12, 1831, which was full of the most scrupulous limitations and the most intolerant orthodox strictness, and showed themselves further in the Encyclical in which, according to custom, he notified all the bishops of his accession to the Roman See, but which, delayed by the disturbances in the Church States, appeared only August 15, 1832. Here he declares himself most explicitly against all ideas, desires, and aims of modern times, and opposes them decidedly as damnable errors. After many complaints on this score, he calls attention to the fact that the Pope alone has the right to judge of the doctrine and the government of the whole Church; that the bishops, therefore, must adhere to the Roman See, and the priests obey their bishops; that the discipline sanctioned by the Church should not be disapproved of, nor, even worse, subjected to the State government; that it was absurd to speak of a restoration or regeneration of the Church, abominable to attack the law of celibacy, and to doubt the indissolubility of the marriage-tie. Most particularly, however, indifferen

dentism ought to be combated, or the delusion that a man could be saved through any faith: this was the source of the insane idea that every human being was entitled to liberty of conscience ("dile

ramentum, asserendum esse ac vindicandum eulibetam conscientiae"). That the way to this pernicious error was paved by the immoderate liberty of opinion which, to the detriment of the Church and the State in general, was commonly prevalent. From this arose the changes of opinion, the corruption of youth, the contempt of religion and its laws among the people, and the ruin threatening the commonwealth. With it was connected that dangerous liberty of the press—not enough to be abominat-
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ed—in consequence of which the most incongruous and absurd doctrines and errors were spread abroad without difficulty. It was preposterous to assert that the effects of the bad writings were canceled by a few refutatory works. No one would allow poison to be publicly sold and circulated because antidotes could be used. That hence the Romish Index was a beneficial institution, and it was a grave error to deny the Church the right to forbid books. In addition, vehement opposition was made to the doctrines by which submission to the sovereigns was shaken and a more universal liberty striven for, as well as to the unions which, aiming at innovations, threatened both Church and State in equal measure. The bishops were exhorted steadily to oppose all innovations, and the sovereigns were invited to aid the former, as the quiet of the State was particularly dependent upon the welfare of the Church ("animadvertant sedulo, pro illorum imperio et quiete geri, quicquid pro Ecclesiæ salute laboratur").

This was the spirit in which Gregory XVI. reigned, looking upon the condition of the Middle Ages as the normal state to be aimed at, and persecuting all institutions of later date as damnable innovations. So long as Bernetti was secretary of state, this tendency was somewhat counterbalanced by him; but through the personal inclination of the Pope the party of the Jesuits continued to increase in importance, and their general, Father Rothaan, an extremely shrewd man, gained more and more influence, and was instrumental in securing to the Jesuits, by degrees, almost the entire control of educational matters. At last the Jesuit party succeeded in deposing Bernetti, the secretary of state, and putting in his place Cardinal Lambruschini, a man entirely devoted to them, who had become known chiefly by his having, in his capacity of nuncio in Paris, persuaded the unfortunate King Charles X., in 1830, to issue the fatal ordinances. Thus the spirit of the Jesuits and of ecclesiastical rigor became the ruling spirit in Rome, and predominated particularly after the fortunate struggle with Prussia, which began in 1837. The occasion for the latter was given by the question of mixed marriages, and by the condemnation of Hermesianism. With regard to the former, the Catholic clergy arrogantly declared that they could only consecrate them upon receiving the promise that all children born of such marriages should be brought up in the Catholic faith. As for the condemnation of
Hermesianism, the claim was raised that it should be carried through in Prussia on the part of the Church without any sanction from the government, and, in consequence, those of the clergy adhering to it should be reduced to complete inactivity. The chief point in this controversy was the question whether clerical decrees proceeding from the Pope or the bishops might be issued and take effect without the sanction of the government. For centuries past all states have claimed and exercised the right of the sovereign “placet” for all clerical ordinances, and must necessarily retain it if they would not be in constant collision with the Church and have their own interests endangered. Rome, indeed, has never publicly acknowledged this right, but yet submitted to it tacitly, until, on this occasion, it combated it most decidedly as threatening the liberty of the Church, and claimed the right for the heads of the Church to make laws and issue orders without any regard to the government.

The King of Prussia, Frederic William IV., put an end to this struggle, which could not be otherwise than precarious for a state with so many Catholic subjects, in 1841, by a compromise. But it is very obvious that this favorable result has heightened the pretensions of Rome and the strict Catholic party, which will, however, find a limit in the more widely spread enlightenment of the present day, and in the character of the existing states; for that enlightenment will check the growth of any religious fanaticism in favor of the Papal pretensions, without which they can never be asserted. The modern states, moreover, guard their rights too jealously to submit to any interference on the part of the Church; the chambers of the constitutional governments, in particular, are quite as much prejudiced against the absolute power of the Pope in the Church as against an absolute monarchy, and recognize that a restoration of the former will involve a return to the latter. These bodies unite within themselves the intelligence of the nation, and thus they can not be misled by the usual artifices of the hierarchy, while through them an anti-hierarchical spirit is gaining firm ground in the whole thinking and patriotic part of the nation. A proof of this is afforded by Spain, which country is just now engaged in open war with Papacy and the hierarchy, notwithstanding it was formerly regarded as the most bigoted of the Catholic kingdoms.

Though the reign of Gregory XVI. seemed not to be lacking
in glory and triumph with regard to the general ecclesiastical conditions, it was yet disastrous to the Pontifical States. In opposition to the most urgent admonitions of the period, this pontiff retained the old conventional Papal mode of government; all the abuses of administration remained intact; trade and manufacture were not encouraged, nor were their fetters loosened; every thing new was rejected—railroads, as well as the meetings of scholars and scientific men, which had been introduced in other states of Italy; thousands were thrown into prison on account of political offenses; and the finances fell into the most terrible confusion, inasmuch as some of the revenues were mortgaged for two or three years in advance, and there was, nevertheless, an annual deficit of from two to three million scudi.

When, therefore, Gregory XVI. died (June 1, 1846), there resulted for the cardinals the inevitable necessity, in order to guard against the ferment in the people, of not only choosing a new Pope speedily, but also letting their choice fall upon one who would hold out to the people the hope of redress for all their grievances. Consequently, as early as June 16, Cardinal Giovanni Maria Mastai Ferretti was elected, and assumed the name of Pius IX. He was born at Sinigaglia May 13, 1792, and was consequently still in the full vigor of his manhood. Hailed with enthusiasm by the people, he in fact did everything to satisfy the great expectations which were generally entertained of him. He immediately began to diminish the expenses of the state, and to combat the manifold existing abuses, and, in particular, called forth an unexampled enthusiasm by the amnesty which he extended (June 16, 1846) to all those under sentence for political offenses, by which six thousand prisoners were restored to their families. Thus he entirely gained the favor of the people, while among the clergy a strong party was formed against him, as they saw in the liberalism which the Pope exhibited an enemy of the Church and of the spiritual power. For this reason, he was very careful not to commit himself with regard to strict Roman Catholic orthodoxy. His Encyclica of November 9, 1846, by which he announced his election to the remaining bishops, breathed the stern, rigid spirit of the former popes. He proposed still to assert the old hierarchical principles with regard to outside matters, and merely to limit his improvements to giving the Church States a constitution and government adapted to the demands of the times. At the
same time, he had no idea of weakening the temporal power of the Papacy, or yielding any of his sovereign rights; he merely desired to regulate the administration of justice, and to grant to the people as many liberties as could be combined with the integrity of those sovereign rights, as well as allow to the laity a share in the management of public affairs, and, in particular, place commerce and manufacture on a better footing, and regulate the finances. He recognized that the government could no longer be carried on as it had been, and therefore aimed to reform it in a spirit of moderate liberalism. Hence, in April, 1847, he summoned estimable men from all the provinces, in order to advise upon the best form of communal organization and to take part in the administration; and from these, in November, a council of state was formed. Soon after, too, he called into life a National Guard. By this he so roused the indignation of the ecclesiastical party that a dangerous conspiracy was formed against him, which, however, was discovered in time. The Pope was now looked upon in the whole of Italy as the head of the liberal party; all the other states began to ferment. But liberalism, unchained and encouraged by him, soon grew too strong for him; the old ideas of the unity of Italy, with a republican or constitutionally monarchical government, gradually showed themselves once more; disturbances arose in the other states, in order to force the sovereigns to grant liberal constitutions. Lombardy was vehemently agitated against the Austrian government as a foreign one, notwithstanding that the material interests of the country had been greatly furthered thereby. The revolution in France of February, 1848, had a decisive effect upon Italy. The Pope, too, was now obliged to grant a constitution, which was proclaimed May 15, 1848. In it the Pope reserved for himself the unlimited government of the Church, but appointed for the government of the Church States a responsible ministry, and convoked two Chambers, on which was conferred the right of voting taxes and of ratifying laws. The cardinals remained the electors of the Pope, and formed a senate inseparable from the latter. When a proposed law had been passed by the Chambers, it was to be submitted to the Pope, who was to demand the opinion of the cardinals in a secret consistory, and, in accordance with it, give or refuse his sanction. According to this constitution, the cardinals could still be ministers; but,
soon after the proclamation, the Pope found himself obliged to fill all the posts of ministers with laymen. In the same manner, he was forced to agree to the removal of the Jesuits. For a long time past the hatred against this order had been openly expressed, and the Roman Jesuits had even, on that account, asked permission of the Pope to leave the country. The latter, however, still hoped to be able to appease the people. But as the safety of the Jesuits was more and more seriously endangered, the latter, at the end of March, 1848, evacuated Rome and the Pontifical States, and repaired to France, England, Belgium, Holland, Malta, North America, etc.

When Lombardy revolted against Austria and received assistance from Piedmont and Tuscany, the Pope was urged by the liberal party also to declare war against Austria. He resisted for a while, but was finally constrained to grant his ministers the power to do so. But as he constantly declared that he himself remained at peace with Austria, he thereby became unpopular, his authority diminished, and the radicals gained the upperhand in Rome. He took Count Rossi, who had long resided in Rome as French ambassador, into his service as minister, so as to have order restored by him. But for this very reason the latter became an object of hatred to the radicals, and was assassinated on November 15, 1848, on his way to the newly opened Chamber of Deputies, in the midst of a crowd. This threw Rome into violent agitation; the radicals were the ruling party, and the Pope fled secretly (November 24) to the Neapolitan fortress of Gaète. A provisional government was soon after formed in Rome, which called together a constituent assembly. By the latter, on February 9, 1849, Pius IX. was declared divested of his temporal power, and a Roman republic proclaimed, which was to be a pure republic, and enter into such relations with the other Italian states as were required by their common nationality. The Pope was to reside in Rome, but retain merely his spiritual power. At the appeal of the Pope, the great Catholic powers upon this united their forces to reinstate him in his temporal power. First a French army appeared in Civita Vecchia (April, 1849), and soon after, Austrian, Neapolitan, and Spanish troops entered the Church States from various directions. After a vehement struggle, the French occupied Rome (July 3, 1849), and with this the Papal rule was restored everywhere. The Pope first sent a
commission of three cardinals, who were to re-establish the Papal government; he himself returned only in April, 1850. He seems willing to go back to the concessions which he made before the constitution of March 15, 1848. He agrees to a council of state, an advisory assembly for financial matters, provincial councilors, and a liberal communal organization, but no constitutional government. The finances of the Pontifical States are wholly disordered by the revolution, and can hardly be regulated without a heavy pressure upon the people or the confiscation of ecclesiastical property. It remains to be seen whether the Papal government can continue to sustain itself without the aid of foreign troops. At any rate, it seems as if the next vacancy of the Papal See must give rise to a serious consideration of the question whether, in this case, the temporal power should still remain in the hands of a prelate.

§ 3.

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF FRANCE.


In consequence of the Revolution, many conflicting elements had developed in the French Church even under Napoleon, and could only be restrained from coming to light by the iron sceptre of the imperial government. The concordat of 1801 had always been looked upon by the strictly Roman Catholic party as having been extorted from the Papacy by the Revolution; and the same party considered all ordinances which had resulted from it, and hence all removals of the old bishops and priests as well as all new ecclesiastical appointments, contrary to law and legally invalid. The infidelity which had developed during the Revolution, and had taken firm root in Paris and the north of France, but particularly in the imperial army, brought about among the faithful Catholics—who were particularly numerous in the south and west of France—a reaction, which was increased by the steps taken by Napoleon against the Pope, and by the captivity of the latter. Thus there was formed, in the most profound secrecy, "the Little Church" (la Petite Eglise), which did
not acknowledge the ecclesiastics of the National Church, had its own priests, and cherished the greatest hatred against the existing government. Added to this, the Jesuits gained an influence in the south of France, though under another name. During the Revolution, the Abbé de Broglie, who had emigrated from France, had formed in Austria a society called the Association du Sacré Cœur; while a Tyrolean named Paccanari had formed another association in Italy, named Les Pères de la Foi. Both were Jesuit societies, and became united, with the Papal sanction, in April, 1799. Broglie, with his society, went to England; Paccanari, to the south of France. Favored by Cardinal Fesch, the association spread more and more in the latter country, and founded establishments in Lyons, Amiens, and several other cities. Napoleon, it is true, abolished these in 1804; but in the diocese of Lyons the Pères de la Foi maintained themselves for some time under the protection of Cardinal Fesch, and continued to exist secretly without disturbance, notwithstanding the frequently repeated decrees issued against them. Many zealous Catholic priests joined the association; they exercised their influence under the most manifold forms, and were particularly instrumental in exciting the religious fanaticism which reached its climax after the reinstatement of the Bourbons.

When Louis XVIII. returned, he found himself in a very difficult position. The greater part of the nation, intoxicated by Napoleon’s conquests, felt humiliated by the foreign victors, and looked upon the Bourbons, restored by foreign arms, as the enemies of French glory as well as of the new constitutions and ordinances created by the Revolution, while the army was entirely devoted to Napoleon and hated the Bourbons. With Louis XVIII. many of the nobility and the clergy returned, whose estates and benefices had been confiscated and sold as national property during the Revolution, and who, through their absence, had become entire strangers to their country. As fellow-sufferers of the legitimate King, they seemed particularly entitled to honors and influential positions, and the hope was not rare among them that the old conditions existing previous to the Revolution would gradually be restored, the nobility and the clergy regain their privileges and their possessions, and the monarchy, in league with the old Church, return to its former splendor. But that which they hoped and longed for was looked upon with aversion
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and dreaded as the greatest misfortune by the majority of the nation, as the endangering of civil equality, the threatening of the holders of property formerly belonging to nobles or ecclesiastics, and the restoration of feudal conditions. Louis XVIII. acted with great shrewdness. He granted the charter by which he decreed national representation, confirmed those of the ordinances and constitutions called forth by the Revolution to which the people had become attached, and, in particular, sanctioned all sales of national property. Nevertheless, the King did not succeed in gaining the popular confidence nor in giving general satisfaction. Among the old nobility and clergy, many were discontented with the concessions made to the Revolution by the charter, thought themselves unjustly treated—their claims not having been regarded—and formed a malcontent aristocratic party, at the head of which stood the Count of Artois, brother of the King. The people, on the other hand, did not trust the King; believed that he had only yielded to necessity in granting so much in the charter, with the intention of subsequently withdrawing these concessions again, and were confirmed in these suspicions by the fact that Louis XVIII. was chiefly surrounded by such of the nobility and clergy as had shared his exile; and it could be supposed that the latter would use all their influence in favor of such a course.

The Revolution and the Empire had greatly lessened religious faith and the attachment to the Church, particularly in Paris and in the north and east of France, and irreligion was widely spread among the masses. In order to thoroughly re-establish a firm and well-regulated monarchical government, as well as to uproot the revolutionary spirit which still frequently made itself perceptible, it seemed absolutely necessary to re-awaken a general religious faith and love of the Church. This was the idea from which Louis XVIII. and his advisers started when they sought once more to favor the Catholic Church in every possible way, and recommend it to the people. Instrumental to this purpose were the congregations of priests, which had been formed since the sixteenth century with the object of assisting the regular parish priests in the cure of souls, and particularly of traveling about as penitential preachers, and winning and inspiring the minds of the people in favor of the Church, at special religious meetings, by sermons and solemn ceremonies. These mis-
sionaries and missions had formerly been quite frequent in France, but had not been heard of since the Revolution. Now the old congregations suddenly reappeared, and soon counted a large number of members, particularly the Lazarists, a congregation founded by Vincent de Paula at the end of the sixteenth century. To the older congregations a new one was added in 1815, that of the Priests of Missions (Prêtres des Missions) in France. The Jesuits also joined them, under the name of Pères de la Foi; but the missionaries were by no means all Jesuits, although the liberals were wont to designate them as such. These missionaries, favored by the government, now began to wander about through France, and to preach to the people penitence and devotion to the Church, as well as love and obedience to the Bourbons. Above all things, they sought to induce their hearers to go to confession; their motto was "Ou la confession ou l'enfer—il n'y a pas de milieu." They made use of all kinds of spiritual artifices—visions, miracles, pomp and parade at divine worship, zealous preaching, etc.—to make an impression. They arranged peculiar ceremonies, which were so theatrical that they were possible only in France. They treated the French people as an apostate nation which had to be won back to its faith, and must formally consecrate itself to that faith anew. In their sermons all the acts of the Revolution were represented as heinous crimes, to be expiated by the people, and among them the confiscation of Church property and the abolishment of spiritual orders were particularly condemned. At the same time, they exalted the newly restored kingdom of St. Louis, declaring its cause to be closely allied to that of the Church. In every place where they held their mission, they closed it with a solemn ceremony—the raising of the cross (la plantation de la croix). A colossal crucifix, decorated with lilies, was borne in procession to the place designated for it, and consecrated with many ceremonies. One of the chief of these was that each one of the believers caused a metal heart, on which his name was inscribed, to be attached to the cross. This was intended to show symbolically how the Church, long suppressed, was now triumphing once more and taking possession of the country which had been wrested from it, and how the hearts which had become estranged from it were again consecrating themselves to it. The whole was intended to imply that France had been for a second time gained over from heathenism and
Christianized. In order, at the same time, to bind the believers still more by a form of worship which appealed to the senses, and to unite them by an association, the Worship of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, as well as the Brotherhood of the same name, was spread abroad throughout the whole country. This worship had been originated by Jesuits in the time of Louis XIV., and recommended by the visions of an hysterical nun. For a long time it was deemed objectionable to make any part of the body of Jesus the object of divine worship; but, nevertheless, the Jesuits generally introduced this worship, and founded brotherhoods for the same; and when the order was abolished, these brotherhoods were the bond by which the Jesuits and their adherents remained united. It was now spread, through the activity of the missionaries, over the whole of France, and bound the fanatical adherents of the Church and of the monarchy in a close alliance which could easily be called into general activity. By its agency, a number of petitions to the King were brought about, to the effect that he should recall the Jesuits and annul the charter.\(^1\)

For this very reason, the liberals saw in these missions merely politico-ecclesiastical emissaries, and were quite as indignant at their object—blind submission to the hierarchy, and the re-establishment of an absolute monarchy—as at the coarse abuse of religion which they permitted themselves, and at the narrow-mindedness of those who endeavored, in this manner, to subject the minds of the people to a new yoke. Hence the Catholic Church, from which these efforts emanated, became more and more an object of hatred to the liberals; and as the government favored the missionaries, although Louis XVIII. himself by no means approved of their exaggerations, it was generally believed that their political tendencies and aims were also those secretly entertained and pursued by the administration. In this way the missionaries were chiefly instrumental in confirming and increasing the mistrust and the inimical sentiments cherished by the liberals against the government. Contempt and hatred of the Jesuits showed themselves plainly wherever the liberals had the upper-hand, particularly in Eastern and Northern France, as also in Paris; frequently, even, the mission services were disturbed
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by fireworks being thrown among the devout multitude. Individuals in the service of the government, or who were seeking favor from it, often feigned great religious devotion and took part in the services; but just by this they contributed to render the whole movement more contemptible. These spiritual “congregations” were joined by the Congrégation des Frères des Écoles Chrétiennes. The latter had been founded at the end of the seventeenth century by Jean Baptiste de la Salle: its members had taken monastic vows, but were all laymen, who devoted themselves exclusively to the public schools, and thus made themselves very useful, although they were called by the people, in derision, Ignorantins. Napoleon recalled them from exile in 1801; but it was only after the Restoration that they spread more and more, and united their efforts to those of the missionaries by striving to inculcate the teachings of the latter upon the minds of the young. Their headquarters, until 1821, were at Lyons, but were subsequently transferred to Paris; in 1822 they already had in operation 180 houses with 1200 Brothers, who instructed about 70,000 children.

It was particularly in the south and west of France that the missionaries gained the greatest influence and awakened the most vehement fanaticism, which soon showed itself in manifold outrages and disturbances.

The first instance of the kind was the persecution of the Protestants in the Département du Gard in the year 1815. The number of Protestants in this department was very large, and, after having obtained during the Revolution equal civil rights with the Catholics, they had acquired wealth and position. On this very account, however, they had become objects of hatred and envy to the fanatic Catholic mob. This fanaticism was expressed immediately after the return of the Bourbons in addresses to the King, the motto of which was invariably “One God, one king, one faith.” At the same time, all sorts of annoyances were directed against the Protestants. But matters grew worse when, after the Hundred Days, Louis XVIII. returned a second time. It has, indeed, been proved that the Protestants, on the return of Napoleon, by no means declared themselves especially in his favor; nevertheless, they were decried as Bonapartists, and the greatest slanders were uttered against them, as, for instance, that they had plundered and assassinated royalist soldiers.
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conquest of Napoleon, the department in question remained for a time without administration, and, in consequence, there was formed in its capital, Nismes, a mobocracy which forthwith turned with the greatest fury against the Protestants, plundered and destroyed their property in Nismes, as well as in Toulouse, Avignon, and Montpellier, and murdered hundreds of defenseless unfortunates. The cry of "One king, one faith" became universal; it was evidently the intention to extirpate the Protestants entirely. The royal officials, indeed, soon after entered upon their functions again, but they, too, looked upon these abuses with indulgence, notwithstanding their King owed his reinstatement solely to Protestant sovereigns, and the armies of the latter were still occupying a large portion of Northern and Eastern France. Consequently, this persecution of the Protestants, in which many of them lost their lives and many more all their worldly possessions, continued from July to November, 1815, until commands issued at Paris put an end to these outrages; but the instigators remained free from punishment. The murderers of the Protestants, indeed, boasted of their deeds, and were arrested, but no witness ventured to appear against them, and so the authorities were obliged to discharge them; even officials used their influence in guarding them from punishment. In 1819 it seemed as if the above-described events were to be repeated in Nismes; but on this occasion the menaced Protestants united to meet force by force, and the Protestant inhabitants of the Cevennes made preparations to come to the aid of their brethren. This put a curb on the fanatics, and, ere long, the Chamber of Deputies in Paris, as well as the minister of justice, issued energetic declarations which forestalled any new disorder.2

The prevailing fanaticism also manifested itself in the persecution of the sworn priests (prêtres jurés or assermentés), i.e. those priests who had taken the oath on the constitution of the time prescribed by the National Assembly in 1790. The concordat of 1801, indeed, gave them the right to believe that the Pope had absolved them from the ban of excommunication, and reconciled them to the Church; but fanaticism now began anew to persecute them and drive them from their livings, if they did not consent, like excommunicated persons, to undergo a penance.

2 See Tzschirmer's Archiv f. alte u. neue Kirchengesch. iii. 225. Vater's Archiv, 1823, ill. 1; iv. 1. (Literature in Ritsert's Orden der Trappisten, p. 205.)
In many dioceses special commissions were appointed to discover and remove the sworn priests. At the same time, they were rendered objects of suspicion to the government by attempts to denounce them as Bonapartists.

Meanwhile, the fanatic priests summoned up once more the old spectre of Jansenism. All sworn priests were declared Jansenists, but less zealous laymen, too, were suspected of Jansenism. When, on their death-beds, they desired the extreme unction, they were frequently asked questions about Jansen, Quesnel, the bull Unigenitus, etc., which they did not understand; and if they did not give the required answers, the extreme unction was refused them, and they were, in consequence, denied burial with religious rites.

In similar manner, the missionaries and other priests began to use their spiritual influence, particularly in the confessional, in order to induce those who had purchased former Church property as national property to give it up again. Such a purchase was represented as the most serious offense against God and religion, which could only be expiated by the restitution of the acquired property. In particular, influence of this kind was exerted upon the women, who altogether showed themselves most susceptible to the exhortations of the missionaries, and thus, where the men remained stubborn, much strife and dissension was caused in families.

During this time, the Jesuits spread more and more, although under other names, because the law passed against them had not been abolished; and, according to their old principles, strove to win the youth of the country, and in it the future generation, for their cause. Hence they established colleges and seminaries, particularly at Paris, Montrouge, Dôle, St. Acheul, in which youths were brought up to ultramontane religious and absolutist political principles.

Added to this, the fanatics continued to declare that the concordat of 1801 ought to be annulled, and that of 1516 restored; that all ecclesiastical regulations made by Napoleon should disappear, and in their stead the Gallican Church be revived in its old splendor. The great number of bishops and ecclesiastics who at this time returned from emigration, and who had lost their positions by the Bonapartist concordat, were naturally in favor of this proposition. As, during the controversy between
Napoleon and the Pope, none of the bishops appointed by the former had received the canonical institution, and, consequently, had not entered upon their office, they were now, of course, obliged to yield, and the positions destined for them were assumed by emigrated priests who favored the fanaticism of the missionaries and the disregard of the concordat of 1801. The religious festivals abolished by this concordat were arbitrarily reintroduced by them; and, in like manner, processions, which legally could not take place, in cities with a mixed population, outside of the churches, were again held with great pomp, as triumphal pageants in honor of Catholicism.

All this took place under the eyes of the government, and was not only censured most bitterly by the liberal journals, but at times, too, brought up in the Chambers on the Left (liberal) side. But nothing could induce the administration to take any steps toward abolishing this nuisance. The King, indeed, was too sensible to approve of it; but he was deterred from doing anything against these fanatics by the thought that they were, after all, the most zealous royalists, and furthered the royal cause to the extent of their power, as well as that any measure taken against them would be looked upon as hostility to the Catholic Church, through which the government was striving to gain a firm footing. And, moreover, the fanatics knew that a powerful aristocratic party at court favored and protected their doings.

This was particularly the case when, after the second banishment of Napoleon in 1815, a strong reaction against all liberalism manifested itself, and was permitted by the King, who was deeply hurt by treachery and ingratitude. At this time the ultra-monarchical and ultramontane religious party, also called, from the residence of its head (the Count of Artois), the Pavillon Marsan, gained the ascendant most decidedly, and formed for the furtherance of its objects a politico-religious association—the notorious Congrégation—which spread over the whole of France, and sought to gain the people for its cause by all kinds of influence. In this way it succeeded in directing most of the elections of Deputies in its favor, so that the Chamber of 1815, the so-called Chambre Introuvable, was full of furious royalism. The Richelieu ministry, too, which went into office in 1815, acted in the same spirit, though more moderately, and therefore not entirely to the satisfaction of the
adherents of the Congrégation. Under these circumstances, it was possible to carry through many laws and ordinances favorable to the Catholic Church; even the King, who was the most judicious of all the royalists, regarded the Catholic Church as the chief prop of his throne, and, therefore, did not feel justified in refusing his sanction to these decisions in its favor. Thus, by a law of May 8, divorce, which by the civil code was allowable, though rendered very difficult, was abolished entirely, according to the principles of the Catholic Church. Another statute, of November 16, 1816, restored to ecclesiastical institutions the privilege of acquiring movable and immovable property, and holding it inalienably. Certain officials, in their districts, even arbitrarily passed all legal limits in following this course. The inspector of public schools in the Département du Gard, in 1815, removed all Protestant teachers attached to such schools, and his example was, by degrees, more generally followed. A great number of convents, particularly nunneries, were established everywhere, notwithstanding the law abolishing all spiritual orders had not been repealed. Even the Trappists, whose terrible austerity was almost equal to a slow suicide, returned from England and Switzerland, where they had sojourned since they had been driven away by the Revolution, bought back the Abbey of La Trappe, in Normandy (October, 1815); and increased so rapidly that sixteen monasteries and nunneries for Trappists were gradually established. The spirit of the ruling party was particularly manifest in the new concordat concluded with the Pope in 1817. In it the concordat of 1801 and the organic articles of 1802, by which Napoleon had secured the rights of the State against the Church, were abolished, and the concordat of 1516 was re-established. According to it, the sees which had been suppressed in 1801 were to be restored (making their number ninety-two, instead of the sixty then existing); and the French clergy, in place of the salaries which they were drawing from the government, were to receive, as before, real estate and a fixed income. Against this concordat, however, the liberal party, which had already been irritated in so many ways, protested vehemently. By it, the clergy would have become more independent of the State, and their endowment with real estate and fixed incomes, as proposed, as well as the establishment of new sees, would have necessitated enormous expenses. At the same time,
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the government changed its system; it felt the necessity of emancipating itself from the rule of the Congrégation and becoming more popular; and the minister, Décazes, who acted in this spirit, obtained the greatest influence over the King. The concordat, therefore, was not submitted to the Chambers, and not acted upon. But it remained in existence, as a mistake of the government, which increased the mistrust of the liberals against the Bourbons and the general dissatisfaction with them. Subsequently, however, after much debating, the number of sees was increased after all. According to the concordat of 1801, there were to be ten archbishoprics and fifty bishoprics; in 1822 the dioceses were so regulated that they mostly coincided with the departments, so that, in consequence, the entire number of the archepiscopal and episcopal churches was increased to eighty. This circumscription obtained the Papal sanction, and still exists.*

The ruling aristocratic ecclesiastical party, however, not only looked upon the privileges originated by the Revolution, but upon all privileges, even those of the Gallican Church, which were so zealously defended by the old French clergy, with aversion. It saw in them, as well as in the Four Propositions, only another constitution by which the absolute power of the rightful ruler of the Church, the Pope, would have been limited. It therefore hated this constitution like all others, followed the ultramontane dogmatics, as well as the ultramontane canon-law, and, consequently, taught that the Pope was infallible in matters of faith, and unlimited sovereign of the Church. Owing to the neglect of all educational institutions since the Revolution, the clergy ranked too low in point of cultivation to be able to refute such opinions, and thus ultramontanism became more and more widely diffused, and Gallicanism began to be looked upon as a sort of heresy. The chief defenders of the ultramontane, or, as it was falsely called, theocratic, system were the Vicomte de Bonald, the Sardinian count and minister of state Joseph de Maistre (d. 1821, at Turin), and particularly the Abbé de la Mennais. The Comte de Maistre, in his writings: Du Pape (1819), and De l'Église Gallicane (1821), sought to recommend ultramontanism as the firmest support of the State, particularly from a political point of view; the Abbé de la Mennais, on the other hand, preached it with fervent religious enthusiasm, in the firm con-

* In 1854.—Tr.
viction that every reasonable person, upon mature reflection, could not fail to decide in favor of this system. The political side of his view is that the reigning powers were entitled to respect and obedience only as long as they followed the divine law; that hence all nations, from time immemorial, had exercised the right of refusing obedience to their sovereigns as soon as the latter renounced obedience to God. That in the Church, however, the Pope alone, as the infallible vicar of Christ, invested with absolute power, had the right in such a case to absolve the subjects from obedience to their sovereigns, because he alone could judge unerringly whether or not the sovereigns had transgressed the divine law. But since the princes had begun to resist the Papal power, and no longer acknowledged the above Papal privilege, the people had resumed their old rights, and hence this emancipation from the Pope, first by the Reformation and subsequently by the Four Propositions of the Gallican Church, had shaken the foundations of the throne as well as of the altar.

Louis XVIII. died September 16, 1824, and was succeeded by his brother, who, as Count of Artois, had hitherto been the head of the absolute party at court, and was at the same time known to be very bigoted, under the name of Charles X. He found a willing and able instrument for his plans awaiting him in the existing Villele ministry. He sought, indeed, to dispel the universal mistrust against himself which was openly exhibited, by immediately abolishing the censorship of the newspapers, which had been reintroduced during the latter part of the reign of Louis XVIII.; but he soon showed by other actions how closely he still followed the party opinions which he had formerly upheld against his brother. Under his reign the Jesuits emerged more and more boldly from their obscurity, without even attempting to conceal that they belonged to an order abolished by law in France. The minister of public worship, Bishop Fraysinous, himself acknowledged in the Chamber of Deputies, in 1826, that there were many Jesuits in France, and that a number of the so-called petits séminaires had been confided to them by the bishops. Now, according to a law dating from the time of the Empire, all educational institutions were under the super-

2 His chief writings at this period were, Essai sur l'Indifférence en Matière de Religion, 1817, and De la Religion Considérée dans ses Rapports avec l'Ordre Politique et Civil, Paris, 1825-1826, 2 vols.
vision of the universities. The seminaries alone, which were des-
tined for the education of priests, were an exception, and were un-
der the sole authority of the bishops. Of these seminaries there
were two kinds—those of higher grade were designed for actual
theological instruction, the lower ones for preparatory studies.
These latter, therefore, the so-called *petits séminaires*, or sec-
ondary religious schools, were about on a par with the gymnasias.
During the Empire, they, too, were under the supervision of the
universities; but the bishops had constantly sought to remove
them from it, and had accomplished their object at the very be-
ginning of the Restoration, inasmuch as Louis XVIII. (October
5, 1814) empowered the bishops to establish in each department
such a *petit séminaire*, which was to be exclusively under epis-
copal jurisdiction. As the Jesuits were not willing to submit to
the direction of the universities, they had, with the aid of the
bishops, not only seized upon a large number of these *petits sémi-
aire*, but also, by their influence in other quarters, had caused
many youths to be confided to these institutions who were not
destined for the priesthood. The number of *petits séminaires*
was increased far beyond the legal limit: in 1828 there were
179 of them, and these contained but few pupils who actually
devoted themselves to the priesthood. It was evident that the
Jesuits, under this pretense, intended by degrees to obtain con-
trol of all school instruction, and withdraw it from the super-
vision of the universities, in order to inculcate their principles
upon the youth of the educated classes, and thus educate the
future generation in France for the yoke of hierarchy and of ab-
solutism. As the bishops constantly aided them in this endeav-
or by continuing to give *petits séminaires* into their hands, or
permitting them to found new ones, this plan became more and
more dangerous. Added to this, the so-called Congrégation now
came forward more openly, and increased its sphere of influence.
This association for the propagation of the Roman Catholic faith
had been founded in Lyons, in 1822, with the sanction of the
Pope, by Jesuits, and continued to be directed by them. It was
a brotherhood which met from time to time for common wor-
ship, and soon counted, in the whole of France, many members
of all classes of society, whose highest aim was the exaltation
of the Catholic Church and the Bourbon dynasty. It established a
treasury for the purposes of the association, to which every mem-
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ber had to contribute only one sou a week, but which, through the great number of members, became a very important means of furthering the aims of the party. All who wished to recommend themselves to the government joined this Congrégation. This society, which, during the rule of the Bourbons, was their main stay and support, still continued to exist subsequently, and spread over all Catholic countries of Europe and America. In 1850 it had a regular annual income of three million francs, and from it defrayed the expenses of missions in all parts of the world. It was also active for the conversion of Protestants, and spent large sums for this object, particularly in Great Britain, the North of Europe, and Switzerland. The society had two directories, in Lyons and in Paris, which issued reports of its activity in annals appearing in numbers every two months. It was amply provided by the Pope with indulgences, and thereby attracted the faithful in great numbers. Many of the youth in the lyceums belonged to it, and were thus early bound to the Catholic Church. Another circumstance calculated to cause apprehension was that the education of the Duke of Bordeaux, the heir to the throne, was confided to the Bishop of Strasburg, Mgr. Tharin, a declared friend of the Jesuits. Thus, every thing seemed designed to firmly establish in France the dominion of the Catholic Church in an ultramontanespirit; and the liberals recognized in the background the additional purpose of eventually destroying the liberties of the people and restoring an absolute monarchy. It was in the same spirit of the Jesuit party that in 1825 the law against "sacrilege" was passed. The desecration of consecrated vessels was punished with death; that of the consecrated host even with the penalty appointed for the crime of parricide. This, however, was expressly limited to the consecrated objects belonging to the Catholic religion, as that of the State, and the Reformed Church was thus reduced to the rank of a merely tolerated Church. The opposition of the government to Protestantism likewise showed itself on occasion of the conversion of Prince Constantine Alexander Salm-Salm, in 1826. This Prince had the intention of joining the Protestant Church in Strasburg. Not only the Catholic clergy, but also the civil authorities, did every thing in their power to deter him from this step; and when all their efforts proved fruitless, the Prefect announced to him the order to leave the kingdom forthwith. The Prince was obliged
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to make his profession of faith in Stuttgart; but the order of banishment was immediately after withdrawn, because it had only had the aim of preventing him from going over to Protestantism.  

In political matters the government acted in the aristocratically absolute spirit, closely related to the ultramontanism described. The emigrants were indemnified by a milliard of francs, strict laws issued with regard to the press, and, finally, censorship of the latter introduced.  

Under these circumstances, ultramontanism came forward more and more boldly in France, and did not hesitate to denounce the Four Propositions of Gallican ecclesiastical liberty as a work of heresy and political atheism. This made it, however, all the more evident to the people that the intention of the government was not so much to further religion as to make it an instrument for establishing absolutism. The liberal opposition gave loud expression to this, and, at the same time, with bitterness and vehemence, laid great stress upon the defection which had taken place from the principles of the old flourishing Gallican Church. This induced fourteen cardinals, archbishops, and bishops to assemble in Paris, and issue (April 3, 1826) a declaration in which they proclaimed themselves against the attacks which had been made upon the Gallican principles. They acknowledged, however, only the first Proposition, which asserts the independence of the temporal of the spiritual power, passed over the others in silence, and even condemned the attacks which, under the pretext of privileges, were made against the primacy of the Pope. The whole declaration was thereby much weakened, and had no important results. It was no less remarkable that an old faithful royalist and pious Catholic, Count Montlosier, indignant at the abuses perpetrated by the Jesuit party, came forward in the Chambers, in 1826, as the accuser of the Jesuits, who had already been banished from France under the previous reign, and published several pamphlets on the subject. But the liberals had the minority in the Chambers, and hence no direct result was achieved by these steps either.

Meanwhile, the ever-increasing indignation which made itself more and more apparent, constrained the King, in January, 1828, to dismiss the ministry of Villele, upon which the moderately liberal Martignac ministry, one of the best and wisest that have

* Vater's Archiv, 1836, p. 275.
existed in France in modern times, took its place. This ministry took quite another course in respect to religion as well as to politics. It first yielded to public opinion with regard to the Jesuits and the complaints of the university about the petits séminaires, and published the two remarkable ordinances of June 16, 1828. By one of these, eight Jesuit petits séminaires, in which there were but few pupils who intended to devote themselves to the priesthood, were placed under supervision of the university, because they had exceeded the number of pupils legally prescribed, and were directed by persons who belonged to a religious congregation not authorized in France. At the same time it was decreed that no one should be appointed to teach in a similar institution who could not show a certificate that he did not belong to such a congregation. The second ordinance limited the number of the petits séminaires; decreed that the number of pupils in them should not exceed twenty thousand, and added several provisions, by which those who did not intend to become priests were excluded from these institutions. These ordinances, which Charles X. signed with great reluctance, were hailed by the great majority with quite as much joy as they were received with secret wrath by the Congrégation. Some of the bishops protested vehemently, and pretended that their conscience forbade them to obey; the Archbishop of Toulouse, Count Clermont-Tonnère, even went so far as to reply to the ministry by the motto conferred upon his family by one of the Popes—"Etiamsi omnes, ego non." Yet they were forced to submit, and many Jesuits emigrated, because they had lost their sphere of activity. In consequence of these orders, moreover, the authorities exercised a stricter surveillance over the other congregations: every thing was done to prevent the founding of new illegal societies, and to abolish those of the kind already existing. The congregations employed in missions, therefore, had their limits contracted, and the Trappists, too, were obliged to close most of the convents of their order; only a small number of them, favored by their secrecy and other circumstances, succeeded in maintaining themselves for a few years longer.

During this liberal ministry, Charles X. seemed to be gaining the confidence and attachment of his people. But this administration did not last long. The liberals were so much encouraged by it that they went too far in their demands. A munici-
pal and departmental constitution, submitted by the ministry, was rejected by the Chambers because it was not sufficiently liberal. But this seemed to be just what the King had desired, in order to draw from it the proof that it was impossible to rule with a liberal ministry. In August, 1829, the latter was dismissed, and in its stead was appointed the thoroughly absolute Polignac ministry, formed from the heads of the Congrégation. Against this there was a general outcry; it was more hated for that which was apprehended from it than for that which it did. But as Charles X. was not willing to dismiss it, but, on the contrary, by three orders of July 25, 1830, dissolved the newly elected Chamber of Deputies before it had met, merely because a decided opposition to the new ministry was to be expected from it; as he furthermore abolished the freedom of the press, and finally issued a new electoral law; an insurrection broke out in Paris, in which a large part of France soon joined. The victories gained by the populace in the streets of Paris from the 27th to the 29th of June forced Charles X. to resign and to leave France with his family. On the 8th of August, the Duke of Orleans, Louis Philippe, was chosen King of France by the Chambers.

In this July revolution liberalism had gained the victory over the absolutists, aristocrats, and ultramontanes. The new government followed a wholly liberal course; the favor shown to the Catholic hierarchy therefore ceased, and the latter was, instead, subjected to many limitations. This spirit first manifested itself in the new government by the restoration of the Pantheon. The National Assembly, in 1791, had converted the Church of St. Geneviève, which had been completed a short time previous, into a Pantheon, a temple in honor of the national glory of France, in which it was intended that particularly such great men as had rendered important services to their country should find their last resting-place, and be honored by monuments. Napoleon, in 1806, restored the building to the Catholic worship, without divesting it of its former destination, and thus it contained monuments to many individuals to whom the Catholic Church would not have granted them. In 1823, finally, the church was repaired and given over to the missionaries. Now, however, Louis Philippe, by an order issued August 26, 1830, restored the building exclusively to its former purpose; and by his command the front of the church was decorated by the celebrated sculptor
David with reliefs, in which the most distinguished Frenchmen, even Voltaire and the heroes of the Revolution, were glorified. Zealous Catholics saw in this act nothing but a desecration of the church and an attack upon Catholicism; the hierarchy recognized what it had to expect from the new government. And, in like manner, the former laws by which the clergy were restricted, but which had ceased to be observed during the Restoration, were re-enforced. Among others, the law made by Napoleon was renewed—that the clergy could not purchase real estate, and that foundations in favor of the clergy could only be made by investments in the public debt, which investments, however, were in all cases to be authorized by royal ordinance (January 14, 1831). The law of 1828 respecting the petits séminaires was strictly enforced; and as the bishops were not willing to place themselves under the control of the government with regard to the finances of these institutions, the State discontinued the appropriations hitherto furnished them. The government, by these dispositions, did its best to satisfy public opinion, which declared itself decidedly against the encroachments of the clergy, but by no means succeeded in doing so. The more distinctly the people recognized the aim of the Catholic hierarchy to hold France in the bonds of a disgraceful superstition, to subject it to itself, and in this way, at the same time, to undermine constitutional liberty—and the more undisguisedly the aversion of the clergy to the new order of things exhibited itself, the more vehemently the hatred entertained by the masses toward the Church and the clergy was expressed, particularly in Paris and in the North and East of France. This was the case especially during the disturbances of February 14, 1831. On this day the Carlists had arranged in the Church of St. Germain l’Auxerrois a solemn service, with unusual pomp, in memory of the Duke of Berry, who was assassinated in the year 1821. White banners waved from the catafalque; the portrait of the Duke of Bordeaux, decorated with immortelles, was carried in procession through the church. This was evidently an attempt to excite an agitation in favor of the exiled royal family; but it had the contrary effect. The populace broke into the church and dismantled it completely. This done, they turned against the archiepiscopal palace, destroyed all its contents, and threw them partly into the Seine and partly into the fire; the doors were taken
off their hinges, the floors torn up, the roof taken off, and all the
out-houses and the garden were destroyed. During this time,
the cry "À bas les Jésuites!" continued uninterruptedly. Such
priests as fell into the hands of the mob were horribly maltreat-
ed; and the archbishop would probably have fallen a victim to
the popular fury if he had not, by accident, been out of town.
The house of the Priests of the Missions in Paris had already
been dismantled during the revolution of July; now, however, a
mob repaired to Mount Calvary, an establishment of those priests,
two hours distant from Paris, and destroyed it entirely. Not
content even with this, the popular fury turned against the lilies
which were attached to many buildings, and against the crosses
on the churches, and tore down all these signs of the Bourbon
rule and of Christianity. The King thought it necessary to yield
to this storm. By an order of February 15, the lilies were re-
moved from the national coat of arms, in which was placed in-
stead an open book, with the words "Charte de 1830." In like
manner, the lilies were taken down from all public buildings, as
well as the crosses from the churches. In consequence, many
local authorities, though not without opposition from the faith-
ful, caused the colossal mission crosses to be removed.

The clerical party, which lost its support with the banished
King, and realized only too sensibly that it could not expect the
same protection and aid from the new government, consequently
adhered firmly to the Carlists, and held itself aloof from the new
dynasty. It was, however, obliged to submit to the defeats it ex-
perienced with suppressed wrath, and sought, in return, to gain
stability and force through fanatical influence upon its orthodox
followers, and through taking advantage of their superstition.
Thus, it began to circulate the story that, toward the end of the
year 1830, the Virgin Mary had appeared to a nun engaged in
prayer, commanded her to have a medal made, with her image
on one side, and on the other the letter "M," a small cross, and
the hearts of Jesus and Mary, and added the promise that who-
ever wore this medal should be under the special patronage of
the Holy Virgin. This medal was struck by order of the Arch-
bishop of Paris, and worn by many. Ere long, countless stories
were circulated of miracles which it was supposed to have
wrought. The medal was also circulated in Bavaria, and was
there, too, much favored by the clergy. In addition, the priests
made use of frequent indulgences and all kinds of special services, in order to bind the believing multitude to them by the strongest possible bonds. It was in the South and West of France that fanatic Catholicism struck the deepest root. The attacks made by the victorious liberal party upon the Church only served to heighten this tendency. In the Vendée a disturbance was even created, which was soon, however, quelled.

In opposition to these Carlists, the victorious liberals split into different parties, and were at variance with each other. Owing to the circumstance that the new order of things was brought about by a revolution, and that the new government owed its existence to the same cause, the tendency to revolution in the French people was newly strengthened and encouraged, and the government could not acquire the authority requisite to it, nor maintain order and quiet in the kingdom. The revolution which had taken place could not, of course, satisfy the desires of all; and hence there remained many malcontents, who looked forward to establishing their fortunes in new subversions, and did not give up the hope that, as one revolution had succeeded, so another would also accomplish its object. Some, therefore, desired a republic; others, a monarchy, with still more republican institutions; but the greater part of the unruly and the disaffected desired chiefly their own advantage, and expected, with the aid of a new revolution, to enter upon a new, brilliant career. As the whole of France is dependent upon Paris, and in Paris there are thousands of poor who are easily induced to take part in any new enterprise, these malcontents were not wanting in instruments to carry out their dangerous purposes. By far the majority of the French people, it is true, desired quiet, so that commerce and manufactures might flourish, and were satisfied with the existing government, which favored these material interests as much as possible; but this majority, fond as they were of gain, were not willing to expose themselves to danger in defending that quiet, and thus the peace of the great kingdom was constantly endangered by small but firmly united factions. How rare moderation was among the parties, in spite of all the experiences which France had undergone since 1789, was shown by the fact that the judicious remark of the King, that extremes ought to be avoided, and a juste milieu observed, gave occasion for a derisive designation of the existing government system.
In the North and East of France, as well as in Paris itself, the chief aim of the masses is the acquisition of material possessions and success in business, while a small minority plans revolutions in order to gain, in that way, honor, influence, and wealth. Thus religion is there thrust into the background, and absolute infidelity is by no means rare. A remarkable phenomenon which characterized these conditions was the Saint-Simonism which prevailed at this time, inasmuch as it plainly disclosed the striving after material aims, and paved the way for a total remodeling of all existing conditions. The man from whom these ideas took their name, but who had died some years before they became prominent—Count Saint-Simon—had formerly served in the army, taking part, also, in the American War of Independence, and in America, where the state is founded upon labor alone, had doubtless conceived the ideas which he subsequently carried out. He soon withdrew from a military career, and occupied himself with reflections and experiments as to how a shape more beneficial to all classes could be given to labor, as the chief means of improving the organization of the governments. Gradually he extended his reflections to all social relations, and strove after a new organization of human society, by which it should be united in one body according to its requirements. He started from a new regulation of labor, then passed on to the arts and sciences, and finally applied his principles to religion. Saint-Simon regarded Catholicism as an attempt, appropriate in its time, to lead men to the unity necessary to them; and, therefore, declared Protestantism to be a retrograde movement in the history of mankind. He believed, however, that Catholicism no longer satisfied the demands of the present time; and hence he announced a new form of Christianity, which, instead of being directed exclusively to the spiritual, should give the material, the cultivation of which was the task of mankind, its due, and, uniting and satisfying all human interests, should diffuse the greatest possible happiness on earth by starting from a suitable organization of labor as the foundation of society, thus, in fact, exalting material interests into a religion. Saint-Simon had spent his whole fortune in travels and experiments for the furtherance of his object, without finding much encouragement. He sank to the lowest destitution, and was taken so little notice of that he attempted to commit suicide in a fit of despair. He merely wounded
himself, however, and recovered. At his death (May 19, 1825) he left but very few pupils, to whom he confided the continuation of his work, with the prophetic and encouraging words, "The fruit is ripe, you will pluck it." At first, his followers labored in secret for the propagation of their principles. In March, 1830, they began to lecture upon them in France, and, particularly after the revolution of July, came forward more boldly, constituted the journal Le Globe their organ, and made the most strenuous efforts to gain adherents in other cities of France, as well as in Belgium. They declared it to be the fundamental error of society, as it was constituted at that time, that one class of men existed merely to work for other idle classes, in whose hands all wealth had accumulated. Consequently, there should be an end to all private property, and the society hold all property in common; every one, therefore, who joined the society must deliver up his property to it. The society then would allot to each member his work according to his capacity, and reward him according to his labor; hence, the motto of the Globe was "Chacun selon sa capacité, chaque capacité selon ses œuvres." All privileges of birth should cease, and women no longer be dependent upon men, nor excluded from holding office or following any occupation they pleased. On the contrary, every function might be exercised by a married couple; all the rights and privileges held by men as members of society should henceforward belong to women also. The government of the Simonist state was to be in the hands of priests, at their head a père suprême. The priests were to possess every power, the legislative as well as the executive. They were to have the control of popular education, which should continue through life; to allot labor to each one according to his capacity, and to reward all labor according to its merits. When these priests were sole regents, the Golden Age would ensue. True religion was entirely wanting in the Simonist plan; that which it called so was pantheism, and an adoration of Nature, but confused and superficial. It taught that the contrast between spirit and matter was merely the result of human reflection; that God is the infinite, universal Being, the Life in All, the living world—not only a spirit, but matter likewise. Man is the final revelation of God, and is created for the purpose of unceasingly growing in God; that is, progressing in art, science, and labor. For all science is knowledge from God; all labor is a worship of God; and
art, inasmuch as it excites the feelings, is religion. It is remarkable that Simonism, which invested its priesthood with a power more despotic than any which has ever existed, could have found adherents in France, a country which for many years has seemed to be insatiably striving only for liberty. This may, however, be attributed to the fact that the great inequality of property existing in the world, with all its attendant evils, can hardly be felt more strongly any where than in Paris, where, close beside the greatest splendor and the most luxurious extravagance, thousands of persons are living in greater destitution than is found in almost any other city of the world. This mass of human beings, of course, gladly hails any change, because they can only gain, not lose thereby, and it is for this reason that every revolutionary movement so readily finds support in Paris. Among these proletarians, the ideas of Saint-Simon naturally found great favor, yet the association could not burden itself with them too heavily, but only refer them to the golden time when the Simonist principles would be the universally prevailing ones. Besides these, it attracted many young adventurers, to whom it opened a prospect of an easy life, and, in the priesthood, even of authority and riches. Only a few wealthy persons joined it—good-natured fanatics—who, in the end, had to support the whole society. At the head of the Simonists, as priests, were Enfantin, Bazard, and Rodrigues. Among them, however, dissensions arose, through Enfantin’s proposing even to destroy the existing marriage and family relations by declaring an arbitrary dissolution of marriage allowable and rejecting the Christian teachings of modesty and chastity. He proclaimed himself père suprême, and at the meetings of the society an empty chair was placed beside his seat for the “free woman” who was still looked forward to as the supreme mother. Bazard and Rodrigues now separated from Enfantin; the house of meeting in Paris was closed. Enfantin, indeed, with his adherents, established himself at Monil-montant, near Paris, and the Simonists there attracted attention for some time by their assemblies and their peculiar costume, consisting of white pantaloons, white vests buttoned behind, and a short blue tunic; in addition to which they wore long beards, and their heads and breasts bare. But a legal investigation had the result that, on August 28, 1832, their leaders were condemned to a year’s imprisonment, and their society, which had undoubt-
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dedly become dangerous by its immoral principles upon marriage, as well as the excitement which it produced among the lower classes, was declared dissolved. Since that time they have been forgotten, and only made themselves ridiculous by the greater part of their number repairing to the East, there to search for the "free woman." Enfantin returned from Egypt in 1839, and accepted a position as postmaster in some town on the road from Paris to Lyons. In like manner, the other Saint-Simonists returned to a simple citizen's life.⁵

Various other remarkable religious phenomena appeared subsequently to the July revolution, which announced themselves as reforms of the Church, and outwardly, indeed, were somewhat more in unison with Christianity, but likewise passed over without important results.

The shortest part was played by the new Templars (Templiers). As early as the beginning of the eighteenth century a secret society had been formed in Paris, which purported to be a continuation of the order of Knights Templars, and could show an uninterrupted succession of grand-masters from Jacques Molay down to modern times. In this society there was developed a religion of reason, modeled after the views of the eighteenth century, which pervades the writings which must be looked upon as the foundations of the peculiarities of the order—the Leviticon, the ritual of the society, and an interpolated Gospel according to St. John. The confession of faith which is contained in the Leviticon shows a mixture of pantheism and naturalism. In keeping with this is the Gospel, altered by the boldest interpolations, in which Jesus is represented as a man who was initiated in Greek and Egyptian science; and the miracles and prophecies of Christ, as well as chapters xx. and xxi., containing the account of the resurrection, are omitted. The pretext, therefore, that this Gospel had been copied in the thirteenth century from an ancient manuscript of the twelfth century extant at Mount Athos deserves no credit whatever.⁶

During the Restoration, some facts about these Templars became known: the succession of their grand-masters since Molay,


⁶ Thilo, Codex Apocryphus Novi Testament. t. i. p. 517.
as well as something about their sacred books. In the year 1831, however, they emerged wholly from their obscurity, in the hope that the general liberty of worship which was granted by the new charter would hold out favorable prospects to them. They maintained that in their society was to be found the pure Christian religion, which, preserved through the apostle John and his followers, the Christians of St. John, had been embraced by the Templars in the East in the thirteenth century, and had, in this connection, been transmitted to the present time. They began to hold public meetings in their peculiar costume and with conspicuous ceremonies, and thus, at first, roused the public curiosity. But their bold idea of remodeling the whole of the Catholic Church in France according to their principles remained wholly without result. Curiosity was soon satisfied, and the Templars shortly relapsed into their former obscurity and were soon forgotten.

The *Église Catholique Française* of the Abbé Ferdinand François Chatel was, for a short time, somewhat more successful. Under Charles X., while almoner of a regiment of the guards, Chatel had already preached liberty of faith, and, shortly before the revolution of July, had commenced to edit a religious opposition journal, *Le Réformateur, ou l'Écho de la Religion et du Siècle*. While by far the greater part of the Catholic clergy were opposed to the July revolution, Chatel appeared from the first as its decided advocate, and immediately made use of the liberty gained by it for an attempt to reform the Catholic Church according to the prevailing liberal ideas. As all churches were closed to him, he began to hold service at his residence, in August, 1830, but was soon obliged to seek a more capacious place of assembly for the congregation which gathered about him. He banished the Latin language entirely from his service, and made use of French alone, even during mass. Altogether, he strove to conform as closely as possible to the views prevailing among the liberals, both in political and in ecclesiastical respect, in order thereby to find more general acceptance. He called his society *L'Église Catholique Française*, and in 1832 published a *Profession de Foi* of the same. The chief substance of the latter was as follows: Among men there is no infallibility; hence the
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claims of the Pope and the councils to such infallibility, which in itself is incompatible with civil and religious liberty, are to be rejected, notwithstanding the direction of the Church is intrusted to the bishops. The voice of the people is God's voice, and is therefore, for us, the divine law. All power emanates from the people, and every government which is not the expression of the will of the nation must be regarded as usurpation. Spiritual and temporal power are entirely distinct, and mutually wholly independent of each other. The priests of the French Church should submit to all the burdens and laws of the State as citizens, and, like all good citizens, resist the government if it violates the laws by virtue of which it exists, as these laws are the expression of the popular will. On the other hand, these priests may demand entire independence in every thing that concerns religion, which every Church has a right to demand as long as it teaches no principles by which public order is disturbed. For each individual, reason must be the fundamental rule for his convictions, and each one should follow these convictions, even though they are not in accordance with the generally accepted faith. The French Catholic Church acknowledges the Gospel as the sole rule of faith, and the three œcumenical symbols as the expression of the evangelical doctrine. It rejects the intolerance of the Romish Church, which gives rise to the declaration that there is no salvation in any other faith, and maintains, on the contrary, that every Church is designed and competent to bring Christian salvation to mankind. It recognizes seven sacraments, rejects celibacy of the priesthood and monastic vows; acknowledges no other obstacles to marriage than those assigned by law, and is, consequently, ready to consecrate every civil marriage. It leaves confession optional; believers need only receive the general absolution before partaking of the sacrament; children, however, are advised to go to confession. No fast-days are recognized; all the sacraments must be administered in the vernacular. While a member of the order of Templars, which claimed that the episcopal office, too, was transmitted in it, Chatel had had this dignity conferred upon him, and in 1833 came forward with the presumptuous title of a primate (évêque primat) of the French Church, announcing at the same time that the hierarchy of the latter, independent of Rome, and with a primate or patriarch at its head, held the grades of bishop, priest, and deacon.
This French Church did everything possible to recommend itself to the government and the people; in particular, it was always ready to lend its aid if the Catholic clergy refused burial with religious rites, or the consecration of a civil marriage. Several prominent journals, among them the Constitutionnel, took the part of Chatel and his work. But the government was wise enough not, indeed, to interfere with this new head of a Church, but to decidedly refuse him all encouragement. By encouraging the French Church, it would evidently only have caused one dangerous breach more in France, and furthered infidelity, while it could not but recognize that the revival of a serious religious feeling was one of the first conditions of political tranquillity and order. When Chatel, therefore, announced that the priests of his Church were ready to accept calls to parishes which might be extended to them, the government immediately issued (February 3, 1831) a circular letter to all prefects, in which it reminded them that, according to the existing code, Catholic churches and parsonages could not be given to priests who had emancipated themselves from the jurisdiction of the bishops. A few congregations, indeed, who were at variance with their bishops or curates, called priests of the French Church, and built chapels for them; but their number was always small, and several of these French Catholic congregations were soon dissolved. Chatel, however, hesitated at no means of finding favor with the people and increasing the number of his adherents. In particular, he tried to use the political tendencies of the French to his advantage: on one side of the altar in his church was written Gloire, on the other Patrie. He preached in favor of the Poles, whose cause is popular in France, and seized especially upon the almost idolatrous veneration entertained by most Frenchmen toward Napoleon. The 15th of August, which, in the Catholic Church, is the festival of the Ascension of the Virgin, he celebrated as the Feast of Napoleon. In his sermons, he was not ashamed to laud him extravagantly. Thus, for instance, he called him "perhaps the greatest man that was ever formed by the hand of the Creator;" and, further, in one of his sermons, instituted a comparison between Christ and Napoleon, asserting that "as Christ had reformed the moral world, so Napoleon was destined to reform the physical world." He also compared the attachment of Josephine for Napoleon to the love of Mary for
Christ; the surroundings of Napoleon to Christ's disciples, declaring that more than one Judas had betrayed him, and that those who had not betrayed him had deserted him when his fortunes changed. One of his prayers entreated that the ashes of Napoleon might be deposited under the Vendôme Column. From the the philanthropists of the Revolution, Chatel borrowed festivals for each of the four seasons, and instituted a peculiar feast in honor of the Eternal, as God was generally designated by him. Altogether, Chatel separated himself more and more distinctly from Christianity, and sought to create sensation by the most audacious religious assertions. Those positive doctrines of Christianity to which he professed to adhere in the first editions of his Confession of Faith, although he did not make them very prominent, he began to reject more and more openly. Thus, he preached one Easter-Sunday that Christ had not risen from the dead; another time he tried to prove the natural origin of Jesus; he preached against the divinity of Christ; taught expressly, in his catechism of 1835, that natural religion alone, which was written in every man's heart, was the true, good, and useful one, and thus his whole Christianity was reduced to the proposition—Christ, the son of Joseph and of Mary, deserves to be regarded and honored (not worshiped) as a model of virtue. According to these views, he altered the lessons for Sundays and holidays in the Eucalogue (Church ritual) published by him. The narrative portions of the Gospels are treated in the most arbitrary manner, every thing miraculous omitted, or represented as quite natural; the whole delineation is modern, and interspersed with empty phrases of a sentimental morality. In glaring contrast to this, however, he continued to celebrate the Catholic mass, even though this was done in the French language.

In this way, no beneficial religious reformation could be reached in France. While Chatel strove to effect such a one by entering into all the views of liberalism, and thus hoped to gain over the liberals to his Church, he overlooked the fact that these liberals, so far as their liberalism extends to ecclesiastical matters, are thorough infidels, and, therefore, utterly indifferent to every thing pertaining to Church and religion, in whatever form it may be offered to them, and that they only attach value to a Church in proportion as it satisfies the popular need of religion in a manner not prejudicial to liberal interests. Ecclesi-
astical reforms, however, provided they are not merely intended to destroy, but also to build up, can not be effected without the aid of religious enthusiasm; for the latter alone can break the force of habit and usage, which are particularly powerful in religious matters, and found in its place some other strong principle of faith.

The number of those who actually belonged to Chatel's Church in Paris was very small. The greater portion of his audience consisted of curious outsiders, whose visits, however, naturally grew less and less frequent. As his Church had no other income than the collections taken up during the services, it was very poor. This is proved by the fact that it could obtain for its meetings nothing but an old barn in the Faubourg Saint-Martin. It was only by the announcement of striking themes to be discussed by the preacher, or by the observance of some patriotic festival, that Chatel still at times attracted a large congregation to his church.

Already in 1833, one of Chatel's priests, called Auzon, separated from him, on account, it is said, of his assuming the title of primate. He held services of a character similar to those of Chatel, and founded several congregations in other cities. But the government paid less regard to him than to Chatel, and in 1837 caused all his churches to be closed, because the authorization of the government had not been obtained before they were opened. In August, 1839, Auzon at length made up his mind to recant—he was forced to do so publicly in a very humble letter to the Bishop of Versailles—received the Papal absolution, and became a Trappist. Chatel's church in the Faubourg Saint-Martin was also closed in November, 1842, by order of the government. Chatel went to Mons, in Belgium, and announced in January, 1843, that he would open a church there, and that he had left the Christian religion in order to become an apostle and priest of natural religion. His influence, however, has entirely ceased.

A no less conspicuous, but yet more honorable, part was played after the July revolution by the Abbé de la Mennais. Although he had always belonged to the ultramontane party, and was even one of its most distinguished writers, he had yet not approved of the course of the Bourbon government. He had recognized that the latter merely favored Catholicism as a means for their political ends, without, however, freely according to the Pope his hierarchical rights over temporal sovereigns. Further, he was
convinced that the conspicuous outward favors shown to the Catholic Church, and the compulsion which had been used in its interest, had only served to injure it in the public opinion, inasmuch as the people had been forced to see in it nothing but a tool of political despotism for the suppression of national privileges; while, if the Church had been left to itself, its inherent truth would have irresistibly seized upon the minds of the people, because this truth was so apparent that human reason, if it reflected upon it seriously and without prejudice, must necessarily yield itself up to it. Thus, De la Mennais believed that the revolution of July had brought Catholicism to a favorable turning-point, and that from that time, liberated from the rule of the government, it would develop its inner vigor without restraint, and irresistibly attract the minds of the people. While, therefore, the Catholic clergy in general made no secret of their disapprobation of the July revolution and the dynasty sprung from it, De la Mennais regarded that event and its results as beneficial, and strove to profit by them as much as possible for the Catholic Church. With this aim, he, together with another ecclesiastic, La cordaire, and a Vicomte de Montalembert, founded a new journal, L'Avenir, the motto of which, "Dieu et Liberté," showed that its object was to preach, simultaneously, Catholicism and the most decided liberty, and by this means lay the foundation for a new future. This journal was commenced in September, 1830. It demanded the most unlimited liberty of conscience, instruction, education, press, association, and election, and, especially, entire freedom of the Church from all interference of the government; the clergy were to accept from the government no salary and no assistance, but likewise not to submit to its orders; the Church was to be poor, but, at the same time, free and independent of the State. It was to be governed by the Pope alone, who, as Christ's vicar, has the sole power to instruct mankind in an infallible manner, and thus make certainty of faith possible, and whom, therefore, all men should believe in and obey implicitly. According to L'Avenir, the cause of Catholicism, of Papacy, and of liberty was one and the same. Gregory VII. was lauded as the great patriarch of European liberalism, who, to his last breath, maintained the supremacy of intellect and the primitive sovereignty of justice: this had been misunderstood only so long as Catholicism had been abused by the administration for political
purposes. For this very reason, the Bourbons had been justly deposed, for they had endeavored to obtain by force what could be reached only by liberty. The sovereignty had been directly bestowed by God upon the people, and only through it given to the princes; the right of the sovereign was only divine on condition of his protecting the divine right of the people to liberty. As soon as a prince attacked this right, he had lost his legitimacy. This principle, moreover, could only be carried out without danger of mistakes and abuses among Catholic nations, because they, instead of mere subjective opinions, were imbued with the divine law, which was infallibly expressed by the Pope. Where, therefore, this infallible authority did not exist, the people were once more entitled to their right of overthrowing a despotic government.

In defense of religious liberty, the chiefs of L'Avenir established an *Agence Générale*, which was to advocate in every way the freedom of instruction, of the press, and of association in the interest of the Catholic Church. The new idea expressed by L'Avenir, of an alliance of the Catholic Church with liberty and the people against the old governments, and against that administrative despotism which would govern every thing, found great favor in France, but still more in Belgium, where, in consequence of the revolution in that country, an entirely new Church, independent of the government, had been established. On the other hand, the French clergy, devoted to the old dynasty, were entirely averse to these views. The editors of L'Avenir declared that they submitted themselves and their opinions unconditionally to the decision of the Pope, in order to obtain which they suspended their journal and repaired to Rome toward the end of the year 1831. Here they soon discovered that there was no inclination to agree to their principles, and that, in particular, their demand of perfect liberty of religious worship and of the press was looked upon with aversion; but still it was thought best to treat such decided adherents of the Papal system with consideration. De la Mennais and his associates were therefore promised, at their request, an examination of the principles of their journal, but the investigation was partly intentionally deferred, partly prevented by the disturbances which arose in the Papal States. During this time, the Archbishop of Toulouse collected from the writings of De la Mennais and his adherents fifty-six
propositions which he deemed objectionable. Several French bishops joined in this censure, and it was sent to Rome, April 25, 1832. Finally, the Pope, in his Encyclical of August 15, 1832, also declared himself against several of the doctrines supported by L'Avenir, without, however, mentioning any names—particularly against the principles of civil liberty, and of the freedom of religious worship and of the press. Cardinal Pacca sent this Encyclical to the editors of L'Avenir, with the friendly admonition to remain obedient to the Papal See. In consequence, they declared, on September 10, 1832, that L'Avenir would cease to appear, and that the Agence was broken up. De la Mennais, however, had so roused the mistrust of the Carlist clergy that, ere long, various rumors were spread abroad with regard to him, and even reached Rome; and when he applied to the Pope, in order to justify himself, the latter called upon him to make a positive declaration that he believed and acknowledged the principles of the Holy See expressed in reference to his cause. De la Mennais, however, replied that those principles were partly of a political, partly of a religious and ecclesiastical character, and that it was only with regard to the latter that he submitted unreservedly to the Pope; but that in all things concerning temporal rule, he must hold himself perfectly free. Nevertheless, he was persuaded by the Archbishop of Paris to sign, on December 11, 1833, a promise to submit entirely to the principles contained in the Encyclical.

But this declaration of submission, to which he made up his mind from a feeling of weariness, in order to obtain peace and quiet, produced a sensation of bitterness within him which soon expressed itself in the remarkable Paroles d'un Croyant (May, 1834). In this work his spirit, struggling for freedom, broke all bonds. In it he attributes all evil to the fact that certain individuals have constituted themselves the rulers of their brethren, and that these tyrants have won over to their interests the priests of Christ as well. He pronounces it a religious duty to destroy monarchy, and to acknowledge no law but the law of God, the law of justice, of love, and of liberty. These doctrines, expounded with lofty enthusiasm in the style of the prophets of the Old Testament, at first created the greatest excitement in inflammable France. A permanent success, however, could not be expected from the work, on account of the peculiar combina-
tion of Catholic orthodoxy and republicanism which it contained; for the republicans were lacking in susceptibility to religious exhortations, while the orthodox Catholics in France were mostly Carlists, and opposed to the republicans. Thus the excitement created by the work soon subsided. De la Mennais was from that time looked upon as having withdrawn from the Catholic Church, and, in his solitude, soon disappeared from public notice, and could only temporarily attract attention again, some time later, by the relation of his negotiations with the Roman See (Affaires de Rome, 1837). Lacordaire had separated from De la Mennais immediately after Rome had spoken, and distinguished himself as a preacher in Paris, especially by his sermons for Lent, in the Cathedral of Notre Dame, in 1836.

Another conspicuous theological character was the Abbé Bautain, professor at Strasburg, who deserves great praise for his improvements in the mode of education of the youth studying there, and was particularly active in raising the petit séminaire established in that city to a much higher level. Before his time, the so-called philosophical course had been despatched in the most unproductive manner, by the dictation of Latin questions and answers. Bautain took charge of it, lectured in French, and, by this new method, soon produced the most striking results. But he also thereby roused the envy of many, who soon cast suspicion on his orthodoxy. Bautain taught that reason, left to itself, would lead away from God; that all truth was to be found in the Catholic Church doctrine alone, and sought to prove this by presenting the Christian truths in their simplest form, and to demonstrate their connection among themselves as well as with all natural sciences. Thus he strove to make faith scientific, and science full of faith. One particular accusation against him was that, in his doctrine, reason did not precede faith in the fundamental articles, and did not suffice to prove with certainty the existence of God and the infinity of his perfections, or to lead the mind to a recognition of revelation. The Bishop of Strasburg issued an "avertissement" against his doctrine, September 15, 1834; and Bautain, who was urged to recant by a Papal brief as well, at last consented to do so on November 18, 1835.*

All these prominent religious phenomena remained without a

---

more general result, and have not diminished the number of non-
_orthodox_. The Catholic Church has the most adherents in the
South and West, and does not allow itself to be disturbed by
these movements in its old accustomed course of ecclesiastical
mechanism, and for this reason it has been incapable of causing a
decrease in the infidelity which prevails particularly in the North
and East of France. It has no means of revenging itself upon
those who show their contempt for it but the refusal of a conse-
crated burial, and this has always been more general among the
French clergy than among that of any other country. A burial
with religious rites is not only refused to all who have kept aloof
from the Church and its sacraments, as well as to sworn priests
(_prêtres assermentés_) and duelists, but also to actors, and even to
the authors of plays and composers of operas, if they have not,
upon their death-bed, expressed repentance and submitted to the
requirements of the Church. Thus it was denied to Bishop Gré-
goire and the composer Bellini, and, in 1838, even to Count Mont-
losier, on account of his denunciation of the Jesuits. Where this
occurs in cases of popular men, it frequently happens that the
people break open a church, take the body to it, and enforce a
burial in consecrated ground. In the provinces, the _maires_ fre-
quently in such cases cause the churches to be opened in defiance
of the priests. Hence this refusal of a religious burial is an ever-
recurring cause of disorder and increasing hatred of the clergy.
The want of the necessary cultivation in the latter is another
reason why they can obtain no influence over the unbelieving
masses. In consequence of the law of celibacy and the small
salaries paid to most parish priests, the clergy are complemented
almost entirely from the lower classes, and receive their educa-
tion solely in the episcopal seminaries, which offer very inferior
advantages. The Theological Faculty in Paris, the Sorbonne,
indeed, was re-established immediately after the Restoration;
but, for want of hearers, no lectures are given there at present.
In addition, it is intended that there shall be a Theological
Faculty in every province; but these, too, exist only nominally.

To what lengths men can be led by a mere education of rea-
son, combined with the thirst of the French people to distinguish
themselves and create a sensation in any way whatever, and
what human monsters can be developed under these conditions,
was shown by a certain Lacenaire in 1835. This man had been
arrested and indicted for a number of the most heinous crimes—murder, theft, swindling, and forgery. Far from denying his guilt, he gave the court and a large assembly of listeners, in the calmest and most cheerful manner, a detailed account of his long career of crime. He explained how, in his peculiar circumstances, he had been led by his pantheistic, or rather materialistic, philosophy to place himself on a hostile footing with human society; how, progressing consistently, he had, without being naturally cruel, made up his mind to commit murders, and did not regret them. That, further, he had considered whether he would end his career by suicide or fall by the axe of the executioner, and had finally decided in favor of the latter. In short, he attempted to show that he had entered upon and pursued his course intentionally and systematically, and, therefore, was far from repenting of it. At the same time, this reprobate managed, while in prison, to make himself interesting by writing dainty verses and vaudevilles, and even composed a poem on the eve of his execution. He succeeded only too well in his intention of creating a sensation and winning admiration. The journals of the day vied in reporting all his remarks, and circulating anecdotes concerning him. Crowds applied for his autograph. His artificially assumed serenity left him only in face of the guillotine, and there he gave way to such abject terror and despair that it became very apparent how even the greatest audacity must fall before the last momentous step—death. It would be unjust to take Lacenaire as an example of the general condition of morality in France, or even only of that of the large number of infidels existing there, but it is, nevertheless, characterized by the fact that such a monster could show himself in France, and expect and attract admiration. It is evident, in connection with this, how little honor, which with a large portion of the French people is the sole principle of morality, can be considered sufficient as such. For every thing depends, in such a case, upon the grade of morality of the public opinion on which honor is based; if public opinion deteriorates, and even praises and esteems the wrong, the above principle will naturally lead to evil just as well as, under other circumstances, it leads to good.

It can not be denied, however, that after the revolution of July, even the liberals realized more and more distinctly the necessity of giving religion a stronger influence upon the people, if they
would successfully establish morality and true happiness among
them. Until that time, the danger threatening from the arro-
gance of the hierarchy had been so preponderant that the liber-
al party were engaged in constant struggles against it; but these
struggles were highly prejudicial to the interests of Christianity,
which was represented by the hierarchy. This danger was now
removed, but one exactly opposite became apparent, viz., that the
people would by degrees cast aside all religion, and that thus all
civil institutions, as well as all moral conditions, would lose their
foundation and all stability. Since the year 1834, particularly,
it has become obvious that the liberal journals, too, have begun
to mention Christianity with respect, to recommend it, and to
direct attention to the fact that without religion and morality,
quiet, order, and happiness can never be firmly established among
a people. And after the disturbances of April, 1834, had again
shown plainly how little of a firm moral foundation there was
among the mass of the people, the leaders of different parties
distinctly expressed their opinion in the Chambers, in May, 1834,
that Christianity alone could check the unlimited dissolution of
society. The government, too, since that time, has sought to
enter into closer relations with the clergy. In the first years
of his reign, the King had never attended any of the festivals
of the Church, at least in his capacity of sovereign, thereby in-
timating that there was no longer a State religion. But after
Fieschi's attempt to assassinate him, in 1835, on the anniversary
of the July Revolution, had, indeed, cost the lives of many per-
sons immediately attached to the King, but not reached the lat-
ter and his sons, he appeared in church again for the first time
in solemn procession, and was received with an address by the
Archbishop of Paris. Subsequently, the birth of the Comte de
Paris, August 24, 1838, gave occasion for a similar solemn ap-
ppearance at church. The indiscreet allusions to the Protestant
faith of the Duchess of Orleans which the archbishop permitted
himself in his speech at that time could not but convince the
King anew that the clergy ought to be allowed no influence in
government matters. But the necessity of reviving religious feel-
ing and attachment to the Church among the people is felt no
less forcibly; and as the Catholic Church is still very near to by
far the greater portion of the French people, the government
feels itself more and more induced to support the Catholic cler-
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... and win them for its cause. It has therefore gradually returned to amicable relations with the Pope, is endeavoring to put an end to the schism in the Catholic Church, and is permitting a number of convents to be established without taking notice of them, notwithstanding they are prohibited by the constitution. But this has had the effect of greatly heightening the pretensions of the clergy with regard to the government. In particular, they are striving once more to gain control of educational matters. They attempt to establish schools at their own pleasure, and to receive as many applicants as present themselves into their *petits séminaires*, without recognizing the control of the university. When the government enforced the law of 1828 against this, the clergy appealed to the liberty of instruction guaranteed by the Revolution of July; accused the university of unchristian, atheistic principles; and declared it utterly unfit to exercise the supervision of the schools. The French clergy were chiefly influenced by the example of Belgium, where the clergy were almost wholly independent of the government, and, in consequence of the existing liberty of instruction, had the right to establish all kinds of schools. But the true motive power of their actions lay in the Jesuits, who spread themselves more and more in France, and strove to gain control of public education in the name of the Church. Through their influence, the French clergy, too, were imbued with an ultramontane spirit, which not only paid no regard to the old privileges of the Gallican Church, but condemned them as reprehensible and heretical. Thus, a vehement controversial correspondence was established between the clergy and the university, and a feeling of great animosity was mutually cherished by the liberal and Jesuit parties. The government, indeed, was on the side of the former, but yet tried to show the greatest possible consideration to Rome and the clergy. At that time, the Solicitor-general of the Court of Cassation, M. Dupin, issued a new edition of a treatise on French canon-law, with notes and additions, referring to the questions of the day, which made a great impression generally, and had


10 Cf. Warnkönig, Die Kirche Frankreichs und die Unterrichtsfreiheit, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1845. 8.

11 Les Libertés de l'Église Gallicane, 1824.

considerable influence in the Chambers against the designs of the clergy. This caused the Primate of Gaul, Cardinal and Archbishop of Lyons, Mgr. Bonald, to condemn this work in a pastoral letter of November 21, 1844, in which, at the same time, the declaration of 1682 was rejected, and the Napoleonic Concordat and the Organic Articles were attacked. Here, however, the Council of State interfered, declared that an abuse (abus) existed, and suppressed the pastoral letter (March 5, 1845). There the matter rested, however; and although other prelates joined in the declaration of the bishop, nothing was done against them. Still, the government continued, very quietly, to act in the same spirit. First, the Jesuits were forced to withdraw, public opinion having been turned against them more than ever by Eugène Sue's Juif Errant. Count Rossi was sent to Rome, and there induced the Pope to call upon the French Jesuits, through the general of the order, to dissolve their congregation. In consequence, most of the Jesuits left France and went to Belgium and Switzerland. At the same time an educational law was proposed for deliberation in the Chambers, by which all encroachments of the clergy in educational matters were to be prohibited.

The number of Protestants in France amounts at present to nearly two millions. The Lutheran Church is wholly confined to the German population. Its adherents are particularly numerous in Alsace, where, even during the persecutions of the Reformed under Louis XIV., it had not been molested, in consequence of the treaties of peace by which its existence had been guaranteed. In the other departments of France there are only a few Lutheran churches, as well as one in Paris; but their members are all either Germans, or of German descent. All these churches are under the direction of the Upper Consistory in Strasburg. For the education of their clergymen, there is established in that city a Theological Faculty, by which the theological sciences are, in substance, taught after the German method. There is also a Reformed professor of theology attached to this institution, and, consequently, it is frequented by many French Reformed students from all parts of the kingdom, as the Reformed theological school at Montauban, founded in 1809, can not be compared to that of Strasburg in point of science, be-

cause, not to mention any other reason, it rests upon itself alone, and has no Philosophical Faculty connected with it.\footnote{In the summer of 1842, Strasburg had forty-four theological students, Montauban fifty.}

Among the original French population, on the other hand, the Reformed Church has alone found favor. The latter possesses a very peculiar consistorial system: adjoining parishes, when they have reached a membership of six thousand, form a consistory from their pastors and secular "notables," i.e. the members who pay the highest taxes; the number of these notables varies from six to twelve. These consistories, of which there are eighty-nine in France, have the direction of all ecclesiastical affairs, but are under the supervision of the State, a government official being present at all their meetings, and all their decisions being subject to the approval of the government. But as these consistories are all independent of each other, the French Reformed Church is greatly lacking in unity; and it is the general desire that a Reformed Upper Consistory should be established at Paris, as had already been promised by Napoleon. Moreover, the want of sufficient theological preparation in the Reformed clergy is very perceptible. The institution at Montauban is too inadequate, that at Strasburg at too great a distance from most parts of the kingdom; hence the establishment of a Protestant theological school in Paris is also urgently desired, as Paris is the scientific centre of France, and alone offers all scientific advantages of every kind. Protestants are scattered all over France, even in places where there are no congregations, so that many lack all connection with churches. This fact gave rise to the formation at Nismes, in 1838, of a Société d'Évangélisation pour les Protestants Disséminés dans les Départements du Midi. In these departments, in the mountains, there still existed descendants of the Camisards, who lived without churches and schools, and thus were in danger of becoming completely barbarized. Through the agents of the above-mentioned society, nearly nine hundred of these Protestants were speedily discovered, of whose existence no one had, until then, had any suspicion. Now pastors were appointed to visit them by turns, to preach to them, administer the sacraments, and circulate Bibles and religious books. The beneficial results of these efforts were so apparent that, soon after, other associations were formed in various parts of France.
after the model of the first society. In Alsace, too, although the population is chiefly Protestant, there are Catholic communities in which the Protestants are without any pastoral care. A society was therefore formed also in Strasburg, for the diffusion of the Gospel among the Protestants scattered about in the Eastern departments, namely in Alsace, Franche-Comté, and Lorraine (April, 1842).

During the same period the Protestants were evidently neglected by the government; but this very circumstance gained them friends in the political opposition party, or among the liberals. Wherever the opposition had taken deep root in the people, Protestantism also found favor with the latter; and several cases occurred where liberal Catholics, from indignation at the pretensions of the Catholic clergy, which were supported by the government, went over to the Reformed Church. Since the revolution of July, 1830, the Protestants have been placed upon the same footing with the Catholics by the government; but this has put an end to the interest manifested by the opposition in Protestantism; and as Catholicism, favored by the State, no longer endangers civil liberty, all aversion to it has ceased. Indeed, the extremely plain service of the Reformed Church, as it is held in France, is generally repugnant to the Catholics; and this is also the case with the Calvinistic doctrine, which has of late been more or less prominent in the French Reformed Church.

During the Restoration, a certain theological liberalism gained the upper-hand in the Reformed Church, which, owing to the superficiality of the theological instruction, was of a very shallow character. From Geneva, where a kind of English Methodism had found adherents in the congregation of Momiers, it spread also to the Reformed communions of Southern France, but without gaining much influence. In January, 1831, an evangelical society was formed in Geneva for the purpose of diffusing true evangelical Christianity by all kinds of means. Soon after, a second similar association was established in Paris. These evangelical societies endeavored to make use of the newly acquired freedom of the press, of worship, and of association, in favor of Christianity, and desired, following the example of England and America, to work for the evangelization of France, without claiming any assistance from the government. The members of these societies were chiefly English persons sojourn-
ing on the Continent, who had not only originated them, but also furnished the means for their support. But, for this very reason, the movement did not meet with general favor in France. The members were called Methodists, and particular exception was taken to the Calvinistic dogma of unconditional predestination, which the Geneva Association at least certainly asserted. The first step of these societies was to send out colporteurs for the sale of Bibles and distribution of tracts, in order thus to awaken a spirit of religion, and then report as to the degree of susceptibility with which they had met. Wherever a number of susceptible subjects were found, prayer-meetings were established or chapels opened, to which preachers were attached, but without demanding either the permission or the aid of the government. Now and then these evangelists also gained access to the Catholic population, and then fell into disputes with the Catholic clergy. It depended, however, entirely upon the local authorities whether they ignored or forbade such associations which had not the sanction of the government. The majority of the clergy of the Reformed National Church were opposed to these evangelical societies; some, however, joined them. It was the struggle between rationalism and supernaturalism which was being carried on here, as in Germany, although in another form.

The sense of the necessity of greater unity in the French Reformed Church gave rise to the so-called Pastoral Conferences in Paris. The plan originated with the preacher Coquerel; and these Pastoral Conferences, of which all Protestant clergymen occupying charges in France were to be members, were begun in 1833. For some time past, the general assemblies of the Protestant religious and charitable institutions had been held at Paris annually, soon after Easter, and had always been attended by clergymen from various parts of France. This circumstance was taken advantage of, in order to establish Pastoral Conferences to be held at the same season. These conferences discussed, among other things, a new constitution of the Reformed Church, by which it should obtain unity, and, in central synods, be placed under a supreme spiritual jurisdiction. But this was frustrated by the Methodist party above mentioned, which withdrew entirely from the supervision of the State, and insisted upon erecting independent chapels for the use of its adherents.

In opposition to this party, however, a Christian Protestant
Society for France was formed in Bordeaux in 1835, whose principles combined orthodoxy and attachment to the Church, and which sought at the same time to promote an adherence to the Gospel and to the existing Church ordinances, and rejected measures which deviated from the latter, such as had been taken by the evangelical societies. In 1842 there was danger of an actual schism in the French Reformed Church, owing to the Methodistic intrigues, which had their centre in the so-called Evangelical Society. This Methodist party took advantage of the manifold complaints which the French Protestants had for some time been making with regard to the neglect of their interests by the government. The salaries of their pastors were too small to enable them to support a family. In many towns, where there was a sufficient number of Protestants, they had no churches and schools; no Protestant clergymen were attached to the army or to the penal institutions, although there were many individuals of that faith in both. Count Gasparin, one of the most zealous of the Methodists, laid particular stress on these wants in the public journals, and caused the formation of a society for the general interests of French Protestantism,\(^{16}\) which, however, was to be composed only of members whose orthodoxy was undoubted. This society was organized in secret, and came forward openly at the Pastoral Conference of April, 1842, after having taken precautions that the latter should be attended chiefly by those who held similar views. At this conference, indeed, the society obtained the majority of votes, but it was greatly mistaken in hoping that this decision would be regarded as that of the French Reformed Church in general. On the contrary, this proceeding called forth general disapprobation. It was looked upon as the beginning of a schism: it was deemed contradictory that this society promised to look after the interests of the whole French Church, and yet excluded from its membership the greater part of it, and with it some of the most estimable clergymen. It was asserted that the consistories were the legal guardians of the Church interests, and no others were needed. From all quarters protests arose against the newly established society. A reaction against Methodism took place, which showed very plainly that the latter had, after all, gained but a small minority in the Church.

\(^{16}\) Société des Intérêts Généraux du Protestantisme Français.
Thus, already on April 30, 1842, one hundred and ninety Reformed clergymen united in a petition to the Minister of Public Instruction regarding the Theological Faculty at Montauban. The appointment of the professors in this institution rested with the minister. Formerly the latter was wont to consult the consistory with regard to this point, but after 1830 he appointed, without previous consultation, and by advice of certain influential persons, only clergymen of Methodistic tendencies to the vacant posts, and thus Methodism gained the upper-hand at Montauban. This was censured in the petition in question, and the minister was requested, in cases of future appointments, to consult the consistory, and for the present to restore the equilibrium between the two parties by establishing a chair for canon-law, which was very much needed, and filling it with a man of liberal opinions.  

From all this it appears that the Reformed Church of France, after having obtained an outwardly secure position, is still engaged in a process of inner fermentation. What it needs most is an improvement in the means of theological education, in order that the French Protestant Church may, in this respect as well as in others, recover from the wounds which it received by the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. It is to be hoped that when this is accomplished, the gloomy Methodism which stands in the way of all more extended influence on the part of the Reformed Church in France will retreat into the background, without, however, thereby causing any diminution of the true spirit of religion.

The government of Louis Philippe aimed at firmly establishing a condition of tranquillity and order in France, and, as far as possible, maintaining peace with foreign powers. It was aware how important is the influence of the churches upon the public mind, and therefore sought to be on good terms with all persuasions, without giving the preference to any. It was particularly endangered by the large number of the impecunious, who, incited by the advocates of communism and socialism, demanded an influence upon the government in order to better their position. On the other hand, the government depended upon the wealthy

---

commoners, and considered itself sufficiently guarded by them and by the National Guard, which was composed of them. For this reason it was long unwilling to agree to a change of the electoral law, which had for some time been demanded by the opposition. According to the charter, the qualification for the election of Deputies was so high that only a proportionately small number of citizens were voters. These, above all, the government sought to gain in its favor, in order to obtain the majority in the Chambers, and to escape an alteration of the electoral law. The opposition were constantly demanding a reduction of the electoral qualification. If this was granted, it was to be foreseen that the latter would gradually be reduced more and more, until, at last, all Frenchmen, without exception, would be voters. But such a multitude of voters could no longer be influenced by the government; the majority in the Chambers would be of an entirely different character. From such a majority demands in favor of the lower classes in a socialistic sense were to be expected, as well as hostile manifestations against foreign powers. The government would be urged into a more and more democratic course, and fall into dissensions and wars with other countries. To escape these dangers, the administration used every means to retain possession of the majority of the elections, in particular that of corruption. The voters were promised privileges for their districts or communities, and even the Deputies had concessions made to them for themselves and those recommended by them in order to retain them on the side of the government. To this mode of corruption was added another. The ministries were so insecure, and, after 1840, changed so rapidly, that some of the ministers made all possible use of the time of their administration for gain—accepted bribes, and were even guilty of frauds. There were always many who aspired to the position of minister; and, for this reason alone, one ministry was not allowed to delay too long before making room for another. The chief cause of dissatisfaction with the Guizot ministry was that it had been at the helm uninterruptedly since 1840. The opposition made it their aim to unveil the above-mentioned bribery of voters and Deputies, as well as the frauds of the ministers, and succeeded in proving several cases, which were especially made use of for rendering the government contemptible, although Guizot himself was free from blame in this respect, and left France in poverty. The government made
itself no less obnoxious in connection with the Swiss affairs of the
day, by apparently supporting the Separate League (Sonderbund),
and with it the Jesuits. In order to bring about the desired elec-
toral reforms, the opposition arranged the so-called reform-ban-
quets. The one designed to take place in Paris, which was, how-
ever, prohibited by the government, occasioned the revolution of
1848, in consequence of which the republic was proclaimed.

The results of this subversion can not be foreseen, nor is it
possible to tell what shape ecclesiastical matters will now assume.
Public opinion seems to be in favor of separating the churches en-
tirely from the State, as in America, and letting them form their
own systems of government. The ultramontanes would gladly
agree to this. They hope, in that case, to gain more by the in-
fluence of the clergy, which would then be quite unchecked, than
they could obtain from the State, and to acquire a greater power
over the public mind than has ever been granted them before.
They would then be able to establish religious schools, which
would thoroughly inculcate their principles upon the youth ed-
ucated in them; all religious orders would be allowed to found
establishments and convents, and thereby extend their influence.
Yet it is, after all, very doubtful whether the prevailing spirit of
liberty would tolerate such an assumption of power. The Re-
formed Church, too, is projecting a new constitution. But the
National Assembly has not had time to attend to ecclesiastical
matters.

§ 4.

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF SPAIN, PORTUGAL, AND ITALY.

In these countries, likewise, liberalism and absolutism have
been engaged in a constant struggle, the latter always in league
with the Catholic hierarchy, the former, on the other hand, op-
posing the pretensions of the priesthood, and secretly averse to
the Catholic Church: it is chiefly found among the educated
classes, who, however, are in the minority.

In Spain the Bourbon family was deprived of the throne by
Napoleon in 1808. The government of this kingdom had been
bad beyond comparison. The last King, Charles IV., had left
the entire power in the hands of Manuel Godoy, the so-called
Prince of Peace, who united all the highest offices in one person.
He was universally detested, and this circumstance finally favored the designs of the crown-prince to usurp the throne as Ferdinand VII. This state of things apparently facilitated the dethroning of the Bourbons. The royal family, indeed, immediately submitted to their fate, and allowed themselves to be taken to the places of residence assigned to them; but the Spanish people, incited by their old national hatred of the French, and by zeal for the Catholic Church, which the latter despised, rose in revolt against the new French King, Joseph Bonaparte. A war was begun which lasted uninterruptedly until the fall of Napoleon, and served to weaken his power considerably. The new King, Joseph, gave the country a constitution modeled after that of the French empire, as was done by all the rulers appointed by Napoleon. He abolished the Inquisition, suppressed the convents, and introduced the French code of laws. He promised, moreover, to convene the Cortes, the old states of the kingdom, which had not been assembled for a long time, every three years. In opposition to him, several juntas at first placed themselves at the head of the rebellious provinces; then a central junta was formed, which, in 1810, placed the administration in the hands of a regency. The latter convened the Cortes at Cadiz, and they proclaimed a constitution March 18, 1812. Liberal ideas, however, had penetrated also to them, and the remembrance of the corruptness of the last monarchical government gained for these opinions an influence upon the new constitution. In the latter the sovereign power was greatly limited, all feudal rights abolished, and many institutions of the French empire adopted. In particular, it put an end to the Inquisition, and suppressed the convents. It expressed the sentiments of the educated middle classes; the people were not in favor of it. The clergy, especially the monks, had too powerful an influence, and they represented this constitution to the people as an attack upon the Catholic religion, as a mark of hostility against the Church. From that time two parties were in constant opposition to each other in Spain—the Liberals, friends of the above-mentioned constitution of the Cortes, and the so-called Serviles, who desired to have the old constitution restored.

After the allies had entered France, Napoleon released from custody the captive Ferdinand VII, recognized him publicly as

1 Councils of State.
King of Spain, and permitted him to return to his kingdom in March, 1814. The Cortes demanded that Ferdinand should now take the oath on the new constitution; but in a declaration published at Valencia May 4, 1814, he pronounced the constitution of the Cortes null and void, and entered upon the most arbitrary government, guided by the attachés of his court (Camarilla), and, in particular, his confessor, Pater Cyrillo. The adherents of France (Afrancesados), as well as the liberals, the partisans of the Cortes, were cruelly persecuted; the Inquisition was re-established, the Jesuits allowed to return, and the suppressed convents restored. The royal arbitrary rule joined hands with clerical fanaticism, and the influential clergy were the most powerful support of the absolute monarchy. But the persecution of suspected parties, both by the government and the Inquisition, gave rise to so much misery and misfortune, as well as fear and anxiety, while, on the other hand, the administration fell into such disorder, and the financial troubles became so serious, that the universal dissatisfaction at length broke out into open insurrection. In January, 1820, a portion of the army proclaimed the constitution of the Cortes, and the King was soon forced to accept it. The Cortes were convened, and issued a series of decisions with regard to the Church which were in unison with liberalism. The Inquisition was once more abolished, the order of Jesus dissolved, and all Jesuits sent to the Pontifical States; the majority of the convents were suppressed, and, finally, the clergy placed under civil jurisdiction. In 1822, indeed, an actual breach took place between the constitutional government of Spain and Rome. The former proposed to send a liberal canonist, Canon Villanueva, to Rome, as minister extraordinary; the Pope refused to receive him, and, in consequence, the Spanish government not only sent the Papal nuncio his passports, but even thought seriously of entirely separating the Spanish Church from that of Rome, and making it independent, with a patriarch at its head. In consequence of a decree of the Congress of Verona, however, a French army entered Spain in 1823, soon put an end to the rule of the constitution, and restored the King with absolute power. This gave rise to renewed cruelties and persecutions against all liberals and those suspected of liberalism, many of whom, driven from the kingdom, made unceasing attempts

* Ranke's Hist.-polit. Zeitschrift, i. 651.
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to bring about new insurrections. A moderate party, however, gained some influence upon the King, at least from time to time, and thus, although the Jesuits were allowed to return forthwith, the Inquisition was not re-established. But in consequence, a fanatically Catholic and absolutist party was formed against the King, too, and not only attached itself to his brother, Don Carlos, but also made several attempts to place him upon the throne. The leaders of these Carlists, or Apostólicos, were ecclesiastics. Their aim was the exaltation of the pure Catholic religion, and they had no greater desire than to have every liberal put to death in its honor. In December, 1829, Ferdinand was married for the fourth time, to Maria Christina, Princess of Naples, his niece, who soon acquired a powerful influence in the government, and, in particular, decidedly opposed the furious reactions against liberalism which still took place from time to time. The King now emancipated himself entirely from the rule of the clerical party, and the breach between him and his brother Carlos was completed by his annulling the Salic law, which had been established for the succession in Spain when this country was taken possession of by the Bourbons. By it Don Carlos was deprived of the right of succession, which was conferred upon the King's daughter, Isabella, born October, 1831.

Ferdinand VII. died September 29, 1833, and left the kingdom in great confusion, and in still greater financial embarrassment.³ The finances were in such disorder, and the court was guilty of such extravagance, that the army never received their pay nor the public officials their salaries regularly, and even the King himself was sometimes in want of the money he needed. In 1830, indeed, 20,000,000 francs had been drawn, with the Papal sanction, from the Church property, but they afforded only a temporary relief, for the expenses of the government annually far exceeded its income.

After the death of Ferdinand, Maria Christina, the mother of the young Queen Isabella, assumed the regency for her; the latter was acknowledged almost universally in Spain, although Don Carlos protested against the validity of her claims from Portugal, where he was sojourning with Dom Miguel, and asserted his older rights. The Basque provinces alone, whose extensive privileges had already been threatened under Ferdinand

³ On the following remarks cf. the Darmstadt Kirchenzeitung, 1841, No. 158.
VII., and were most in danger from the rule of the Queen, followed the insinuations of the Carlists, revolted in October, 1833, and proclaimed Don Carlos King, in consequence of which he appeared in their midst in July, 1834. As he was the centre of the absolutist party, the Queen-regent could look for aid only to the liberals; she was forced to yield herself up to them entirely, and, consequently, to concede more and more to them. First, she granted a moderately liberal constitution by the *Estatuto Real* of 1834, which, however, soon no longer satisfied the demands of many of the liberals, and occasioned internal struggles among the party. And as, moreover, the terrible financial disorder became distinctly apparent— as the government was obliged to admit the bankruptcy of the State, and the means of equipping the army were entirely wanting—the insurrection of Don Carlos was not easy to quell, and even progressed, thus repeatedly seriously endangering the cause of the Queen.

The Queen-regent, meanwhile, had fallen into disagreement with the Pope. The latter desired to maintain a neutral position in the quarrel about the succession, and therefore refused to recognize Queen Isabella, as well as to accredit his nuncio in Madrid to her court. By the Concordat of 1753 the Spanish crown makes the nominations for all bishoprics, but the parties nominated have to receive bulls of institution from the Pope before entering upon their office. In these bulls of institution the Pope now objected to mentioning the nomination of the candidates by the Queen-regent, as this would involve an acknowledgment of Queen Isabella. He was willing, indeed, to give bulls of investiture to the bishops nominated by her, but proposed to make use of the expression in them that the bishops had been nominated *motu proprio et benignitate Sedis Apostolicae*, and, finally, secure the right of patronage of the Spanish crown by a special declaration. This proposition was rejected by the Queen-regent. In August, 1835, the Papal nuncio, who till then had continued to reside in Madrid, received his passports and left Spain; while the government, partly by force, induced the chapters to elect the bishops whom it had nominated, *vicariis capitularibus*, and thus intrust them with the administration of their dioceses.

For some time past the eyes of the liberals had been directed toward the vast possessions of the churches and convents, as they alone seemed to present the means of regulating the disordered
finances of the State. Consequently, a decree of April 22, 1834, ordered the establishment of an ecclesiastical junta, composed of clerical and secular members, which was to prepare a new organization of the clergy; another order of the same date forbade all monasteries to receive novices in future.

The majority of the clergy and the monks had always inclined toward Don Carlos. Absolutism was closely in league with religious bigotry; an absolute government was obliged to lean chiefly upon the clergy, and hence the latter had reason to expect from Don Carlos high honors, and respect and upholding of their privileges. In Spain, as in all Catholic countries, the liberals were averse to the clerical and Papal dominion. They menaced the privileges and revenues of the clergy, and could, therefore, not have many friends among the latter. The Carlists used these circumstances, too, to their advantage; they designated the Christinos as heretics, and called themselves Apostólicos.

The Queen's party was soon forced, by the general want of funds, to attack the Church property. Mendizabal, Minister of Finance, was authorized in 1835 to have a number of superfluous church-bells melted down. At the same time, the necessity became apparent of utilizing the ample possessions of the convents, likewise, for government purposes. Hence, even before any orders from the government had been issued, a fearful storm against the monks broke out in the cities, where the middle classes, among whom there was much enlightenment, had long felt oppressed by the monastic yoke. First, the convents were attacked in Saragossa, July 5, 1835, and many monks killed; the principal cities of the South—Barcelona, Valencia, Seville, Cadiz—immediately followed, and their example was imitated by the smaller towns. The government yielded forthwith to this expression of public opinion, and on July 25, 1835, decreed, without paying the least regard to the Papal See, the suppression of all monasteries which did not contain at least twelve monks. This measure was soon extended, and finally Mendizabal, in consequence of the vote of confidence conferred upon him by the Cortes, suppressed all monasteries (March 8, 1836) and decreed that the nunneries should die out. The secularized monks, indeed, were promised support by the State, but they never received any assistance from it, and thus naturally became the bitter enemies of the Queen's government.
The Pope had to be satisfied with expressing his complaints against the Spanish government in an allocution delivered at a secret consistory February 1, 1836, and with protesting against all infringements of the rights of the Church and the clergy.

Very soon, however, progressive liberalism was no longer satisfied even with the Estatuto Real, and demanded the restoration of the Cortes constitution of 1812. The Queen-regent was obliged to consent to the election of Cortes for the purpose of revising the constitution in question; the moderate party succeeded only in somewhat modifying its democratic tendency, and the constitution thus revised was adopted in June, 1837.

The ecclesiastical junta appointed in 1834 had made proposals with regard to the reorganization of the clergy, but these had been found too little in accordance with the plans of the ruling liberal party, and had therefore remained disregarded. In 1837, however, the Constituent Cortes appointed a commission for the purpose of accomplishing the same task more satisfactorily; and as early as May 10, 1837, the majority of the commission submitted their propositions. The substance of the latter was that the Pope should henceforward be regarded merely as primus inter pares among the bishops; the bishops alone grant absolution and dispensation; all Papal jurisdiction and revenues cease in Spain; and the clergy draw their salaries from the State. These propositions evidently went too far, and the Queen-regent refused to confirm them. She was willing to regulate the new ecclesiastical constitution only in conjunction with the Pope, but all efforts toward a reconciliation with the latter remained without result.

In 1839, however, the war with Don Carlos came to an end. He was too weak to govern the different factions into which his adherents, too, were divided; he became their foot-ball; and, in particular, allowed himself to be induced, by his very bigoted surroundings, to give his sanction to the most arbitrary actions and the greatest cruelties. His most able general, Maroto, seceded from him in consequence, with the greater part of the army, by the treaty of Bergara; he himself escaped to France, whither the remainder of his troops, under Cabreras and Balmesada, were obliged to follow him in 1840.

Meanwhile, Maria Christina no longer satisfied the desires of the radicals, who were more and more gaining the upper-hand:
many cities seceded from her party in September, 1840. She was forced to abdicate in Valencia in October of the same year, and her most distinguished general, Espartero, was chosen regent for Queen Isabella, who was still a minor. The ex-Queen-regent also withdrew to France, and fixed her residence in Paris.

During the above-mentioned agitation of September, 1840, juntas had been formed in all the principal cities before Espartero was chosen regent, and these juntas widened the breach with Rome. They expelled such bishops and parish priests as were opposed to the new order of things, put other ecclesiastics of ultra-liberal sentiments in their place, and made new divisions in the parishes. The greatest sensation, however, was created by the abolition of the ecclesiastical court of the nunciature in Madrid.

In former times, the Papal nuncio in Madrid had exercised, through an auditor, the highest ecclesiastical jurisdiction; in 1771, however, by an agreement between the government and the Pope, a tribunal had been established for this purpose in Madrid under the title of Rota de la Nunciatura Apostólica, the assessors of which were chosen by the King, while the Pope nominated the auditor or president. When, in 1835, the nuncio was forced to leave Madrid, he transferred to the auditor of the Rota, with the sanction of the government, the adjustment of the current affairs of the nunciature; but when this auditor, Don José Ramírez de Arellano, remonstrated with the regency which had been formed previous to the election of Espartero against the acts of violence which the revolutionary juntas had permitted themselves toward the clergy in September, 1840, the regency referred these complaints to the highest secular tribunal, notwithstanding the Rota was not subject to any other court. In accordance with the decision given by this tribunal, the regency abolished the Rota, transferred its affairs to the Supreme Court, and caused Don Ramírez to be conducted across the frontier.

The Pope censured all these measures most bitterly in his allocution of March 1, 1841. He protested against the suppression of the convents, the removal of certain ecclesiastics, the new division of parishes by the secular authorities, and against sundry other points. In particular, he declared it uncanonical that many chapters had conferred upon the bishops nominated by the government the office of a vicarius capitularis. Consequently, certain of the chapters refused to acknowledge the bishops thus
nominated as capitulary vicars. The government responded to
the Pope's allocution by a no less vehement manifesto of July
30, 1841; the Cortes, on June 23, declared all the possessions
of the secular clergy national property, and resolved to pay the
salaries of the clergy from the public treasury. All remittances
to Rome for indulgences were forbidden, and all extraordinary
spiritual tribunals, as well as the Papal nunciature, declared abol-
ished, as only the episcopal jurisdiction was to remain in exist-
ence.

Upon this the Pope issued a brief, February 22, 1842, in which
he repeatedly declared all decrees of the government which in-
terfered with the rights of the Church null and void; ordered
prayers throughout the whole Catholic Church for Spain and its
Church; and granted to all who should take part in these prayers
according to the prescribed forms full indulgence in shape of a
jubilee. This measure was entirely calculated to spread abroad
the greatest indignation at the course of the Spanish government,
and hatred of its instigators, and could not but make a deep im-
pression in Spain itself. After the expulsion of Espartero, how-
ever, in 1843, the young Queen Isabella assumed the reins of
government in person, and matters gradually appeared to regain
a firmer position. Through the influence of the Queen-mother,
Maria Christina, who, during her banishment, had humiliated her-
self before the Pope and subsequently became very devout, the
government has begun to show itself more yielding toward Rome.
In July, 1848, a Papal nuncio once more appeared at Madrid.
Spain, however, has by no means returned to a condition of safety
yet, either in temporal or in spiritual matters. In the cities, to
which many modern views have penetrated from foreign parts,
the hatred of the clergy, who have been the cause of so much
oppression, is very great, and open infidelity by no means rare.
On the other hand, the priests and the monks still retain a strong
influence in the country. The passionate, violent character of
the Spaniards has developed the greatest animosity between the
two parties, and that which happens to have the upper-hand
openly aims at the total destruction of its opponents. Thus
Spain, at present, is wavering between the extremes of supersti-
tion and infidelity; and it is evident that a long time will be
necessary to bring its political and ecclesiastical conditions to a
tranquil medium state.
Portugal was invaded by Napoleon in November, 1807; the royal family fled to Brazil, and Portugal became, from this time, the scene of continuous wars, until, in 1814, the old government again entered into undisputed possession. After the example of Spain, an insurrection broke out here, too, in August, 1820, and a Cortes constitution was proclaimed, which was accepted by the King, Juan VI., after his return from Brazil in 1821. In the Portuguese Cortes, ultra-liberalism was quite as much in the ascendant as in those of Spain, so that the King retained merely a shadow of his dignity. Against the pretensions of the hierarchy, too, the Cortes of Portugal declared themselves quite as strongly, and sought to weaken all ecclesiastical influence as much as possible. The Jesuits had been refused admission to the kingdom on the restoration of the order; now the Inquisition was abolished, and the Cortes, in 1821, went so far as to do away with all Church holidays except Sunday, and to institute, instead, five political holidays in commemoration of the glory and the freedom of Portugal. In 1822 it was further decreed that the majority of the convents should be suppressed, and the Pope be requested to permit those monks and nuns who wished to leave the convents to do so. As the inferior secular clergy had been much neglected in Portugal, as everywhere, their salaries were increased. But these measures against the monastic clergy robbed the Cortes of the confidence of the people; and thus the second son of the King, Dom Miguel, had no difficulty, in May, 1823, while the French were overthrowing the Cortes constitution in Spain, in doing the same in Portugal. King Juan VI., indeed, intended to replace the annulled constitution by another more moderate one; but he was too weak and undecided to withstand a court party at the head of which stood his Queen, who abominated all constitutions. When Juan VI. died, March 10, 1826, the crown fell to his eldest son, Dom Pedro, Emperor of Brazil. The latter immediately issued a new constitution, April 23, 1826 (the Carta), and then ceded the crown of Portugal, which he was not permitted to wear simultaneously with that of Brazil, to his daughter, Dona Maria da Gloria, who, upon reaching a suitable age, was to marry her uncle, Dom Miguel. The new constitution met with vehement opposition from the party of the Queen-dowager, Carlotta (who wished to secure for her son the unlimited sovereignty), but was, nevertheless, established by a regency. At
length Pedro, hoping thereby to reconcile the opposing parties, appointed his brother, Dom Miguel, regent; the latter having repeatedly taken the oath on the constitution. But Miguel had hardly reached Portugal, in February, 1828, when he broke his oath, and, with the aid of the powerful clerical party, annulled the constitution and caused himself to be proclaimed King, with absolute power. From this time he reigned over Portugal in the most arbitrary manner, and persecuted the liberals with unexampled cruelty, but was supported unconditionally by the priests and monks, as the protector of the true Catholic Church. In April, 1831, Dom Pedro, deprived of the throne of Brazil in consequence of showing too great partiality toward the Portuguese, returned to Europe in order to assert his daughter's rights against his faithless brother. He landed in Portugal with a small army in July, 1832, and first occupied Oporto. In July, 1833, he took the capital, Lisbon, and gained a decided ascendancy. All these successes, however, he owed to hired foreign troops. In the kingdom itself, the powerful clerical party was opposed to him, and stirred up the people against him and the constitution as dangerous to religion and the Church. The enlightened middle classes, who are removed from this influence, and judge the condition of affairs more correctly, are still greatly in the minority compared to the mass of the people. Dom Pedro, after his conquest of Lisbon, did much to increase the excitement of the clerical party against him. He immediately dismissed the apostolic pronuncio resident there; and, in view of so many priests being devoted to Dom Miguel, decreed a general reformation of both the secular and the monastic clergy; annulled the *privilegium fori*; forbade the nunneries to receive novices; suppressed such convents as contained fewer than twelve monks or nuns; and placed all cloisters under the jurisdiction of the bishops. Those ecclesiastics who were openly active for Dom Miguel were removed, and the nominations for clerical positions made by them were declared invalid. Pope Gregory XVI., in an address delivered at a consistory September 30, 1833, expressed himself most vehemently against these innovations.

In the mean time, Dom Miguel was wholly conquered, and obliged, in the treaty of Evora (May 26, 1834), to resign all claim to Portugal and leave the country. He went to Italy, where he forthwith revoked his concessions. Dom Pedro now reigned as
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guardian of his daughter, and abolished all convents and monastic orders, in which he had his most vehement opponents. After his death (September 24, 1834), the young Queen assumed the government. Portugal is constantly being brought in contact with and infected by the agitations in Spain. As, in the latter country, liberalism was constantly progressing, so, too, the Carta of Dom Pedro soon ceased to satisfy the Portuguese liberals; and the Queen was obliged, in September, 1836, to recognize the constitution of 1826, which, however, like that of Spain, had been modified by revision. During all this time, the attempts of the Miguelists did not cease, but they were less dangerous than those of Don Carlos in Spain. The fate of Portugal could only be decided simultaneously with that of Spain, and Dom Miguel and the clerical party conquer with Don Carlos, or Maria and liberalism with Isabella.

In Italy, religious fanaticism is much less prevalent than in Spain and Portugal. The Italians have too much sound sense to be easily drawn into any exaggerated enthusiasm. Moreover, they are too well acquainted with the Papacy, its weaknesses and its defects, and are not so liable to be dazzled by it as distant nations. The less so, indeed, that Papacy, for centuries past, has been engaged in frequent controversies with the smaller Italian states, by which the interests of the individual subjects were also affected. These states have therefore long since become familiar with the arrogance of the Papacy, and do not hesitate to resist it when necessary. Thus the kingdom of the Two Sicilies abolished, without ceremony, its feudal service to the Papal See. It was in the time of Joseph II., in 1786, that King Ferdinand IV. first refused the annual observance of the feudal service, which consisted in his furnishing a palfrey for the use of the Pope on the day of SS. Peter and Paul (June 29). After his return to Rome in 1814, Pius VII. strove to have this relation restored like other old conditions, but did not succeed. Ferdinand IV. declared to him, in 1816, that feudalism had ceased every where else; that he had been unconditionally restored to the possession of his kingdom by the Congress of Vienna, and that his sovereignty was incompatible with a feudal relation. At the same time, he reminded the Pope of the fact that he had

* On the regulation of Church affairs in Sicily, see Vater's Anbau, i. 63; in Sardinia, ib. p. 134.
been ready, on certain conditions, to recognize Joseph Bonaparte as King of the Two Sicilies, which proved that the monarchy in Sicily might, under some circumstances, be seriously endangered by the recognition of the Papal right to feudal service. The Pope thereupon used various threats, but did not venture to support his claims by ecclesiastical censure. The non-discharge of the feudal tribute is merely protested against on the day of SS. Peter and Paul, as, indeed, all pretensions of the Papal See are insured by protest on this occasion.

Unfortunately, the indifference of the Italians to the hierarchy has caused indifference to religion in general to become prevalent among them. They look upon it as something existing, something firmly established, and punctually fulfill their outward religious duties; but they are far from making religion a subject of reflection, or of inner sentiment. This tendency is frequent among the higher clergy as well, so that they look upon the Church as a merely external institution, similar to the State, and the government of the one quite as much a result of policy as that of the other. When, therefore, after the Restoration, several Italian governments attempted to diffuse, by outward compulsion, more of a religious spirit among their subjects, they only increased the discontent and disaffection prevailing among them. The strongest measures of this kind were taken by the governments of Sardinia and Modena. In the kingdom of Sardinia the importation of books and newspapers, and even of maps, was strictly prohibited. The Duke of Modena, an Austrian prince, began with a law on the abuse of learning, by which, in fact, all scientific liberty was to be abolished, and the middle and lower classes excluded from all higher education. The university was closed, and colleges established instead, where youths were prepared for their different vocations by monastic training. The elementary education was entirely in the hands of the Jesuits and priests; the existing free schools were abolished; the attendance of foreign universities and traveling in foreign parts almost prohibited; a strict censorship of books was introduced, and the numerous cloisters were re-established. The State withdrew almost

\[3\] In 1829 the Duke issued an order to the effect that his subjects should deliver up all bad (i.e. liberal) books, under penalty of severe punishment, and receive instead good books (books of prayer and of devotion); and, in consequence, the police began to search the houses to see if they contained books without the double stamp of censorship, i.e. the spiritual and the secular.
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entirely from all care for the public welfare, only maintaining a numerous and strict police force; the taxes were exorbitant.

On the other hand, the governments of Tuscany and Parma distinguished themselves by leniency and judiciousness.

In consequence of the Spanish Revolution, one of similar character broke out in Naples in July, 1820, and another in March, 1821, in Piedmont. Both, however, were quelled in the spring of 1821 by an Austrian force. The result of these agitations was a reaction, which, like that in the other states, sought, with the aid of the Church, to restrict the public mind. In Naples the Jesuits were restored in July, 1821. In both kingdoms laws were passed for the purpose of accustoming the youth of the country to the regular attendance of public worship. The French July revolution gave rise to an insurrection in Modena in February, 1831, which soon spread to Parma and the Pontifical States, but was subdued in a few days by the Austrians. In the Papal States alone it broke out again in January, 1832, so that the Austrians were obliged once more to enter the country and occupy the northern part of the States. Naples and Sardinia were spared on this occasion, for in these kingdoms two young princes had succeeded to the throne who vigorously abolished all existing abuses, introduced many improvements, and thereby satisfied their subjects; although they were by no means inclined to liberalism, but declared themselves in favor of a so-called enlightened despotism. These rulers were Ferdinand II., who had occupied the throne of Naples since November, 1830, and Carlo Alberto, formerly Prince of Carignan, King of Sardinia since March, 1831.

The Restoration of 1814 was particularly disastrous in its results to the twenty thousand Waldenses who were living in the Alpine valleys of Piedmont. Under the French administration, they had been placed on an equal footing with the Catholics; had been permitted to spread beyond their valleys, and their clergy had received their salaries from the State. As soon as the country returned to the Sardinian rule, their condition became once more that which it had been before the French invasion. They were not permitted to settle outside of their valleys nor to erect new churches, and were excluded from all offices and military promotion. A Waldense community could not even

*Water's Anbau, l. 153.
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have physicians and local magistrates of their own persuasion. Their clergy were deprived of their government salaries; a church erected under the French rule was closed. Meanwhile, England and Prussia took the part of this oppressed people by protest at Turin, and thus some concessions were granted them in 1816. They were permitted to engage in all kinds of arts and trades—even to become surgeons, apothecaries, and surveyors; their clergy were again to be paid by the State. Subsequently, in 1818, they were disturbed by a pastoral letter from the Bishop of Pignerol, in whose diocese their valleys were situated, which called upon them to return to the Catholic Church. Upon a remonstrance of the Prussian ambassador, however, the Court of Turin expressed its disapprobation of this step, and gave its assurance that it should not be repeated. Notwithstanding the number of Catholics in the Piedmontese valleys is very small compared to that of the Waldenses, there is a Catholic church for every house of worship of the latter; they are obliged to contribute to the support of the Catholic parsonages, and have to pay higher taxes than the Catholics. The great poverty of the Waldenses, which made it difficult for them to maintain their ecclesiastical institutions, was greatly relieved by donations from other Protestant states, i.e. Prussia, England, Holland, and Switzerland. They were thus enabled to erect two hospitals, while formerly such of their number as desired to be admitted to the government hospitals were obliged to abjure their faith. In addition, their preachers and school-teachers received considerable assistance, so that they increased in prosperity.

The Waldenses, too, have lately been disturbed by English Methodists. Since 1826, individual travelers have gained converts to Methodism among them, who, as in French Switzerland, withdrew from the congregations, and accused the preachers and other Church members of being unbelievers and reprobates. They met with strong resistance from the healthy religious spirit of the Waldenses, so that they number only from forty to sixty. Their spiritual pride, and their mania for condemnation, called forth such bitter feelings against them, particularly among the younger people, that this gave rise to various insults and excesses against them. The Methodist journals in France and the Pays

de Vaud were not slow to accuse the Waldenses of hostility against true Christianity on account of these demonstrations. These circumstances made the Waldenses averse to uniting their school to an educational institution which the English were projecting, and for the establishment of which they had collected nearly 400,000 francs. They feared that the latter was to be devoted to training Methodists.

The liberal measures taken by Pius IX. in respect to the Pontifical States exerted a powerful influence upon the whole of Italy. In 1847, already, a general fermentation began to show itself, and the liberals, greatly encouraged, far exceeded the intentions of the Pope, although his name was on their lips on all occasions as their guiding-star and leader, and they caused all Italy to reverberate with the cry "Evviva Pio Nono!" Civil liberty and the unity of Italy were the aims in which they united for the moment, although the most diverse opinions were entertained with regard to the political organization of united Italy. The Italian states could offer no strong resistance to these agitations, for, in Sardinia, Carlo Alberto even entered into them, and placed himself at their head, in the hope of uniting under his sceptre the whole of Italy, or, at least, a portion of it. On the other hand, Austria, as the ruler of Lombardy, was the most dangerous enemy of these aims—the desire for civil liberty, as well as the striving after the unity of Italy. The old hatred of Austrian rule, therefore, increased in Italy to a fearful extent. As early as 1847, Germans and Austrians became the objects of universal scorn and bitter animosity. At the beginning of the year 1848, several disturbances occurred in Lombardy, and the King of Sardinia placed himself decidedly on the side of the Italian party against Austria, when, after the February revolution in France, open war broke out between Sardinia, with which all liberal Italians united, and Austria, which was to be expelled from Italy. At first, the Austrians, who were not powerful enough, were repulsed; but on July 25, 1848, Radetzky gained a victory over Carlo Alberto at Custozza, and the latter was forced to propose an armistice. When the war recommenced, in the spring of 1849, he was beaten so severely at Novara, on March 23, that he abdicated, and ceded his crown to his son, Victor
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Emanuel II., who was forced to conclude peace immediately. After Rome, too, had been retaken by the French (July 3, 1849), a reaction again took place throughout all Italy, with the exception of Sardinia, where the liberal constitution which Carlo Alberto had established February 8, 1848, remained intact.

In all these agitations in Italy, political liberalism, as was the case everywhere, was closely connected with the advocacy of religious freedom. Where liberalism gained the victory, the Jesuits, as instruments of the spiritual slavery of nations, were expelled, and measures were taken to limit the power of the clergy. Where, however, the liberals were vanquished, the Jesuits were recalled and the clergy lifted their heads anew.

In Sardinia, the liberal constitution continued to exist, and, in consequence, the Waldenses, so long oppressed, obtained many mitigations. According to this constitution, indeed, the Catholic religion was to remain the only State religion; but other existing persuasions were to be legally tolerated. In view of this, the King, February 17, 1848, issued an ordinance by which he granted to the Waldenses the enjoyment of all civil and political rights, but in such a way that no innovations could take place with regard to their public worship and their schools. Thus, they are allowed to take up their residence outside of their valleys, but not hold public worship elsewhere, and even in their valleys they can not build a new church without the permission of the government. They are forbidden to do any kind of work on Catholic holidays; no religious books can be printed by them without the authorization of the bishop. Their condition, therefore, is greatly alleviated, yet they still have reason to feel painfully that their Church exists only on sufferance.

But the conditions of the Catholic Church and clergy, too, were now altered according to the constitution of Carlo Alberto. After the government had vainly attempted to bring about these alterations by a treaty with Rome, it proceeded to effect them by civil legislation. Minister Siccardi submitted to the Parliament the following draughts of laws:

1. All civil causes are to be tried by civil courts, and according to the common civil law.
2. All ecclesiastics are subject to the jurisdiction of the State in criminal causes.
3. The arrest of a criminal may be effected in churches or oth-
er consecrated places, although with an appropriate regard to the sanctity of the spot.

Parliament confirmed these provisions, and they were proclaimed as laws by the young King on April 2, 1850. But the Pope and the Sardinian bishops looked upon them as sacrilegious, and as infringements upon the rights of the Church, and protested against them, thus producing much discord. The Archbishop of Turin, Franzoni, immediately declared himself opposed to the new laws, but was brought to trial and sentenced to a month's imprisonment. Subsequently, in August, 1850, he went so far as to refuse one of the ministers, the Count Santa Rosa, the extreme unction, except on condition of his expressing repentance of his co-operation in these laws, and revoking the same. The minister, however, refused to accede to this demand, and, in consequence, died without the extreme unction, and was refused a religious burial by the clergy.

The government was in a difficult position, as the greater portion of the people, even now, is still entirely in the bonds of the clergy. This induced the originator of the laws in question, Siccardi, to resign his position as minister: he had become the object of the popular hatred, but his laws remained in force. Franzoni was again tried for insubordination to the State, and condemned by the Court of Appeals of Turin, on September 26, 1850, to loss of office and banishment from the kingdom. He repaired to France.

The Archbishop of Cagliari met with a like fate at about the same time. Great abuses had crept into the administration of charitable foundations and the distribution of tithes in Sardinia; the government sent a commission to the island to examine into the condition of affairs. The archbishop denied the right of the commission to do so, forbade all ecclesiastics to furnish the required information, and excommunicated all officials who took part in the examination. The government brought a charge against him at the Court of Appeals of Turin, and the latter pronounced sentence of deprivation of office and banishment against him too. The archbishop went to Civita Vecchia.

These measures widened to the utmost the breach between the Pope and Sardinia. Pius IX., in his allocution of November 1, 1850, pronounced them incompatible with the doctrines of the true faith, and utterly rejected the attempts of Sardinia to
§ 5. ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND.

The institutions of the State and Church of England have long been in need of improvement, as they were often in direct contradiction to the demands of the times and the existing conditions. But it was difficult to enter upon any reforms, because it was obvious that as soon as the ancient structure was once shaken, innumerable alterations would become successively necessary, which might endanger the old privileges. At last, however, it became imperative to commence such reformation, and the important changes which have already taken place make it evident that other more extensive ones will follow, so that the ecclesiastical constitution of Great Britain, in particular, will probably, in the course of a few years, be entirely reorganized.

The inadequateness of the Church polity of England and Ireland lay in the fact that in these countries the Episcopal Church is the Established Church, and, as such, was highly favored. In Scotland the Presbyterian Church enjoys the same privileges; but they are less oppressive there, because the greater part of the inhabitants attend that Church, and the revenues of the Scotch clergy are moderate.

After the Test Act, until 1828, no one was allowed to hold a public office or become member of Parliament who did not belong to the Episcopal Church. The old laws against the Roman Catholics, however, had been modified, and the government even ignored the fact that, soon after 1790, a number of Jesuits had established a large educational institution at Stonyhurst, near Liverpool, which had the special object of training priests. A
wealthy Catholic Englishman, named Thomas Weld, ceded to them his castle of Stonyhurst, and to the Trappists his park of Lullworth. (His son, also Thomas Weld, became cardinal in 1830, and died April 10, 1837.) All the old Church property is in possession of the Episcopal clergy; the dissenters were obliged to support their own churches and schools, and even pay sundry taxes to the Episcopal clergy, among which the tithes were the most oppressive. The revenues of the bishops, canons, and rectors are very large; the clergy of the Episcopal Church is the richest in existence. Consequently, the nobility mostly retain these offices for their younger sons, and the crown, which has the disposal of the greater portion of them, is obliged to encourage this in order to secure the support of the aristocracy in respect to politics. But the result has been that these clerical positions are looked upon by most of their occupants, who are frequently not at all prepared for a spiritual charge, as mere benefices. They appoint vicars, at a low salary, to discharge the requisite ecclesiastical functions, and themselves live in great extravagance at a distance from their parishes. These conditions, of course, weighed very heavily upon the dissenters, as they thus had to pay a high tribute not only to a clergy foreign to their Church, but also to one which was unworthy. The Catholics in Ireland were particularly indignant, for it frequently happens in that country that a parish contains no Episcopalians but the parson and his clerk, and that, therefore, no regular service can be held in the Episcopal church, although the parson has pastoral prerogatives in the whole parish, as also the right to collect tithes. The result of these conditions for the Episcopal Church itself was that the zeal for religion and the Church died out almost entirely. Divine service, conducted by hirelings, degenerated into a lifeless mechanism. In consequence, though many individuals, from the conservatism peculiar to the English people, still adhered to the Episcopal Church, many turned to the dissenters; and even though they did not always join the communion of the latter, yet sought edification at their chapels. For the preachers of the dissenters, whose vocation had no outward attractions which might induce those who were unfit to enter upon it, were generally men filled with zeal for their calling, and their sermons, therefore, for the most part, far exceeded those of the Episcopal Church in fervor and the power of edifying. In this way the
people are gradually becoming estranged from the Episcopal Church, and it grows more and more obvious that the latter can not exist much longer in its old state.

The first efforts for reform were directed against the Test Act, and effected its annulment. For several years past the Irish Catholics had striven for this result, or for their emancipation. At first, however, the Test Act was annulled, in April, 1828, with regard to the Protestant dissenters; it was only in April, 1829, that the Catholics, too, were emancipated. Catholics as well as Protestants, therefore, are now admitted to Parliament; and, in consequence of the parliamentary reform accomplished in 1832, their number in that body is by no means insignificant. It was therefore to be expected that the Episcopal Church might likewise anticipate serious reforms in its organization. These were first directed toward the Irish Episcopal Church, which, indeed, was greatly in need of them. On July 30, 1833, it was decreed that of the twenty-two Irish bishoprics ten should be abolished on the decease of their incumbents, as well as a proportionate number of deanships and chapters, and that the salaries of the remaining sees should be reduced before any reappointments were made.

Serious consideration is demanded particularly by the condition of the Irish Catholics, among whom there is quite as much destitution and misery as religious bigotry and want of education. There existed the Kildare Society, for the purpose of instructing in its schools the Irish youth of all confessions. But the Bible was read in these schools without any explanation, and, in consequence, they were not much attended by Catholics. In 1831 the government decreed that the scientific instruction should be common to both confessions, but that the religious instruction should be given separately in special classes. For the support of this system the government appropriated £30,000 annually, which sum was subsequently raised to £100,000. Since then the number of Catholic scholars has greatly increased, but there are still a great many who are not reached by these improvements. Great relief was afforded the Catholic Irish by the new tithe-law, which was adopted by Parliament in 1838, after a long opposition from the House of Lords. Until then the pressure of the tithe system weighed upon the poor Irish farmers; the English land-owners were not affected by it. Now it
was decided that, instead of tithes, an annual tax on real estate should be paid by the land-holders: these taxes were fixed according to an average value of the tithes, but with a discount of thirty per cent.

The theological sciences have not made much progress in England in modern times. The theological education of the Episcopal clergymen was too superficial, and they were too fond of an easy life to pay any attention to the subject. The clergy of the other parties had received too entirely practical an education, and were too much engaged in practical work to devote themselves to science. Of late years, however, the interest in theology seems to be reviving; and the dissenters, too, have done much to further scientific cultivation among themselves. The only universities formerly existing in England, Oxford and Cambridge, both belong to the Episcopal Church. In Oxford, dissenters are even excluded from matriculation; in Cambridge, they can be matriculated, but are not permitted either there or in Oxford to receive academic degrees. In consequence, the dissenters succeeded in bringing about the foundation, in the autumn of 1829, of the University of London for their special benefit, to which all religious confessions were admitted. On the other hand, the Episcopal party, in 1831, established, in opposition, the King's College in London. In 1835 the two colleges received a royal charter, by which they were united in one university in such a manner that the crown appointed a joint neutral senate which examines the students of both institutions for their academic degrees, and confers the latter.

England, however, has exerted a very wide influence by the Missionary and Bible societies, which reached their present extent through an impulse given by that country.  

The great London Missionary Society was formed in 1795. The idea had originated with the Independents, but the society was joined by members from all religious parties extant in England. As early as 1796 the association sent out a ship of its own with missionaries to several of the South Sea Islands; other missionaries, in 1797, to the West Coast of Africa; and others still to the Cape of Good Hope in 1798. After the pattern of this association, the British and Foreign Bible Society was found-

---
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ed in 1804, for the purpose of universally disseminating the Bible, without notes and after publicly authorized translations where such existed, and having it translated into those languages into which it had not yet been rendered. Both these societies, but especially the Bible Society, have caused, since 1813, when communication was restored between England and the Continent, the foundation of similar associations on the European Continent, and the latter have been liberally assisted by the English societies. This assistance, however, is frequently connected with the assertion of a certain Methodistic influence, which has had particularly unfortunate results in France and in Switzerland.  

In modern times the old freethinking principles, which had long since disappeared, have been revived in England in a new sect—the Socialists—which, singularly enough, had its origin in very philanthropical ideas.

The founder, Robert Owen, a rich manufacturer in Scotland, was induced, in view of the great inequality of property, to seek for the cause of this disproportion. He thought he discovered it in the system of competition, according to which human beings, instead of aiding one another, counteract each other as rivals, each one striving for gain at the expense of the other. In the belief that he recognized in this system the foundation of all human misery, he opposed to it that of mutual assistance, by which the workman was not merely to receive the daily wages fixed by competition, but to be made a participator in the profits of the labor. This system he introduced into his factories. At the same time, Owen provided for the welfare of his workmen in every way, and even took charge of their religious education and the instruction of their children, so that his institution called forth universal interest and approbation. He was even presented, in 1815, to the foreign sovereigns visiting England at that time, and met with an honorable reception from them. Subsequently, however, he went farther and farther in the development of his ideas; proposed to do away entirely with the right of private property and with difference of station, and finally went so far as to demand the entire subversion of the religious and moral basis of the social system, inasmuch as he looked upon

all civilization of the present day as pernicious. Thus he arrived at a system closely related to that of Saint-Simon, which he called Socialism. As he could not expect to realize these ideas in Europe, he bought a tract of land in the United States of North America, in Ohio, of the German sectarian Rapp—who had there established a colony of his sect—and founded upon it, in 1828, a settlement, called New Harmony, in which he gave shape to his reformatory socialistic principles. Among its eight hundred inhabitants general liberty and equality prevailed; the labor of the day was seasoned by nightly entertainments; on Sundays, lectures were given on a variety of subjects, religious themes excepted. After a year, however, this colony was dissolved, as the members brought forward many conflicting claims, which ended in dissension. Owen returned to England, and there sought to gain adherents by proclaiming his principles. For several years he thus worked in obscurity with no visible result, until, finally, a sect of Socialists, or Owenites, came forward openly and sought to make converts by lectures, journals, and other writings, particularly among the lower classes.

This system flatly denies the existence of a God, and, consequently, declares all religion to be superstition. Man is forced by his nature to follow his instincts. His will is merely the result of his feelings, which are nothing but instincts of human nature, and are qualified by the conditions in which the individual lives, so that he is a creature of outward circumstance, and can not form his own character. For the same reason there is no sin nor wickedness, but only physical evil. The grave is the end of human existence; with death, man sinks back into universal nature, to furnish new matter for new mixtures and conformations. In order to bring about a happy state of humanity, each individual should, from childhood, be placed in circumstances which would instill into him love for his fellow-men and kindness to all living creatures. The present social system, on the contrary, gives rise to ignorance, depravity, and poverty. These evils can only be remedied by the Socialistic system, which secures equal liberty and equal privileges to all. Even marriage is repudiated as a violation of the laws of nature, and the chief source of all misery. The freedom in the relation between the sexes existing among animals ought to be taken as a pattern by mankind. Human society should not consist of single families,
but of associations numbering from three hundred to two thousand, according to the local conditions; the children, as children of an association, to be brought up in common.

Though there is undoubtedly a more earnest religious spirit among the dissenters than in the Episcopal Church, this very earnestness not infrequently leads to fanaticism. One of the most striking examples of this truth is furnished by Edward Irving. He was a Scotch Presbyterian minister, from 1822 preacher at the Caledonian House of Prayer in London, who created a great sensation by his animated, almost theatrical style of preaching, and attracted large congregations. Even before his time many preachers had come forward with expositions of the prophecies of the Old Testament and the Apocalypse, professing to be fitted for the task by special divine inspiration. They prophesied the millennium, the restoration of the Jews, the renewal of all things; and one prophetess, Mary Campbell, was even believed to have performed miracles. Irving expressed his concurrence with these opinions in 1826 by a work entitled Babylon and Infidelity Foredoomed.*

One principal view of this party was, that it was merely because of want of faith that the gifts of grace of the first apostolic time (1 Cor. xii. 9, 10: gifts of healing, working of miracles, prophecy, divers kinds of tongues, interpretation of tongues) had disappeared from the Church, so that wherever the true faith was reawakened those gifts of grace would again be conferred. Since 1831, manifestations of this kind appeared in Irving's congregation. A number of the members, especially some Scotch maidens, began, in the morning prayer-meetings, to speak in unknown tongues (a loud shriek was first uttered, then, in rapid succession, short, distinctly articulated sounds). Others prophesied in English, sometimes for hours together, concerning the future of the Church and the people. All declared themselves involuntary instruments of the spirit which moved them. Irving acknowledged these gifts of the spirit, and thanked God for them in his sermons. Notwithstanding the prophecies often referred to a time so near at hand that their non-fulfillment was quite obvious, the faithful did not allow themselves to be disturbed there-

by. The Scotch Church authorities instituted an inquiry, and deprived Irving of his clerical office in March, 1833. Upon this he built a chapel for himself and his adherents, and became the founder of a new sect, but died December 6, 1834.  

The Irvingites established seven chapels in and around London, which they called after the seven churches in Revelation. Connected with these are apostles, prophets, evangelists, elders, deacons, etc. A rich land-owner, Henry Drummond, of Albury Park, is at their head. The converts to this sect were chiefly Quakers; their missionaries were sent to the Continent. They were particularly well received in Berlin. A Dane, named Böhme, as well as several Englishmen and Scotchmen, among others a Captain Barclay and a Mr. Carlisle, came to that city as apostles, and, in consequence of letters of introduction, met with great favor, especially in the higher classes of society.

The Church of England, or Anglican Church, has always attached great value to its outward form. It strove to represent within itself the oldest Catholic Church, as it existed before the Nicene Council, purified of all its later corruptions, and, therefore, attributed to the pre-Nicene tradition of the Church the character of an undisturbed, and therefore binding, authority. In particular, it considered the apostolic succession of its clergy of great importance, and, like the Catholic Church, it made this succession the condition of the validity and efficiency of its sacraments, so that it did not recognize the sufficiency of the sacraments of a non-Episcopal Church. It was this attaching such great value to outward ecclesiastical forms which caused in the Episcopal Church that want of life, that mechanism in the observance of Church rites, which led many of its members to leave it and turn to the dissenters, where they found religious earnestness and fervor. And from these dissenters many of the Episcopalians gained the conviction that Christianity is essentially something inward, and not dependent on any outward form; and these latter did not hesitate to unite with dissenters in missionary and other Christian work. Thus an Evangelical party was formed in the Anglican Church which counted many adherents even among the clergy. Those, on the other hand, who remained true to the old principles of the Church were called High-Churchmen.

When, in modern times, the public voice demanded more and more loudly various reforms in the Church of England, as well as the removal of the restrictions placed upon the dissenters, the strictly clerical party rose up with renewed zeal to defend the integrity of the menaced Episcopal Church. Its chief seat was Oxford, and its heads were Dr. Pusey, professor of Hebrew, and Dr. John Henry Newman, attached to the university as preacher, who were joined by Dr. Keble, professor of poetry. They carried the peculiar views of the Anglican Church so far that they thereby approached very near to Catholicism. When the Whig government (after the autumn of 1830) entered into the above-mentioned reformatory ideas, suppressed ten Irish bishoprics in 1833, and, in 1835, demanded that the University of Oxford should give up the signing of the Thirty-nine Articles at matriculation, as well as admit dissenters to the latter, the High-Church party came forward in zealous defense of the Church. They issued a number of writings—in particular, after September, 1833, many small pamphlets, under the title Tracts for the Times—in which they developed their principles very clearly. To the same end they edited various writings of the old Church fathers, in which they professed to find the same principles expressed.

This party propose to restore the apostolic Catholic Church and its principles on the basis of a genuine apostolic tradition, and thus keep a true middle course between the Roman Catholic and Reformed churches, by partaking of the firm, substantial character of the former, without its corruptions, and of the purity of doctrine of the latter, without its vacillating want of harmony. They agree with the old High-Church party in attaching great value to the apostolic succession of the priesthood,

---
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but join to this the veneration for old ecclesiastical tradition, accepting it, next to the Holy Scriptures, as the source of the doctrine of faith. They look upon the English Book of Prayer, in particular, as testifying to this old ecclesiastical tradition, and would have the Thirty-nine Articles interpreted according to it.

In the doctrine of justification they agree with the Catholic Church in looking upon justification as a conferring of righteousness, and considering it something progressive. With regard to the communion, they hold, indeed, that the substance of the bread and wine remains; but they maintain that the true body and the true blood of Christ are at all times present in the sacrament, and that both are offered to the Father as expiatory sacrifice. They would allow pious subjectivity to take no other shape than that prescribed and sanctioned by ecclesiastical form, and seek the blessing and grace of God chiefly in the sacraments, which can only be administered by a clergy consecrated by apostolic succession. All Christian life outside of the connection with this Church is imperfect, and, therefore, all communion with dissenters for religious purposes is reprehensible. This party has acquired an important influence in the Church of England, and through its efforts many older Church institutions have been re-established which had gradually fallen into disuse, e.g. the observance of Saints' days, of Friday as a fast-day, as well as fasting in general; daily service, a more frequent partaking of the communion, a greater regard for the symbolical part of the Church service, a higher respect for the clerical office, etc. This course of ecclesiastical and moral discipline is intended to effect sanctification; and, in consequence, this party deviates materially from the Pauline doctrine of justification, for the very reason that they consider it too subjective, and because it attaches value to faith alone, and none to outward observances.

Through the party in question, the Catholic elements in the Episcopal Church have been brought to light and developed in an unexpected degree. This was done in a particularly objectionable manner by Dr. Newman in his last (nineteenth) Tract, in which he actually demands the recognition of all councils, even that of Trent — only not in the sense of the Romish Church — and seeks to demonstrate that the doctrines of purgatory, indulgences, image-worship, transubstantiation, the adoration of saints, the celibacy of the clergy, and the authority of the Pope, in the
Thirty-nine Articles should by no means be rejected altogether, but merely in their Romish form, so that a member of the Anglican Church might accept them all, only not in the modified shape in which they were confessed by Rome. In consequence, the Puseyites feel much more closely related to the Romish Church than to the other Protestant confessions. They pronounce the former an elder sister-church, while the latter are regarded by them as anti-Christian, renegade sects. In consequence of this declaration, the Vice-chancellor of Oxford, with the heads of the colleges, openly renounced the Puseyite party, and the Archbishop of Canterbury prohibited the further publication of their polemic tracts (March, 1841).

An event which was of great importance to the entire Protestant Church was the establishment of an evangelical see at Jerusalem, which originated with England and Prussia.*

Until that time, the evangelical Church had lacked all legal recognition in the Turkish dominions; while the Latin, Greek, and Armenian churches were not only in the enjoyment of it, and had, in their bishops, legally acknowledged representatives, but the Greek Church, besides, is supported by the protectorate of Russia, the Latin Church by that of France. Without legal recognition and higher protection, the evangelical Christians were wholly at the mercy of the pashas with respect to their religious observances. After Mehemet Ali, in 1832, had conquered Syria, and extended his protection to all religious parties, the United Missionary Society of Boston sent several missionaries to Palestine, and their example was followed by the Episcopal Society for Missions to the Jews, in London. The chief object of these missions was the conversion of the Jews in Jerusalem and the Druses of Mount Lebanon. When Syria, however, was restored to the Turkish rule in 1840, and the old disorder and despotism returned with the latter, it was thought advisable to insure to the Protestant Christians dwelling there a state of greater security.

The powerful influence which England exercised on Turkey was particularly adapted to secure this end; but the idea originated with the King of Prussia. His first intention was that an Anglican see should be established at Jerusalem, and a German evangelical bishopric at Bethlehem. Negotiations were opened

on the subject with the English government and the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the parties finally united upon the establishment of an Anglican see at Jerusalem, which was there to represent Protestantism in general. The King of Prussia undertook to bear one half of the expense; the other half was covered by a subscription taken up in England. All this was settled by private negotiations, and then the way prepared for the matter by an act of Parliament (November, 1841), by which the archbishops of Canterbury and York were authorized to consecrate bishops for foreign countries who would neither be obliged to take the oath of allegiance to the British crown nor to swear obedience to the Archbishop of Canterbury. The See of Jerusalem was to be filled in turn by England and Prussia; the first bishop appointed to it was Michael Solomon Alexander, a converted German Jew, born in the Grand-duchy of Posen, and professor of Hebrew and rabbinical literature at King's College in London. He was consecrated November 7, 1841, and left for his destination immediately. He reached Jerusalem January 21, 1842, and soon after laid the corner-stone of a Protestant church. The Archbishop of Canterbury published an official report of these transactions. 

In connection with this matter, two points of view should be specially considered:

Firstly, the relation of this bishopric to the Anglican and the German Protestant churches.

Secondly, its position and sphere of influence with regard to other Christian churches, and to the Jews in Palestine.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in his statement, regards the establishment of this bishopric as opening the way to an essential unity in discipline as well as in doctrine between the Anglican Church and the less perfectly organized Protestant churches of the Continent. It soon becomes apparent that he finds no important difference in the doctrines, but attaches value merely to the episcopal organization, the want of which he considers an imperfection in the German Protestant Church. The See of Jerusalem is to be a thoroughly Anglican one; the bishop is to look upon the Archbishop of Canterbury as his metropolitan. His spiritual jurisdiction is to extend over the English churches.

---

* Statement of the Negotiations concerning the Foundation of a Bishopric of the United Church of England and Ireland at Jerusalem, London, 1841.
in Palestine, and, for the moment, over those in Syria, Chaldea, Egypt, and Abyssinia, as well as over all other congregations in those countries which may unite with his Church and place themselves under his episcopal authority. With regard to these latter, the bishop, with the permission of his metropolitan, is at liberty to make other arrangements. The German congregations which join this Church are to be allowed the use of their national liturgy, which, compiled from the old liturgies, coincides in all points of doctrine with the liturgy of the Church of England; but the German clergymen connected with these congregations are obliged to be ordained according to the ritual of the Church of England, and to subscribe the articles of the latter. In order, however, that they shall remain qualified for the future administration of their office in Germany, they must exhibit to the bishop, previous to their ordination, a certificate of having signed, in presence of competent authorities, the Augsburg Confession. Confirmation in the German churches is to be administered by the bishop after the English form.

From this it appears that the German churches which join this bishopric must unite, in all essentials, with the Church of England. Nothing is conceded to them but that which, according to Anglican principles, must be conceded at any rate, i.e. the retaining of their national liturgy; but they are obliged to accept priests consecrated by the Anglican Church, and with them the principles of the latter with regard to the priesthood and the necessity of an apostolic succession of bishops. The union of churches, which, in the opinion of the Archbishop of Canterbury, was to be prepared by the foundation of this see, would therefore be nothing more than a going-over of the German Evangelical to the Anglican Church. This, however, is the less to be expected, as the Germans are more justified in finding in the Episcopal Church a less distinctly developed Protestantism than the archbishop in considering their Church organization imperfect. It is to be foreseen that the free German Protestant churches in the East will not attach themselves to the See of Jerusalem. The chaplains of the Prussian consulates will, indeed, be obliged to do so; but this can have no influence on the German Protestant Church in general. Naturally, however, it can not be gratifying to the latter to have some of its clergymen forced to receive the ordination of another Church, and to prom-
ise allegiance to the same, nor to see these conditions result in a division between the German Protestant churches in foreign lands. In addition to the above, the Archbishop of Canterbury mentions the following aims of the new bishopric:

Firstly, that through it amicable relations are to be established with the Oriental churches, which will tend to their purification.

Secondly, that it will promote the conversion of the Jews. The bishop is to enter into the friendliest relations possible with the other churches, and to permit himself no interference with their rights; but if the above-mentioned aims of purification and conversion should become prominent, it is to be foreseen that such friendly relations will hardly be established. On the other hand, however, the Evangelical Church in Jerusalem may serve to meet the higher wants of individual aspiring minds who are not satisfied by the mechanism of the Oriental churches, and in this manner gradually open the way once more for evangelical truth in the land of its birth. In particular, this may be effected by the college which the bishop has founded in Jerusalem, the special object of which is the education of converted Jews, but which is also permitted to receive Druses and Oriental Christians.

On the part of the Roman Catholics, the foundation of this see was regarded most unfavorably, particularly as the statement of the Archbishop of Canterbury contains serious attacks against the course of the Catholic Church in the East, and its endeavors to convert the old churches and subject them to itself. Hence, many rumors disadvantageous to the new bishopric were spread abroad from this quarter, e.g. that the Sultan would not give his consent to its establishment; that the bishop had been badly received in Jerusalem, and even personally maltreated; but it soon appeared that these reports were entirely unfounded.

The Scotch National Church is the Presbyterian, which is governed entirely according to democratic principles by synods and presbyteries, at the head of which is the General Assembly, which meets annually. To the National Church belong 1023 churches; the Protestant dissenters have 755 churches, the Catholics 55 chapels. The population of Scotland amounts to

---

3,000,000; of these, about eight to nine hundred thousand are dissenters.\textsuperscript{11}

The character of the constitution of the Scotch Church demands that the clergymen should, in reality, be chosen by the congregations, and the Church did its utmost to attain this end. Consequently, when the Church constitution, after the deposition of James II. in 1690, was reorganized, the right of patronage was abolished. But this democratic nature of the Church did not find favor in England, and patronage was therefore re-established in 1712, under Queen Anne. A third of all the churches in Scotland is under royal patronage; otherwise the right of patronage is in the hands of private individuals, and is acquired and disposed of like any other property. When a living becomes vacant, the candidate is presented by the patron; if the Presbytery (i.e. the district synod) make no objection, the former preaches a trial sermon. On a later day, some member of the Presbytery preaches for the congregation, and invites them to sign the call to the new minister. This call by the congregation, which is founded on the recognition of the popular right of election, gradually fell into disuse, however; frequently the signature of one church-member alone sufficed, and sometimes even that was wanting. This order of things was the more objectionable that the majority of patrons belonged to the Episcopal Church; and hence the Scotch clergymen were, for the most part, appointed by those who were not one with them in the faith. In consequence, an opposition arose in 1830 against the system of patronage, at the head of which stood Dr. Thomas Chalmers, professor in Edinburgh. This party first applied to the House of Commons, and requested the abolishment of patronage, or the repeal of the law of Queen Anne. As the House of Commons did not accede to this request, the General Assembly declared, in 1834, in the so-called Veto Act, that the congregations had the right to reject all ministers presented by their patron. This view found great favor, and several congregations acted in accordance with it, not even permitting the candidates to preach their trial sermon; some of them, evidently, with the sole intention of asserting the right in

question. It was the obvious aim to do away entirely with the whole system of patronage. The Scotch Church was therefore divided into two factions: the adherents of the Veto Act, the Non-intrusionists, who asserted that the congregations should not have any minister intruded upon them who did not meet with their favor, and the Moderates, who wished to have the rights of the patrons maintained. Several patrons and rejected candidates now entered complaints at the Court of Sessions in Edinburgh, and the latter decided in favor of the plaintiffs. The General Assembly, however, adhered to their declaration, and even suspended a Presbytery which acted in accordance with the decision of the Court of Sessions. Thus, the highest spiritual authorities and the supreme judiciary tribunal stood opposed to each other, and a decision by Parliament became necessary. This, however, was deferred, in order to give the excited parties time to cool down; for the Non-intrusionists were so decided that, in order to preserve their ecclesiastical independence, they even spoke of separating from the National Church. At length the General Assembly applied to the Queen, complained of the interference of the civil jurisdiction with the rights of the Church, and demanded the entire abolition of the right of patronage. This address was presented in June, 1842, but the government delayed the answer for a while, in order to give the clergy time for consideration. After the Board of the General Assembly, however, had complained of this delay (November 17, 1842), and accused the government of a want of respect for the Church in so long deferring an answer in a matter of such importance, this answer was finally given, January 4, 1843, by the Minister for the Home Department, Sir James Graham. He rejected the claims of the Non-intrusionists, as being opposed to the existing ordinances and privileges, and pronounced the decisions of the civil courts conformable to law. Attention was directed to the fact that all reasonable claims of the Church were insured by the existing constitution, inasmuch as the patrons could only choose from the number of candidates examined and licensed to preach by the Church; as, moreover, an examination of the licentiate by the Presbytery took place after the presentation, and the congregations had the right to state their objections to the candidate to that ecclesiastical body, which alone had to decide upon his final admission. The Non-intrusionists, on the other hand, demanded
that the congregations should have the right to reject the candidates presented immediately, without admitting them to a trial sermon, and that in such cases an examination and decision by the Presbytery were unnecessary. They desired the administration to recognize this pretended right of the Church, otherwise nothing would remain to them but to dissolve their connection with the State. When the government persisted in supporting the right of patronage, this dissolution actually took place in May, 1843. The General Assembly met in Edinburgh on May 18. Immediately after its being opened, the Non-intrusionists handed in a protest to the effect that, inasmuch as the civil courts had assumed the right of decision in purely ecclesiastical matters, a free, lawful assembly of the Scotch Church was impossible, and that it was therefore necessary to protest against the existence of the General Assembly here convened. Immediately after, the Non-intrusionist members of the General Assembly withdrew from it, constituted a Free Presbyterian Church, and formed an Assembly of the same, which resigned all claims to any Church property extant, and was obliged to form a new fund. Its head is Dr. Chalmers; more than four hundred clergymen belong to it. Over £250,000 were subscribed for the foundation of the new congregations. Six hundred and eighty-seven of these were formed, under the name of Free Church associations. Their preachers are frequently obliged to hold service in the open air. They have great difficulty in erecting the necessary buildings, particularly as in many places the lords of the manor refuse the requisite site for them. It has therefore been proposed to provide movable tents for divine service.

The idea of a fraternization of all those Protestant Christians who adhere to the evangelical faith, and therefore agree in all essential doctrines of religion, originated in the Free Scotch Church in 1843, and was stimulated by the progress of Puseyism and Catholicism in England. It was thought necessary to unite in working against this evil, and, for this end, to allay the inner dissensions of the Protestant churches among themselves, as well as to further the diffusion of a Christianity conformed to the Scriptures. On October 1, 1845, therefore, over two hundred members of seventeen different Church communions met at Liverpool, acknowledged the desirableness of such a union—which, however, was to be formed only among individuals, not among
congregations—and resolved that all evangelical Christians who confessed to the doctrines of divine inspiration, the authority and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures, the Trinity, the total depravity of human nature in consequence of the Fall, the incarnation of the Son of God and his work of redemption of mankind, the justification of sinners by faith alone, the divine institution of the ministry, as well as of the sacraments of baptism and the Lord’s Supper, should be invited to a general meeting to be held in London for that purpose. At the same time, it was declared that differing views on other points might be constantly discussed among the members, but only with suitable moderation and in brotherly love, and that all bitterness must be avoided in doing so.\textsuperscript{12}

The result was a general conference of more than six hundred Protestants, mostly clergymen, from Great Britain, France, Germany, Switzerland, North America, etc., which, commencing August 19, 1847, lasted thirteen days, and ended in the above-mentioned union—the Evangelical Alliance. Its aim is to promote, among the orthodox evangelical Christians, a friendly acting in concert for the spreading of evangelical Christianity, the combating of infidelity and superstition, particularly Catholicism, without, therefore, attempting to form an association of different Church societies. The final and complete organization of the association was deferred to the next general meeting; but, in the interim, branch associations were to be established in all countries.

§ 6. CATHOLIC CHURCH IN SWITZERLAND.

§ 6.

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN SWITZERLAND AND THE NETHERLANDS.

It has been possible for Rome to interfere more freely in the affairs of Catholic Switzerland than in those of any other state, because the diversity of opinions made it easy to form parties. In the reorganization of the cantonal governments which was effected after the Peace of Paris, the aristocracy once more gained the upper-hand; and, at first, gave the Curia free play, believing that the restoration of the Church to its mediæval form would most effectually hold in check the revolutionary spirit. The Act of Confederation of 1815 established no strong central power which could have resisted ultramontanism; it did not by any means grant equal rights to all Christian religious parties in the whole of Switzerland, but, on the contrary, the cantons remained in part Catholic, in part Reformed, and in part mixed, and were not under obligations to admit other religious persuasions. On the other hand, however, the act in question guaranteed to the convents their further existence and their property. A large portion of Catholic Switzerland belonged to the bishopric of Constance, with the administration of which, under Dalberg and Wessenberg, Rome was highly dissatisfied. Negotiations were therefore opened with the cantonal governments with regard to the separation of this Swiss portion of the bishopric; but, without awaiting their conclusion, the Papal nuncio in Lucerne effected this separation January 1, 1815, and appointed Provost Göldlin, a well-known ultramontane, apostolic vicar of the Swiss part of the see. When the Swiss complained of this and other arbitrary acts of the nuncio, and appealed to the old prerogatives of the Swiss Church, these prerogatives, which had already been reprobated by Clement XIII., were condemned anew by a Papal rescript. The Swiss yielded, and thus the protest of the Chapter of Constance remained ineffectual. After this, the foundation of a national bishopric was long a matter of discus-
This plan, however, was not carried out; but in 1823 the double See of Coire-St. Gall was established, as well as the See of Basle in 1828. During these negotiations, Catholic Switzerland was governed by apostolic vicars under the supervision of the nuncio at Lucerne. But the new bishoprics, too, having been placed directly under Rome, remained entirely under the control of the nuncio, so that the latter became the actual ruler of the Catholic Church in Switzerland. Thus everything was done to bind the clergy firmly to Rome; in particular, efforts were made to introduce the Jesuits everywhere. It was only in Valais and in Fribourg, however, that such efforts proved successful; and these two cantons, therefore, fell completely under the rule of the clerical party. From them, accordingly, a strong influence was spread over the whole of Catholic Switzerland against the so-called erroneous doctrines of Wessenberg, as well as against his partisans among the clergy, while, at the same time, the minds of the people were stunted by superstitious writings, processions, pilgrimages, missions, miracles, and miraculous images, and intolerance and hatred of the Reformed were reawakened everywhere. Subsequently, however, the aristocratic governments became sensible of the dangers of this ultramontanism, placed themselves in opposition to it, allowed no interference in political matters, and asserted the rights of the State over the Church. Fribourg, Valais, and the three original cantons—Uri, Schwyz, and Unterwalden—alone, were entirely in the hands of the Jesuits.

The French revolution of July, 1830, caused a powerful excitement also in Switzerland, and, in consequence, agitations arose in the aristocratic cantons, by which the constitutions were changed and received a democratic form. The new governments strove to raise Switzerland to the level of the enlightenment of the day, by establishing above all an upright and independent administration of justice, and seeking to reform the department of instruction, which had been greatly neglected. Their efforts were directed as well to the higher educational institutions as particularly to

the public schools, in order thereby to oppose a firm barrier to ultramontanism. A more liberal spirit in ecclesiastical matters soon became apparent in the Catholic cantons, with the exception of the original ones. In Fribourg and Lucerne, too, an aversion to the ultramontane system manifested itself, and the nuncio found himself so much neglected in Fribourg that he left that city and took up his residence in Schwyz.

Ultramontanism, however, grew all the more active in its opposing influence, for which it had a firm foundation in the want of enlightenment among the people, to whom the latest constitutions assigned the highest power. The convents, those central points of ultramontanism, were brought into closer connection with each other. Celestine, Abbot of Einsiedeln, founded, in 1831, the Catholic Association, which, by small contributions from its numerous members, collected large sums. Among the people the idea was circulated that their religion was endangered by the new governments and their school reforms, and a control was thus exercised over the popular elections of the members of the administration. The Order of Jesus, in 1836, was permitted to establish a college also in Schwyz, and thus gained a new centre of influence. In many Reformed cantons, too, the fear gradually gained ground that the new governments, by their school reforms, were endangering religion. This apprehension reached its climax through the call of Dr. David Strauss to the University of Zurich—which was, indeed, a precipitate measure—and, in consequence, the government of Zurich was overthrown in September, 1839, a new one, with views more favorable to religion, established in its place, the constitution changed, and an entirely new course entered upon with regard to ecclesiastical and educational matters. This event, occurring in the large and influential canton of Zurich, was hailed everywhere by the adherents of the Church as a victory over infidelity, and the old Orthodox party gained in strength thereby, as well among the Reformed as among the Catholics. Among the latter the opinion was circulated that the radicals, by the call of Dr. Strauss, had intended to overthrow the Catholic Church in Switzerland. This roused the fanaticism of the Catholic people. Ultramontanism entered into a league with democracy, as the latter, entirely devoid of enlightenment, was wholly at its mercy. Thus, in 1840 and 1841, in the canton of Lucerne, the constitution was revised in
an ultramontane spirit, and all liberals were removed from influential positions. Lucerne, the Catholic temporary capital, became the headquarters of the ultramontanes. An attempt was made to bring about a similar result in the canton of Aargau, which had many Catholic subjects, and as the reaction there was unsuccessful, a plan was made to divide this canton, and to cut off from the Reformed part of Aargau a Catholic canton of Baden. As this end was not reached by legal means, the Catholics, in January, 1841, broke out into open rebellion, which was, however, suppressed. Aargau now abolished its convents, which had been the principal seats of the insurrection. This gave rise to a struggle which lasted three years, inasmuch as the so-called conservative cantons (Reformed as well as Catholic) disputed the right of Aargau to effect this abolition, as the convents had been guaranteed in the Act of Confederation. The ultramontane party took advantage of the occurrence to rouse the fanaticism of the Catholic people, by representing to them that its object was the suppression and destruction of the Catholic Church. The idea of a Catholic Alliance was now developed. It was proposed that Catholic Switzerland should separate entirely from the Reformed part of the country and form a confederation of its own, and that to attain this end, the Catholic portions of the Reformed cantons should be divided from them, in order to form new cantons from themselves. The Jesuits became more and more powerful, and worked upon the people through missions. Finally, a revolution broke out in Valais. Upper Valais had always been under the rule of the clergy, but in Lower Valais the liberals had obtained the supremacy, and carried through, in 1840, a liberal constitution. When, however, the new government abolished the immunities of the clergy, reformed the public schools, and joined the liberal party at the Diet, the priests had no difficulty in diffusing in Upper Valais the opinion that the government intended to exterminate the Catholic religion. That canton, therefore, rose in revolt in May, 1844, invaded Lower Valais, and changed the government. The liberals were either massacred, driven out of the country, or imprisoned, and their property was confiscated. It is almost certain that this attack was organized in Lucerne, and its expenses paid by a gift of 98,000 Swiss francs from the Missionary Society in Lyons.
Encouraged by this, the ultramontanes in Lucerne took the step they had long contemplated: they called, in September, 1844, the Jesuits to that city, in order to place under their control the greater part of the Lyceum and the Theological Seminary. This measure created universal excitement, for Lucerne is one of the three capitals of the Confederation, and it was to be foreseen that when its turn came to take the lead, the Jesuits would have the direction of the federal affairs. In the canton of Lucerne itself, a large portion of the people are against the Jesuits; in particular, the whole commonalty of the city of Lucerne. In December, 1844, an insurrection broke out in the canton, but was soon suppressed. The Diet tried to mediate, but without force or success. The motion of the liberals to banish the Jesuits entirely from Switzerland was not carried, because the conservative cantons were afraid of violating the cantonal sovereignty by such a resolution, and remonstrances proved entirely ineffectual with Lucerne. Upon this, the bitter feeling entertained by the greater portion of Switzerland against the Jesuits broke out into open violence. From many cantons volunteer corps came to the aid of the liberals of Lucerne, and they all advanced upon the city March 31, 1845. But this volunteer expedition failed of success, through its imperfect organization and want of discipline. Hence the ultramontane party triumphed in Lucerne. Hundreds of liberals were obliged to fly, or were imprisoned; their opponents had evidently formed the plan of entirely exterminating them. But this ultramontane fanaticism merely had the result of awakening the contrary spirit in the other cantons. In Zurich the conservative government (the so-called Men of September), by its want of decision in this matter, had drawn upon itself the general indignation; at the new elections (April, 1845), it was replaced by liberals. Even in the Catholic cantons of Fribourg, Lucerne, and Valais, a large proportion of the inhabitants were against the Jesuits and ultramontanism: the abhorrence of the partial and cruel conduct of the administration in Lucerne toward the liberals was universal. In order to increase their power, the seven Catholic cantons—Lucerne, Fribourg, Zug, Schwyz, Uri, Unterwalden, and Valais—formed a closer alliance (1846). Their pretext for doing so was that they wished to mutually protect each other from attacks like the one which Lucerne had suffered from the volunteer
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corps; but at bottom there was evidently the general intention to promote more vigorously by this alliance their common interests, particularly those of the Church. This separate league (Sonderbund) immediately excited great dissatisfaction in the remaining cantons; yet, for the moment, it was opposed by no decisive majority at the Diet. This was only the case when Geneva, by a revolution which took place in October, 1846, had become a wholly democratic canton, and declared itself decidedly against the Sonderbund. The Diet therefore passed a resolution (July, 1847) to the effect that the Sonderbund, being incompatible with the confederate compact, must be dissolved, and that no Jesuits should be tolerated in Switzerland. The Sonderbund was not willing to submit to this decree, but was brought into subjection by a short campaign in November, 1847. With this the liberal party, till then suppressed, gained the preponderance also in these cantons. But it can not be denied that this party, too, showed the same intolerant spirit toward their opponents which the latter had formerly manifested toward them.

The double bishopric of Coire and St. Gall having become vacant in the mean time, the separation previously desired was effected. By a concordat of the canton of St. Gall with the Holy See of November 7, 1845, the bishopric of St. Gall was reorganized.

The kingdom of the Netherlands had been formed, in consequence of a treaty between the four great powers (London, June, 1814), by the union of the former republic of the Netherlands and the Austrian Netherlands. This union seemed very well adapted to the material interests of both countries, for Belgium was an agricultural and manufacturing country, while Holland, on the other hand, was decidedly commercial. Thus these two countries could supply each other's wants, and exchange the products of their activity in a manner beneficial to both; and, indeed, this alliance has proved very advantageous, especially for Belgium, where it has diffused a prosperity before unknown. There were other difficulties to contend with, however, in connection with it. Since the division of the Netherlands under Philip II., the two countries, chiefly on account of the difference of religion, had not only become estranged from each other, but there

* Ernst Münch, Denkwürdigkeiten, Stuttgart, pt. 1. 1832. Rheinwald, Repertorium, in several places.
had arisen between them as strong a national hatred as can well exist between neighboring countries. The Dutch were rigidly Reformed; the fanatic Catholicism of the Belgians was hardly equaled by that of any other people. For this reason, the reigning house of Nassau-Orange, belonging to the Reformed Church, was looked upon from the first with mistrust and dissatisfaction, and, in consequence, through the influence of the clergy, a strong party of malcontents was immediately formed against the new government, which soon entered into close alliance with the Jesuit party in France. Its fanaticism forthwith made itself strongly felt. Prince Broglio, Bishop of Ghent, who in former times had been obliged to swear to the French constitution, protested against that of the new government in the name of the clergy, chiefly because it guaranteed equal protection to all religious parties, and issued a public pastoral letter against it, so that the Pope himself was induced to admonish him by a rescript (1816) to keep the peace. After this, the Belgian bishops refused to pray for the Princess of Orange in their churches during her pregnancy. Cardinal Consalvi reminded the Bishop of Namur that the Catholic Church had never refused to pray for non-Catholic sovereigns; but, nevertheless, the Bishop of Ghent refused to have a Te Deum sung on occasion of the birth of an heir to the throne (March, 1817), because it was against his conscience to pray for a heretic prince. For this, however, as well as for having carried on secret negotiations with Rome, he was accused of high-treason. He escaped arrest by flight to France; his portrait was exposed at the pillory. But until his death (1821) he continued to exert an agitating influence by correspondence, pamphlets, and pastoral letters, in his diocese as well as in other parts of the country.

Meanwhile the fanatical Catholic party continued to act in opposition to the government. Several priests, from their pulpits, stirred up the people to rebellion, and were deposed in consequence. Catholic reading-societies and unions were founded, in order to disseminate the ultramontane doctrines; in particular, the Société Catholique, whose members were compelled to subscribe the bulls *In Coena Domini* and *Unigenitus*. This society was dissolved by order of the government, August 21, 1823, but continued to exist, nevertheless.

At this time a number of Jesuits entered the country secretly
from France. They appeared as Frères Ignorantins, founded schools, and taught in them in an ultra-Catholic spirit. Families of rank sent their sons to the Jesuit institutions which had been established in France. The government for a long time had left public instruction quite free from control, but finally felt the necessity of interfering. In particular, the institutions for the education of the clergy needed to be reformed. Here, as in France, the candidates for the priesthood were trained only in episcopal seminaries; but the preparatory schools for these, which were also under episcopal supervision, were the so-called petits séminaires. The instruction in them was extremely poor, and only served to nourish the grossest superstition and intolerance. The government did not, indeed, venture to wrest the actual theological instruction from the episcopal seminaries, but it decreed, in June, 1825, that the petits séminaires should be closed, and, instead, a Philosophical College be established at Louvain, in which every one who wished to enter an episcopal seminary must go through a philosophical course. At the same time, the Jesuit schools were also closed, the so-called Frères Ignorantins conveyed across the frontier, and the attendance of foreign schools without special permission prohibited, in order to prevent the frequenting of the French Jesuit schools. Upon this the bigoted Catholic party raised a great clamor about restriction of liberty of instruction. The Archbishop of Mechlin refused to accept the curatorship of the Philosophical College; the bishops spread abroad that they would receive no graduate of that college in their seminaries. During these proceedings, the negotiations of the government with Rome had led, in 1827, to a concordat, which, effected by a faithless envoy, Count Celles (it is said that he was bribed by half a million of lire), proved highly disadvantageous, and one of the conditions of which was that the attendance of the Philosophical College should henceforward be optional. The consequence was that the college lost all its students, and in 1829 had to be abolished by the government."

It was this bigotry and religious hatred, nurtured by the priests, which immediately gained adherents among the people for the

---

1 The order was founded in 1724. Pflanz, Religiöses Leben in Frankreich, p. 63; restored by Napoleon, 1808, p. 67.
2 Der Process wider De Potter, 1829, in Münch's Denkwürdigkeiten, p. 389.
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Belgian rebellion of August, 1830. Although the government might have erred in some of the measures taken, the people were not affected by them; on the contrary, the prosperity of the country had increased in a striking degree. Religious hatred alone could effect an insurrection among the people. It was remarkable that during this insurrection two parties entirely opposed to each other joined in a common struggle against the government—the bigoted clerical party, which at the same time led the people, and an ultra-liberal republican party, which had cast aside entirely all religion.

These two parties, so long as matters were not settled between Holland and Belgium, have been obliged to make mutual concessions to each other, in order not to endanger their inner union for an outward struggle which might possibly become necessary. Their alliance was particularly facilitated by the fact that the principles of De la Mennais had found considerable favor in Belgium. In the National Congress which first assembled, the liberty of all persuasions was declared; and in the constitution of the new kingdom the Church was pronounced entirely independent of the State, so that the latter has not even the right to affix the placetum regium to ecclesiastical decrees. It is true that a Protestant was at last chosen King, viz. Prince Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, who ascended the new throne in July, 1831. But, in consideration of the state of feeling among his subjects, this Prince married, in August, 1832, a Catholic princess, the daughter of the King of France, promising, at the same time, to have his children brought up in the Catholic faith. The diversity of opinion in spiritual matters existing in Belgium was exemplified in a remarkable manner by the circumstance that in 1834 two universities were founded by private associations—one, a Catholic institution, in Mechlin (transferred to Louvain in 1835), and a Free University at Brussels. The Catholic University has for its curators all the bishops of the realm. The professors are compelled to subscribe the Confession of Faith of Pius IV. and vow obedience to the bishops. They are under obligation, in all departments, to make their teachings consistent with the principles of Catholicism, and to take every occasion to imbue their pupils with love for the Catholic Church. The Free University, on the other hand, which is under the special patronage of the city of Brussels, is conducted on thoroughly liberal principles.
In addition to these, there are two national universities at Ghent and Liege, supported by the government, in which, however, theology is not taught at all.

In 1839 the long-desired treaty between Holland and Belgium was at length concluded, and it is only since then that Belgium has entered upon a calmer course of development, in which it will be shown whether the country has gained or lost by its revolution. Under the wise rule of King Leopold, there has been a great improvement in the internal order and tranquillity, as well as decided progress in arts and manufactures. But Belgium has many difficulties to contend with. It needs, for the numerous products of its industrial labor, which far exceed the necessities of the country, a foreign market, which is greatly limited by the fact of its possessing no colonies, and because all the adjacent countries have shut themselves off by heavy frontier duties. Moreover, there are still many conflicting elements involved in the opposition between the strict Catholics and the liberals, as well as in that which exists between the Flemings and the Walloons, and which has manifested itself in the struggle between the Flemish language, still in course of development, and the imported French tongue.

The future must show whether the wisdom of the sovereigns will succeed in permanently suppressing or uniting these elements.

§ 7.

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF PROTESTANT GERMANY.

Saintes, Histoire du Rationalisme; German translation by Ficker, Leipsic, 1845.—Fries, Schroeter, and Schmidt, Oppositionsschrift, iv. 1.—Erdmann, Die Aufklärung des 18ten u. 19ten Jahrhunderts, Leipsic, 1849.

I. FROM 1814 TO 1840.

The Wars of Deliverance gave a new impulse to the interest in religion and the Church. It was keenly felt that the decline of religious and patriotic spirit had been the cause of the humiliation of Germany and its oppression by a foreign nation. The people had recognized in the great events by which a mighty ruler had been stricken down, and their country liberated, almost a direct interference of God in the world's fortunes: hence a powerful religious feeling was awakened within them, and uni-
versally expressed itself very strongly in repentance and gratitude, and in enthusiastic wishes and hopes for the future. But whereas, formerly, the cold reflection of reason had biased the minds of many, they were now rendered quite as one-sided by an exuberance of sentiment, which also could not fail to lead them astray. And, at the same time, a fault became prominent (which, indeed, has always been common to mankind, but yet is particularly characteristic of modern times), i.e. the tendency of the individual to reflect upon the general condition of affairs and its improvement, instead of first and mainly improving himself. For if each one, in the position in which he is placed, does right, the whole will certainly grow better; whereas if all think chiefly of the means and ways of improving the whole, without beginning with their own improvement, there will be no lack of abortive attempts or even extravagances.

Under the French rule and during the Wars of Deliverance, the Germans had contracted a strong hatred against every thing foreign, and particularly against every thing French. It was proposed to return to the old German manners and customs; many even wished to have the old constitution of the Holy Roman Empire restored. This tendency manifested itself especially among the young, in a striving to give a purely German character to their speech, dress, and demeanor. The Burschenschaften* at the universities, in particular, owed their origin to this spirit, and exhibited it most strongly. This passion for every thing purely German strove, indeed, to effect something impossible, i.e. to restore conditions long passed away. It was something artificial, unnatural, and, therefore, could not maintain itself. Yet it had considerable influence in connection with religion and the Church. An abhorrence of the frivolity which had penetrated into Germany from France in the eighteenth century was becoming more and more prevalent, and there was a general feeling that the former indifference to religion was a great misfortune for a nation, and that an end ought to be put to it. But whereas each individual should have striven to gain a correct understanding of Christian truth by means of his reason—the faculty bestowed upon him for this end—to let it influence him, and thus fit himself to be a living member of the Church, many were led, by excess of sentiment and misguided

* Burschenschaft, a political association among German students.—Tr.
reflection upon the general condition of religious affairs, into wrong courses.

The enlightening theology of the eighteenth century contained, indeed, much that was very repulsive. It had done away with the symbols of the Church, yet considered itself in harmony with the Scriptural doctrine. To maintain this harmony, however, it had taken the liberty of adopting the most arbitrary and shallow exegesis. The miracles were explained, in the most far-fetched way, according to nature; in order to remove everything objectionable from the teachings of Jesus and the apostles, it accommodated itself most freely to the ideas and prejudices of the times, so that in this way every thing could be made out of any thing. This theology was the first attempt to bring Christian dogmatics into harmony with the other sciences, which were constantly progressing. It was obliged to combat and reject many things pertaining to the former symbolical Church doctrine, and this gave it a negative and chilling character. Hence, in order to retain its connection with Christianity, it had adopted a wholly untrue exegesis, and partially resolved the positive doctrine of faith into general and obscure propositions, while, at the same time, it attached the highest value to the ethics of Christianity.

Many voices were now raised against this chilling theology, to which they attributed the decline of the Church. There was a general desire to return to the old belief and its fervency: the excited emotions longed for it; many, too, called for it because they were convinced that through it alone the old order and tranquillity could be restored. Hence this demand was made not only by the excited youth of the nation, but also by the aristocracy, who longed to have the former conditions revived, and saw in the old faith the most effective means of holding the people in check. Many jurists, too, shared this desire, who demanded for the Church equally positive and unalterable conditions as existed for the State.

Now and then this predilection for the old state of things led back to the Romish Church. Many looked upon the Middle Ages as an ideal time, which they sought to restore—as the time of vigor, simplicity, orthodoxy, and piety. They regarded the Reformation as the foundation of all the evils of modern times: in their opinion it had destroyed the beautiful unity and strength of the Middle Ages; in the Church, devout emotion had been
supplanted by cold reasoning and subverting criticism, childlike faith by doubt and infidelity, and schisms and sectarianism had, in consequence, become prevalent. They held, moreover, that the division in the Church had so undermined the political strength and unity of Germany that it had lost all political importance among the European states, at the head of which it stood during the Middle Ages. This predilection for mediæval institutions found a support awaiting it in the romantic school of poetry, which had been developed since the beginning of the century, chiefly by Ludwig Tieck and the brothers August Wilhelm and Friedrich von Schlegel. These romanticists made it their chief aim to restore the credit of the Middle Ages, which had indeed often been unjustly dealt with; but, in so doing, they not infrequently overstepped the limits of truth and good taste. They strove to represent the rich and varied life of that period in poetical productions, and to win love and admiration for it; they brought forward mediæval art, which, until then, had been but little noticed, as the true German art, and directed attention to the beauty and grandeur of mediæval architecture, to the old German paintings, so replete with sentiment and artistic in execution. They drew forth the old German poets from the obscurity into which they had relapsed. It was meritorious that they combated the exclusive admiration of ancient Greek and Roman art, and pointed to that of their country, which was certainly not wanting in peculiar beauties; but they were undeniably too partial in their praise of mediæval art, and blind to its defects. This branch of art, moreover, had developed in the closest connection with the Roman Catholic Church. At almost every point it came in contact with the latter—its doctrine, its worship, and its sacred history; it was applied almost exclusively to the service of that Church. Thus the romantic school of poets became kindly disposed toward Catholicism and averse to Protestantism, which afforded so little nourishment for their inclination to a sensual representation of religious subjects. They therefore complained of the bareness and emptiness of Protestantism, which offered no material for art, as the latter was essentially designed to serve religion, and to make it sensually impressive to man, a sensual creature. They declared that Protestantism ignored entirely the claims of emotion, which was the true seat of religion, and appealed merely to the understanding;
hence it could never bring forth any energetic action, any self-sacrifice for religious principle, as both were inconceivable without a quickening of the emotions. In connection with this, however, this school overlooked entirely that true religious feelings are by no means of a sensual nature, but that, on the contrary, they are directly excited by the religious principles which Protestantism, above all other religions, presents in their greatest purity: it demanded a sensual religious impulse and sensual emotion as the supporter of religion.

Among the remarkable proselytes of modern times, Count Friedrich von Stolberg was the first who, in 1800, at Münster, went over to the Catholic Church. It is probable that aristocratic principles, poetic sensibility, and a confusion of ideas combined their influence in causing him to take this step. His former friend, Johann Heinrich Voss, subsequently, in a very harsh manner, demonstrated the mode and progress of his conversion in a well-known treatise.¹

The next convert was one of the leaders of the romantic school, Friedrich von Schlegel, who joined the Catholic Church at Cologne. His example was followed (in Rome, 1811) by F. L. Zacharias Werner, who soon became a priest, and created a sensation in Vienna by burlesque sermons. Other members of the romantic school were suspected of having secretly become Catholics—in particular, Ludwig Tieck. With regard to the latter, this suspicion has been proved to be unfounded; but he became entirely estranged from the Protestant Church, as well as from all religious observances.

This leaning toward the Middle Ages received new nourishment from the predilection for every thing German which was developed after the Wars of Deliverance, and induced several German artists, especially painters, to join the Catholic Church. Rome, the seat of art, was very frequently visited by painters for the purpose of study. A special German school of painting was formed there, which adopted for its character a slavish imitation of German mediæval painting. Catholic legendary lore became the chief source from which the adherents of this school drew the subjects for their works; the mediæval pomp which the Church in Rome is constantly developing furnished them with the necessary models. Thus, love of art and excitement of the

¹ Wie ward Fritz Stolberg ein Unfreier? in Paulus's Sophronizon for 1819, pt. iii.
§ 7. ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF PROTESTANT GERMANY. 503

senses led many German painters, shortly after the Wars of Deliverance, over to the Catholic Church, e.g. the younger Schadow, the brothers Riepenhausen, etc.

Others were led to the same end from a political-juristic standpoint. Among these was Carl Ludwig von Haller, professor in Berne, and member of the Sovereign Council in that city. The aversion to all revolution which the French Revolution had developed caused him to consider the absolute power of governments and the unconditional obedience of subjects the only means of salvation for the world. The spiritual power, too, according to him, should be absolute and universal, and, in order to assert its independence, should possess real estate. In this spirit he wrote his Restoration of Political Economy since 1816 (six vols.). He had, therefore, long held Catholic views, while outwardly still belonging to the Protestant Church. At length, in 1820, he went over secretly, and obtained from the Church authorities a dispensation from all outward religious observances, in order to be able to retain his official positions. The matter became known, however, and in 1821 he was expelled from the Grand Council for having broken the oath of office by which he had promised to the State inviolable fealty and truth, which he could not render if, being a Catholic, he gave his vote in matters of the Protestant Church.

In a similar manner several jurists were won over to the Catholic Church. The members of the legal profession, being accustomed in their department to demand consistency and unconditional validity for all statutes which determine life, are easily inclined to require the same qualities from the doctrines of the Church. They therefore not infrequently adopt the symbolical doctrine, not because they are inwardly convinced and penetrated by it, but because they look upon it as legally established. But inasmuch as it lies in the nature of the Protestant Church that the individual does not give up his conviction, and, therefore, does not submit unconditionally to doctrines which he can not inwardly adopt, merely because they have the outward sanction of the Church, and inasmuch as this outward conforming to Church doctrines is rather the character of the Catholic Church, certain jurists allowed themselves to be drawn by these facts into a predilection for the latter, and some have even gone over to it. Thus, in particular, Professor
Jarke, in Bonn till 1825, then in Vienna, as also Professor Phillipps in Berlin, 1828, subsequently in Munich. And recently, even a Reformed clergyman named Hurter, Antistes (chief preacher) in Schaffhausen, was led over to Catholicism in this way. He was a decided opponent of the modern agitations, such as have taken place in State and Church since the French Revolution, and for that very reason became an admirer of the institutions and ordinances of the Catholic Church and the outward unity arising therefrom. After expressing this tendency in a very remarkable manner, in his Biography of Innocent III. (Hamburg, 1834—1842, 4 vols.), he was obliged to resign, and, finally, in 1844, joined the Catholic Church in Rome. He subsequently became Court Councilor and Austrian Historiographer at Vienna.  

These conversions to Catholicism, however, were mere isolated cases. A prevailing tendency toward that faith existed only for a short time among the German artists and romanticists. Many efforts are constantly being made for this object on the part of the Roman Catholics, and the great Missionary Society in Lyons, in particular, devotes large sums to it—a portion of which, distributed at Munich, is expended in Germany—and by these means isolated conversions are still purchased, especially among the lower classes. But, nevertheless, the number of those converted to Romanism is by no means as large as that of those who have left this faith, and, in particular, there has never been an instance of whole congregations going over to the Catholic Church, while a number of Catholic congregations have become Protestant in modern times.

Of more importance in the Protestant Church than this tendency to Catholicism was the inclination to a false mysticism, a result of religious feelings intensified by the great events of the period.

Religious mysticism is the apprehension and expression of the doctrinal mysteries of religion through the emotions and the imagination. All religious doctrines contain mysteries, so far as they refer to the infinite and its influence in the finite; for these are subjects which can never be thoroughly grasped by the finite powers of perception. Human reason is the common organ for

religious perception, but it can not conceive the infinite; it can only define it by excluding from it all conceptions of the finite. Such negative conceptions, however, can not have that effect upon the emotions and the will which religious perceptions should have. We therefore merely conform to human nature and our own wants if we clothe them in suitable typical language, and thus give them life and vigor for our feelings. Imagination transforms these infinite religious conceptions of the understanding into corresponding intuitive, and therefore finite, perceptions, which vividly affect our emotions, and thus, too, exert a stronger influence upon the will. This method of apprehending and expressing religious doctrines for the emotions through the imagination, is religious mysticism. So long as the latter remains conscious of its dependence on the understanding, not striving to search out religious doctrines, but merely seeking to clothe those which have been acknowledged by reason in the language of feeling; so long, moreover, as it clearly recognizes its typical language as a sensual expression of supersensual truth, and does not confound it with that truth itself, this mysticism is not only allowable, but is also indispensable for the quickening of religious truth in man, as it stimulates the emotions and invigorates the will.

When the religious feelings are strongly excited, this true mysticism, in cases where it is connected with an unrestrained imagination, easily degenerates into a false mysticism by overstepping the limits drawn above. For this spurious mysticism no longer recognizes the understanding as the sole organ for religious perception, but thinks itself able to grasp higher things by direct apprehension or intuition, either through inner perception or in outward sensual impressions, looking upon pictures of the imagination as perceptions of supersensual objects. Inasmuch, therefore, as it thinks itself capable, in this way, of directly perceiving the divine essence, and believes itself under the immediate influence of the latter, it forms for itself, from fantastic conceptions, a system of religion; and as these conceptions are taken from sensual impressions alone, it in fact draws down the divine into the sphere of the sensual.

Times rich in great events, which strongly excite the religious emotions, frequently also produce such false mysticism. Great political revolutions, serious national misfortunes, and startling
phenomena in nature seem to the religious feelings like a more direct appeal from the Supreme Being to mankind than is afforded by the tranquil, monotonous course of events which the mind is apt to attribute merely to the laws and necessities of nature, without considering God's agency in them. Such extraordinary occurrences tend to give rise particularly to the thought that God, by them, intends to manifest his displeasure at the sins of men, and that the latter, in order to reconcile him, are in need of radical repentance and conversion; or, in general, that mankind have gone astray and must return to the right path in order to please God. Hence, individuals of excitable feelings and vivid imagination, by yielding to these impressions, easily fall into the delusion of not only recognizing such divine admonitions in unusual events, but of being themselves their immediate recipients, and then consider themselves the chosen instruments through which God would speak to mankind. Such persons are rightly called false mystics, and not only does the term apply to them, but also to their adherents; for these latter either, like their masters, believe themselves to have entered into direct communication with the Divine Being, or else they have faith in the fantastic emotions of their leaders. In short, they assign to fantastic feeling, instead of to reason, the place of the sole organ for religious perception.¹

This false mysticism began to manifest itself during the unhappy time of the French rule in Germany, when occasional reports arose of prophecies, which were sometimes founded on visions, sometimes on interpretations of the Apocalypse. Immediately after the Wars of Deliverance, Madame de Krüdener, widow of a Russian statesman, made a great sensation by her tendency to mysticism. At the time of the second Peace of Paris she was in that city, and there gained a strong personal influence over the Emperor Alexander of Russia, whose refined, devout nature, was likewise open to all impressions of mysticism. Her exhortations to repentance affected him deeply, and he often prayed with her for hours. The forming of the Holy Alliance was chiefly occasioned by her, as it was she who influenced the Emperor of Russia in favor of this idea. In 1815 and 1816 she traveled through Switzerland and Germany, preaching repent-

¹ F. W. Krug, Kritische Geschichte d. prot. religiösen Schwärmerei im Wupperthale, Elberfeld, 1851.
ance, designating herself as the instrument through which God intended to reform the times, and even calling revelations and miracles to aid. In Switzerland she left behind her a seed which subsequently produced a fanatical sect whose frenzy even drove it to bloody deeds. In Germany she was merely looked upon with wonder, as a strange phenomenon, without leaving any perceptible effects. She then returned to St. Petersburg, where she continued her efforts for several years longer, and held frequent prayer-meetings. Her influence over the Emperor, however, diminished gradually, and in 1822 she was commanded to leave the capital. Upon this she went to Livonia, and thence to the Crimea, where she died, December 13, 1824.

In Würtemberg, the Pietistic tendency which had long prevailed there gave rise to various new sects. Pietism had already been established there in the time of Spener, but had received, through Johann Albrecht Bengel, a peculiar apocalyptic character. Among the Würtemberg Pietists the expectation was universal that Christ's second advent would take place and the millennium would begin in the year 1836. Many conventicles were held, by which individual talented men gained distinction in smaller circles, and circulated peculiar opinions in them, so that the great band of Pietists was subdivided into many lesser factions. Thus, a peasant, George Rapp, had, from 1785, been gaining adherents, who, with him, separated entirely from the Church, looked forward to the near advent of the Lord, and attached great value to celibacy. Rapp, with his followers, went to North America in 1803, and there founded a community, called Harmony, with a very peculiar constitution. Many of the Separatists who remained behind went further and further in their fanaticism—repudiated marriage and animal food, dressed in a peculiar manner, abused the clergy and the Church, refused obedience to the authorities, and considered Bonaparte the messenger and son of God. A second party gathered around another peasant named Johann Michael Hahn (d. January 20, 1819), whose doctrine was a mixture of Pietism and the theosophy of Jacob Böhme, and who also prophesied the near advent of Christ. His party

---

* Die Theosophie Fr. Chr. Oetinger's nach ihren Grundzügen, von Dr. C. A. Au berlen, mit einem Vorworte von R. Rothe, Tübingen, 1848.

(Michelians) are still scattered through the country in numerous congregations. A contrast to them is presented by the Pregizerians, called after a preacher named Pregizer, who think themselves so entirely justified by faith that they have no longer any need to pray for forgiveness of sins, and, therefore, give their meetings a joyous character, and sing their hymns to the airs of lively popular songs. All the Pietistic parties in Würtemberg were especially displeased with the National Church when, in 1791, it adopted a new hymn-book, which seemed to them entirely wanting in faith; and hence Separatism increased since that time, inasmuch as many Pietists left the National Church. This was still more the case when, in 1808, a new liturgy was compulsorily introduced, which defined the old Lutheran faith less distinctly, and, in particular, excluded the abnegation in the formula of baptism. In consequence, many separated entirely from the Church, and no longer had their children either baptized or confirmed. By mystical writings, chiefly by Bengel's Interpretation of the Book of Revelation, as well as Jung-Stilling's "Heimweh," they were led to the idea that the millennium was at hand, and that they ought to go toward the east, in order to participate in it more easily. The government vainly sought to suppress them, and was finally glad to further their intention of emigrating to the south of Russia, where, as early as the reign of Catharine II., several German, and, particularly, Würtemberg colonies, had established themselves in the neighborhood of Odessa. The Emperor Alexander declared his willingness to receive them, and thus, in 1816 and 1817, fourteen hundred families in all repaired to Russia in several installments. The greater portion of these companies suffered severely on the way, partly from the hardships brought upon them by the deception of their leaders (for several hypocrites had gained great distinction among them), partly from the diseases which broke out among them, and in consequence of which nearly half of their number died. Nevertheless, the majority were not willing to remain near Odessa, where the Russian government wished to establish them, but preferred to go farther east. Five hundred families, therefore, went to Grusia, and built several villages in the region of Tiflis. The Russian government did a great deal

for them, but they endured much suffering through the Persian war, in which many were carried away by the Persians, through the cholera, and even more through their own fanaticism. They were not willing to submit to any ecclesiastical government, and a large portion at length suffered themselves to be induced by a prophetess, Frau Spohn, who declared herself the bride of Christ, to go to Jerusalem, there to await the coming of Christ and the millennium. They gave away all their possessions, and intended to start upon their journey entirely without means, and without carrying food and drink even for a day, because they believed that God would send ravens to feed the believers. The government was compelled to use force in preventing the execution of this plan (1843), and as the prophetess was arrested, without receiving the expected divine assistance, and two men who had been sent to Jerusalem returned with a very unfavorable report, this fanaticism soon ceased. The congregations now received regular pastors, who strove to bring them back to a Church system. The greater part of the marriages had not been consecrated, children twelve years of age were still unbaptized and without instruction. After this, however, the colonies enjoyed general prosperity.

Other Pietists were induced to remain in their native land by the circumstance that permission was given them to form an independent community. The proposition was made by the burgomaster of Leonberg, Gottlieb Wilhelm Hoffmann, who, when the royal sanction had been obtained, placed himself at the head of the enterprise. The manor of Kornthal was purchased (1819), and a community established on its estates, which was granted great civil privileges and entire ecclesiastical independence of the Consistory. In the beginning, indeed, various differences of opinion manifested themselves in the new community, but, notwithstanding, they all united in the confession of the old Lutheran faith, and in a Church organization which was chiefly founded on that of Herrnhut. Like the Herrnhuters, too, they forbade the taking of an oath, though they permitted the military state. So many families soon congregated in Kornthal that the place could not accommodate them all. The government was willing to sanction the establishment of a second colony only on condition of its settling in an uninhabited district and cultivating it.

Germania, by Dr. W. Stricker, ii. 386, Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1848.
The community therefore founded, in a marshy region on the frontier of Baden, about fifteen miles from the Lake of Constance, the colony of Wilhelmsdorf (1828), with the same privileges as those enjoyed by Kornthal. The two communities call themselves United Brethren, but do not belong to the Herrnhut association, although they are on friendly terms with it. After the manner of the Herrnhuters, they have established sundry schools and other educational institutions in their midst, which are often frequented by children residing at a great distance. In Kornthal, particularly, a reform school for neglected children was established in 1822. A similar institution has been founded in Wilhelmsdorf, as well as an asylum for discharged convicts. Hoffmann remained until his death (January 29, 1846) the soul of all these institutions: the communities will find it difficult to replace the leadership and the point of union which they have lost with him.

With all this, the Pietists, who are still in the communion of the Established Church, but have, at the same time, their own assemblies, have by no means disappeared. On the contrary, they have still several heads and leaders among the clergy, the most prominent of whom is Albert Knapp, of Stuttgart, who furnishes, in his Christenbote (a yearly publication), the principal organ of Pietism. But the Church authorities have adopted a more moderate and tolerant course toward them, and, in particular, have paid regard to their aversion to the established liturgy and the hymn-book, by decreeing a revision of the former and the compilation of a new hymn-book. This has, in a great measure, removed the dissatisfaction of the Pietists with the Established Church.

Other sects have striven less successfully to obtain an extended influence in Württemberg. Of late years, the English Baptists have made great efforts to gain adherents in Germany. Their steps to this effect were taken partly from Switzerland, partly from Hamburg, where a small Baptist congregation has been formed. Its pastor, named Oncken, who is supported from England, has been exceedingly active, by traveling and the distribution of tracts, in trying to win members for his community,
and in some cases, e.g. in Berlin and Marburg, has succeeded to a certain degree. This sect has nothing in common with the Mennonites, and requires complete immersion in baptism, which is generally administered in a river. Since 1837 a small society of Baptists has been established at Stuttgart; they rejected infant baptism, and celebrated the communion among themselves, in accordance, as they hold, with its original institution by our Lord. Oncken came to Stuttgart and baptized the members in the river Neckar. Their number, however, has always remained small.

The English influence has also been instrumental in gaining a foothold for Swedenborgianism in Würtemberg. Since 1823, Dr. Joh. Friedr. Immanuel Tafel, and Ludwig Hofacker, in Tübingen, have been active for the same end, by editing new editions of Swedenborg's writings, and publishing treatises of their own for the demonstration, explanation, and defense of the Swedenborgian system. In 1840, they were joined by a young divine, Gustav Werner, from Reutlingen, who, assisted by an unusual oratorical talent, travels about, holds conventicles everywhere, and meets with great approbation, particularly among his female hearers, even of the higher classes. Notwithstanding, he does not appear to have gained many adherents.°

In close connection with these forms of fanaticism was the ostensible communion with spirits, which, for a time, also found a receptive soil in Würtemberg. The eighteenth century—the century of enlightenment—was rich in exorcists and visionaries, among whom Schröpfer and the so-called Count Cagliostro deserve particular mention. These visionary fancies, however, merely ministered to curiosity and other impure motives, and were not subservient to any religious doctrine nor in connection with peculiar religious opinions.

An exception to this, however, was made by Swedenborg, who believed himself able to commune with spirits at will, and to obtain from them profound disclosures concerning higher truths. Moreover, the belief in communion with spirits was fostered by Johann Heinrich Jung, who, in his writings, called himself Still- ing, and who won distinction as an oculist and instructor in political economy (d. in Carlsruhe, 1817). He was a man of childlike piety, who believed himself to have experienced during his life

the most obvious signs of an uninterrupted divine guidance, and even miraculous assistance and remarkable answers to prayer. By his writings, adapted for popular reading, he exerted a widespread influence in favor of the Pietistic view of Christianity. True, he was opposed to all extravagant fanaticism, which boasted of new revelations, and warned against the latter in a special work (Theobald or the Fanatics); but he was himself inclined to a milder form of enthusiasm, and, in particular, advocated the theory of a communion of departed spirits with the living.¹⁰

A new impulse in this respect was given by the so-called Seer of Prevorst. This woman was the daughter of a forester in the village of Prevorst, in Württemberg, who already in childhood had developed a surprising power of presentiment. After her marriage she fell into a magnetic state, which manifested itself in a remarkable manner by clairvoyance and prophesying. In the year 1826 she was placed under the treatment of Justinus Kerner, physician-in-chief at Weinsberg, a man who had acquired distinction as a poet, and in whom sentiment predominated. Under his care the magnetic phenomena in his patient became more and more decided, and finally took the shape of a distinct communion with spirits. She beheld in the moon and the stars the dwellings of the departed happy spirits; but declared, on the other hand, that the spirits of such persons as had at their death been burdened with sin, or had clung too firmly to terrestrial things, were still retained upon the earth in our atmosphere, in the so-called intermediate realm, and were yearning for deliverance. Such spirits appeared to her in human form, sometimes in the usual dress of the day, sometimes in unusual apparel, and demanded consolation and aid from her through prayer. They were not, indeed, visible to others, but made themselves perceptible by noises, e. g. by footsteps, knockings, sighs, etc. Kerner looked at all this more from a poetical point of view, with genial simplicity. But he was joined in the observation of his patient by Christoph Adolph von Eschenmayer, Professor of Philosophy at Tübingen, who had always inclined to a certain mysticism based on the Philosophy of Nature. The latter now endeavored to arrange and prove these phenomena scientifically. The seer, whose magnetic condition had obviously been intensified instead of moderated by the treat-

ment, and who, during her attacks, adopted the ideas of such persons as had a magnetic influence upon her, fell a victim to her disease in 1829. Her history has been related by Kerner and Eschenmayer in the work Die Seherin von Prevorst, Stuttgart, 1830, 2 vols. This work was the beginning of a whole literature on spiritual manifestations, which partly examined and refuted the above communications, and partly furnished the relation of new experiences by their authors. For, from that time, apparitions and ghost stories of all kinds became quite common in the neighborhood of Weinsberg. Kerner and Eschenmayer asserted the influence of a spirit world upon our own, entirely in accordance with the popular belief. Eschenmayer, in 1836, resigned his professorship in order to devote himself wholly to these investigations. Accordingly, he believed himself to have witnessed supernatural occurrences, possession by demons, and the like, and was zealous in their defense. But in this way the matter became so absurd that all persons who laid any claim to enlightenment could not but discountenance it.

A very peculiar party among the Mystics, which created a great sensation, was that of the Muckers in Königsberg. Indirectly, they were originated by a theosophist of that city, Johann Heinrich Schönherr, who, after the manner of the old Manichæans, taught the existence of two primitive beings, and, in consequence, divided mankind into two classes—natures of light and natures of darkness—according as light or darkness had the upper hand in them. Among the natures of light, he again distinguished principal natures, which had the faculty to enter directly into an inner and immediate communication with God, and which were appointed for the guidance of the secondary natures. For a time, Schönherr had many pupils, but, on account of his singular extravagances, he was finally entirely deserted by them, and died in solitude and poverty in 1826. One of his disciples, Johann Wilhelm Ebel, preacher in Königsberg, left him as early as 1819, and undertook to found a secret sect of his own. Aided by great oratorical talent, he preached repentance and sanctification, but differed essentially from the Pietists in directing men to their own powers for the attaining of this end, and not to the mercy of God. At the same time, he assembled a secret band of adherents around him, who, for the most part, belonged to the highest classes of society,
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and consisted chiefly of women. To these he communicated the fundamental doctrines of Schönherr, but built up upon these very dangerous practical rules. Proceeding from the above-mentioned distinction between principal and secondary natures, of which the last could only gain salvation by attaching themselves to the former, he, as such a principal nature, established a fearful tyranny of conscience over his adherents, and, in particular, required of them the most unrestricted communication, not only of all their actions, but also of all thoughts and emotions, and the most unconditional submission to his guidance. The following, however, was especially pernicious: Ebel held up, as the chief element of the sanctification to be striven for, sexual purity, which he declared to consist in being above all excitations of the sexual impulse, and to exercise complete control over the latter. In order to gain this mastery, such excitations between the two sexes were brought about in the most shameless manner in the secret meetings of the society. Before long, dark rumors were circulated about the matter. In 1835, finally, a fiscal suit was instituted against the two heads of the party, the preachers Ebel and Diestel, which ended in 1839 with their condemnation. They were deposed from their offices, and Ebel was sentenced to imprisonment, which was to last until he changed his views.11

These sects did not acquire a very extended influence, and the number of their adherents remained small. Of far greater importance, however, in the German Protestant Church was the struggle between Rationalism and Supernaturalism. Rationalism is that theological view which assigns to reason the supreme inalienable right to decide what is religious truth. It acknowledges, indeed, a divine revelation in the Holy Scriptures, but a revelation which was effected indirectly, according to general natural laws, and, therefore, consisted essentially in a providential guidance of individuals to a purer knowledge of God, so that this knowledge, like any other, was qualified by the general state of enlightenment as well as by the influence of nationality and of the age. Under the divine guidance, the Hebrew people had developed a purer knowledge of God, but in a shape adapted
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to the popular comprehension, and mingled with prejudices peculiar to the people and to the times; so that in the Holy Scriptures we find the eternal divine truth offered to us in an imperfect human form. Thus it appertains to reason to decide what is eternal truth in the Holy Scriptures, and what merely local and temporary opinion. The Bible is not itself the Word of God, but the Word of God which it contains must be brought to light by reason. Rationalism, therefore, is distinguished from Naturalism by its recognition of divine revelation, and its efforts to discover the traces of such revelation in history. Until this time Rationalism had not come forward undisguisedly, but had accommodated itself, in a measure, to the old Church system, e.g. in the works on dogmatics of Henke and Eckermann. The first free and consistent exposition and development of the Rationalist system appeared in Johann Friedrich Röhr's Letters on Rationalism, Sondershausen (rather Zeitz), 1813, and in Julius August Ludwig Wegscheider's Institutiones Theologiae Christianae Dogmaticae, Halae, 1815 (8th ed. 1844).

Directly opposed to Rationalism is Supernaturalism. The latter is characterized by its admission of direct revelations from God, the truth and divinity of which it proves solely from the form in which they are communicated, without granting the reason a decisive investigation of their purport. If a religious doctrine is proclaimed as a divine revelation by some pious individual whose truthfulness is undoubted, and who can not be convicted of fanaticism; and if, moreover, this doctrine is not directly opposed to reason, Supernaturalism feels itself compelled to accept it as a supernatural revelation, and no longer permit reason to examine it conclusively. It must be remarked that the two ideas of Rationalism and Supernaturalism are not in a contradictory, but in a contrasting relation to each other; that Supernaturalism also lays claim to Rationalism, inasmuch as it recognizes the necessity of proving by reason the reality of a supernatural revelation, and that Rationalism partakes of Supernaturalism in so far as it admits an unceasing influence of God upon the religious discipline and development of mankind, and, therefore, also acknowledges a divine, even though an indirect revelation. Hence many theologians, like Bretschneider, have designated themselves as rational Supernaturalists, and others, such as Tzschirner, as Rationalists believing in revelation, which
would not have been possible if the two ideas in question were
in contradiction to each other. It has therefore been justly said
that the direct opposite of Supernaturalism is Naturalism, which
denies all revelation, while that of Rationalism is Positivism,
which acknowledges a religious truth merely because it is assert-
ed, without any reference to its relation to reason.

The struggle between Rationalism and Supernaturalism has
continued uninterruptedly in modern times under different
shapes. The majority of the Supernaturalists, however, have
emancipated themselves more or less from the symbolical dog-
mas of the Church; they prefer, for the most part, to retain the
simple Scriptural doctrine. This is particularly the case with
Knapp, Hahn, Steudel. Hence they differ in single less im-
portant points, but unite in the principle that all that which can
be proved to be Scriptural doctrine by means of historico-gram-
matical interpretation, should just on that account be recognized
as divine revelation. At the same time, they are more or less
willing to reconcile this doctrine to the intellectual development
of the times, and to show how even the progress of science has
already done away with many apparent discrepancies which had
formerly been urged against the doctrine of revelation. This
was especially the case with Tholuck, in his numerous works,
chiefly in his Literarischer Anzeiger für Christliche Theologie
und Wissenschaft überhaupt (commenced 1830), in which the
results of modern science, particularly the natural sciences, are
frequently considered in their relation to Christian theology from
the above point of view. The works on dogmatics of Twisten
(Hamburg, vols. i. and ii., pt. i. incomplete) and Nitzsch (Bonn,
5th ed. 1848) also retain the Biblical standpoint, and endeavor to
philosophically construe and to justify the Scriptural doctrine.

On the part of the Rationalists, critical investigations of the
origin of the separate Biblical writings were zealously carried
on, and although this criticism has not infrequently led to arbi-
trary exaggerations, it has yet furnished various results deviating
from the old traditional acceptations, which may be regarded as
historically certain. Among the Supernaturalists, too, there are
many who acknowledge these results; others, in particular Heng-
stenberg and his school, have combated them vehemently, and

Knapp, Glaubenslehre, Halle, 1827, 2 vols.; Hahn, Leipsic, 1828; Steudel, Tü-
bingen, 1834.
have permitted themselves the most arbitrary suppositions for
the removal of the historical grounds.

That form of exegesis which sought to explain all the miracles
of the Scriptures on natural principles was given up as arbitrary,
even by most Rationalists, and a purely grammatico-historical
exegesis generally adopted instead, and carried on with increas-
ing thoroughness. For a while the latter was opposed by a cer-
tain mystical exegesis, which, however, soon lost its adherents.
Its aim was, taking it for granted that the Bible was verbally in-
spired, to discover, without any reference to the rules of human
interpretation, mysteries, or deeper revelations of higher truth in
certain passages and expressions, and thus to facilitate a more
profound comprehension of the Scriptures. Of this kind are
many Scriptural interpretations by J. A. Kanne, Professor of Ori-
ental Languages in Erlangen (d. 1824); Joh. Friedr. von Meyer,
magistrate in Frankfort-on-the-Main, who even regards the Cab-
ala as the depository of profound religious mysteries; and Ru-
dolph Stier, now preacher in Prussian Saxony.

In the controversy between the Supernaturalists and Rational-
ists, the latter were accused by the former of applying to the
history of divine revelation the standard of a false criticism, in-
asmuch as they reject every thing which the ordinary human
understanding can not comprehend, and which deviates from
the common course of events; that, by so doing, they make
religion a matter of reason, and throw a chill over the heart
and the emotions; that, if they consistently followed the same
course, they would render all doctrines of religion uncertain,
and finally arrive at Atheism. On the other hand, the opponents
of Supernaturalism censured it for disregarding the claims of
reason, which alone should decide upon the grounds of faith,
and asserted that it followed a traditional interpretation of the
Holy Scriptures without the necessary examination; that even
if it made a pretense of such an examination, the latter was
conducted with prejudice, and the results which were to be at-
tained were determined beforehand; and, finally, that it allowed
itself to be guided too much by obscure feelings, and, therefore,
was inclined to involve its followers in a false mysticism. It is
true that many individuals on both sides have been guilty of the
errors of which their whole party is here accused, but to such an
extent these reproaches are unjust. The Supernaturalist does
not necessarily withdraw the grounds of his belief from the investigation of reason; and Rationalism does not make the understanding, but the reason, the arbiter in matters of faith; nor does it refuse to acknowledge that religious truth can not be thoroughly comprehended by the understanding. Hence, it is quite as unjust to call the Supernaturalists simply Pietists or Mystics, as to designate the Rationalists, after the manner of their opponents, as Naturalists.

As for the share taken in this controversy by the people, Supernaturalism, as the traditional form of religion, had the preponderance with the great majority, mostly, however, without their being familiar with the points of dispute. It was only in some parts of Germany, where Supernaturalism had gained access in the form of Pietism, that some preachers communicated these questions to the people, in order to excite them against Rationalism. The educated laity for a long time kept the middle between both parties. They felt repulsed as well by many assertions of the Supernaturalists as by the negations of the Rationalists; their religious life, indeed, was based merely upon the more general religious truths, but they for the most part regarded the positive and historical doctrines of Supernaturalism with awe, although they were more willing to be content with so doing than to allow such doctrines any influence on their religious life. For this reason, those writings which developed religious truths in a rational manner, without any polemical discussion, found great favor. This was particularly the case with the Hours of Devotion (Stunden der Andacht), which first appeared at Aarau in single weekly numbers, from 1809 to 1815, but subsequently circulated, in many editions, among all religious parties, and, in spite of all attacks on the part of zealous Supernaturalists, became the most highly prized book of devotion of countless individuals. The author long remained anonymous, because he had intended his work for all Christian confessions, and did not wish to have his faith, if it became known, prejudice those of another belief against the book. It was only many years later that the celebrated Zschokke, of Aarau, laid claim to the authorship. A similar degree of general approbation was gained by Dinter's School-teacher's Bible (Neustadt, 1824–1828), a popular explanation of the Bible, which lays stress only upon the rationally religious and the practically moral elements of the Scriptures; and,
on the other hand, without combating the supernatural elements, does not advocate them.

Notwithstanding that the educated portion of the people regarded with mistrust any open opposition to supernatural Christianity, yet, as they were not its decided adherents, they could not take an important part in the attacks upon Rationalism, and hence, even the more serious of these have passed by without any result. Among them may be mentioned:

1. The Harmsian controversy on theses. Claus Harms, arch-deacon in Kiel, a man of superior mind and a very effective preacher, who, however, had gone over from a peculiarly liberal view of Christianity to the most rigid Lutheran orthodoxy, published, in commemoration of the Jubilee of the Reformation (Kiel, 1817), the Ninety-five Theses of Luther, adding to them ninety-five other theses against various errors and confusions in the Lutheran Church of the present time, in which, as defender of the old Lutheran faith, he declaimed against Rationalism and the then beginning union between the Lutheran and Reformed churches. These theses immediately made a great sensation, and found many opponents but few advocates.

2. The attack of Professor Hahn, in Leipsic, against Rationalism. When, in 1827, Hahn was called from Königsberg as Professor of Theology to Leipsic, he entered upon his new office with a dissertation "De Rationalismi vera Indole," in which he sought to prove that Rationalism is nothing but Naturalism, and would lead to Materialism and Atheism. In further defense of his assertions, he published in the same year the treatise, "An die Evangelische Kirche zunächst in Sachsen und Preussen, eine offene Erklärung," in which he directly accused the Rationalists of being renegades, and proposed their exclusion from the Church. This step, however, was disapproved of even by many Supernaturalists; the controversial writings which appeared in consequence soon ceased, and no further results ensued.

3. The same year, 1827, witnessed the commencement of the Evangelical Church Gazette (Evangelische Kirchenzeitung) of Professor Hengstenberg, which from the first has combated Rationalism unceasingly. The oldest Church gazette is the "Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung," edited by Court-chaplain Zimmermann, in Darmstadt, since April, 1822. Its aim was to give reliable information and competent opinions on all conditions and events
of importance to the Church, and thus furnish an ecclesiastical history of the times, verified as much as possible by documents. This end, however, was not reached by it. The information it brings has the character of all newspaper information; it is for the most part one-sided, often partial to some peculiar interest, and rarely complete and verified by documents. The greater part of the paper is occupied by articles treating, often very superficially, of ecclesiastical subjects. Still, a Church gazette was well adapted to the requirements of the age, which desires to be speedily informed of every thing, and to receive instruction in an easy, pleasant, effortless manner; and thus there appeared, after the model of the Darmstadt Kirchenzeitung, several other journals of the kind, Protestant and Catholic, most of which, however, were soon discontinued. These journals have, indeed, contributed to diffuse an interest in Church matters, but more by creating excitement and awakening and nourishing party prejudices than by affording real instruction and fostering a spirit of religion.

When the Darmstadt Church Gazette began to appear, almost all German theological journals were rationalistic in tendency, and the new Church Gazette followed their example. In opposition to the latter, Professor Hengstenberg, in July, 1827, began the publication of the Evangelical Church Gazette, with the aim of defending in it the doctrines of the Church, and as a journal of this kind, the style of which was adapted to the comprehension of the general public, did not yet exist, it soon gained a wide circulation and became very influential among those who shared its opinions. At the same time, however, it repelled many by the gloomy, bitter spirit which pervaded it from the beginning. Its tone is arrogant, opinionated, and sneering, as if it were dealing with the most narrow-minded public, while it treats its opponents, after the manner of the judges of heretics in all ages, like perverse, hardened sinners. It preaches strict symbolical orthodoxy, but, nevertheless, in accordance with the course recommended by the government, it favored the union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches, although the unconditional authority of the symbols can not coexist with the latter. Among its attacks upon Rationalism, particular sensation was created by a correspondence from Halle, in the January number of 1830, whose author subsequently proved to be Von Gerlach, Director of the Pro-
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vincial Court in Halle. In it, certain extracts from the lectures of Professors Wegscheider and Gesenius were quoted in order to show the pernicious spirit which was spread abroad by these men, and to convince the government of the necessity of removing them from their positions. This article caused universal indignation, not only because such publication of verbal utterances was a breach of confidence, but also, and particularly, because it involved an open demand for the suppression of liberty of instruction, which is acknowledged to be a necessary condition of scientific life. Neander, at that time, openly dissolved his connection with the Evangelische Kirchenzeitung. The Prussian government ordered an investigation of the accusation, but subsequently declared that it could find no reason to take action against the accused, and that the existing liberty of instruction should remain intact. Notwithstanding that this occurrence called forth the disapprobation even of many of the former friends of the Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, its spirit and tone have still remained the same.13

4. The Altenburg Controversy. In September, 1838, Pastor Stephan, of Dresden, with many adherents, several hundred of whom were from Saxe-Altenburg, emigrated to America because they considered pure Lutheranism and a true Christian piety extinct in Germany. The official report of a general visitation led the Consistory to conclude that the fault of the above occurrence lay chiefly with the clergy, who ignored the positive fundamental doctrines of Christianity, and preached only the general truths of religion. In consequence, a consistorial rescript was addressed to all the clergymen and school-teachers of the country (November 13, 1838), in which this error was censured in a manner which showed the apparent intention of the authorities to restore religious instruction to the form in which it had existed a hundred years before, direct reference being had to the catechetical instruction of former times, as well as to the older hymns of the hymn-book. This rescript caused great excitement throughout the country; the clergy partly felt offended, and partly feared the beginning of an ecclesiastical reaction. A lively controversy ensued; the ministry induced several theological faculties to issue opinions, which it collected and had printed. No further

measures followed, however, and thus the matter soon came to an end.  

In close connection with the state of theology at this time is the Union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches, which, during this period, was accomplished in a large portion of Germany. Since the development of modern theology, the separation of the Lutheran and Reformed churches had been more and more regarded as ungrounded, and its abolition desired. The theologians of each Church could not conceal from themselves that far more important theological differences existed among themselves than between the symbolical doctrines of the two churches, without, therefore, necessitating a schism. And it was equally undeniable that the doctrines which had occasioned the division were not expressed in the Holy Scriptures with irrefutable distinctness, and that, consequently, according to the principles of both churches, a difference of opinion with regard to them ought to be permitted just because the Bible had left them free. As for the difference in the form of worship, that had from the beginning been pronounced unessential by the theology of both churches. Among the people, too, these views gained the preponderance in proportion as the value attached to the speculative development of the positive doctrines of Christianity diminished. Hence, the barrier between the two churches had long since fallen; but it was desirable that the cessation of the separation should also be formally announced, and the union effected outwardly as well, so that there should be an end to the party designations which might so easily reawaken a party spirit, and so that the external interests of the two churches might be amalgamated; inasmuch as, so long as they remained separate, they would always be likely to give rise to discord. All that was needed for this union was that the inner unity between the two churches, which already existed, should be acknowledged—i.e. that it should be admitted that the Word of God was preached with like purity, and the sacraments truly administered in both; that, in consequence, both sides should enter into a Church communion, declare their intention to form only one Church, and renounce sectarian names and sectarian sentiments. On the oth-

* Opinions of the Theological Faculties of the National University of Jena and the Universities of Berlin, Göttingen, and Heidelberg on the Rescript of the Ducal Consistory of Altenburg of November 13, 1838, Altenburg, 1839.
er hand, it was unnecessary to require a perfect correspondence in the ordinances and rites of the newly united Church, inasmuch as these had always existed in various forms in each division, and might continue to exist in the same manner in the united Church. In its essential principles, the Union met with general favor and approbation at that time; but in some places it roused opposition by demanding unity and conformity in non-essential matters. E.g.

1. By requiring unity in the form of worship, and particularly in the communion-service, as there were many individuals who were loth to give up the rites to which they had become attached by habit.

2. By the attempt to bring about, at the same time with the Union, a combination of individual Church societies, or a different division of parishes. For many were strongly attached to their old Church communion, and unwilling to renounce it; and in many cases a congregation which possessed ample Church and parochial property and other charitable foundations would have met with great disadvantage from a union with an adjoining parish which was poor, and perhaps even in debt.

Notwithstanding all this, the union of the two evangelical churches has been happily effected in a large portion of Germany.

First in Nassau, at the General Synod of Idstein, in August, 1817. Immediately after this (September 27, 1817), the King of Prussia, Frederic William III., issued a proclamation calling upon all the ecclesiastical authorities of the kingdom to use their influence in inducing the two factions of the evangelical Church, in celebration of the approaching Jubilee of the Reformation, to overthrow the barrier which divided them, and unite in one evangelical Church. This invitation was very generally responded to. In many places the Union was solemnized on the very day of the jubilee, October 31, in a very affecting manner, by a joint communion-service. It was only outside of Prussia that some voices were raised against the Union (in particular, Harms, in Kiel; Ammon, in Dresden; and Tittmann, in Leipsic). In that country itself it was accepted by so great a majority that the government soon after entirely abolished the use of the terms "Lutheran and Reformed churches" in official documents, and decreed that the entire National Church should henceforward be designated as Evangelical. The matter at first only met with
occasional opposition, because of the attempt made to introduce a new communion-service at the same time with the Union, and in some places to unite Lutheran and Reformed congregations. But another obstacle soon after arose in shape of the new liturgy which was introduced in Prussia in 1821. This liturgy was disapproved of, particularly by the Reformed, because it resembled that of the Roman Catholic mass, and by some Lutherans because the form of the communion-service was evidently based on the Reformed doctrine of the sacrament. Dr. Scheibel, professor and preacher in Breslau, was the first to refuse decidedly to join the Union and adopt the new liturgy, by declaring, on the contrary, his adherence to the rigid Lutheran doctrine. In vain was it represented to him that the Union did not exclude this doctrine; that he could join the former and use the liturgy without yielding up his strictly Lutheran orthodoxy: from his standpoint he could justly oppose all the reasons which in former times were advanced by the Lutherans against any union with the Reformed, i. e. that they could neither tolerate, nor even recognize as admissible, errors of doctrine in the Church, inasmuch as they would thus pave the way for indifferentism. For a long time Scheibel was alone in his opposition; all other clergymen in Breslau, with their congregations, declared in favor of the Union and the ritual. When, finally, he was suspended by the magistracy as the patron of the Church (1830), two thousand members of the congregation, among them Professors Huschke and Steffens, left the United Church with him, and declared their intention of adhering to the unaltered Lutheran faith. Scheibel, indeed, was deposed, and compelled to leave Silesia in 1832, when he went to Saxony; but the disturbance had at that time already spread over the whole of Silesia. In many places the Old Lutherans separated from the United Church, established a service of their own, attached themselves to a few clergymen of like views, and when too distant from these, even began to have the sacraments administered in their own houses by certain members of their communion. Two large parishes in particular, with their preachers, decidedly renounced the National Church, and refused obedience to the Consistory. The government interfered by force, prohibited all meetings of the Old Lutherans, and deposed the two preachers, but was compelled in one of the parishes, in Hönigern, to have the church taken from the con-
gregation and delivered over to the newly appointed preacher by the aid of military force (December, 1834).

During the reign of Frederic William III., these Old Lutherans were not tolerated in Prussia; their meetings were forbidden, their preachers were punished for holding divine service or administering the sacraments. It can not be denied that there was much blind fanaticism among them, as, for instance, when they complained in Silesia that the liturgy was intended to overthrow their old Lutheran faith, and that a new Bible and a new catechism were to be introduced. The government continued to assert that the Union was not designed to abolish the Lutheran confession, and that every one was at liberty to retain the Lutheran or the Reformed faith in the United Church. Nevertheless, there was an apparent arbitrary harshness in requiring that the Old Lutherans should no longer continue in the Church communion separate from the Reformed, which they had maintained since the Reformation, but should enter into fellowship with them, notwithstanding that the strict Lutherans had always rejected such association as a communion with reprehensible errors, prohibited by conscience. The Old Lutherans, therefore, were justified in complaining that their religious liberty, which had been secured to them by several treaties of peace, was now being taken from them. This Old Lutheranism, moreover, spread also over other provinces, and congregations of this persuasion were formed in the Old March, in Halle, and in Erfurt, in spite of all prohibitions of the Prussian government. And in other countries as well, in which the Union had not yet been introduced, strict Lutherans reappeared, particularly in Saxony, Bavaria, and Hanover, and were furnished with organs in the journals of Rudelbach and Harless. With the year 1838, a portion of these Old Lutherans began to emigrate to North America, the Prussians in order there to gain the religious freedom refused to them in their native land; others, particularly from Saxony, because they regarded even the Lutheran Church of their country as degenerate, and desired to re-establish it elsewhere in a thoroughly purified form. In vain many leaders of the party, especially Scheibel, protested against this tendency to emigration. One of the largest companies, consisting of emigrants from Dresden, Magdeburg, and the Altenburg region, had at its head pastor Stephan, from Dresden, who enjoyed a great reputation among his
party, notwithstanding that very unfavorable reports had for some

time been in circulation with regard to his character and his morals. He succeeded in gaining the implicit confidence and obedience of the company, and was nominated as bishop by them immediately after their arrival in America. Soon after, however, it was found necessary to depose him on account of immoral practices and embezzlement of common funds, and he subsequently became a Catholic. He afforded a new sad example of the facility with which shrewd dissimulation can succeed in obtaining, by a pretense of sanctity, the leadership in sectarian associations, and how closely hierarchical arrogance may be allied to the most depraved aims.13

Following the example of Nassau and Prussia, many other German countries have adopted the union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches. Thus, the provinces of Electoral Hesse, the principality of Hanau, and the grand-duchy of Fulda, at a synod in Hanau; subsequently, in 1823, the schools and consistories of both religious parties were united throughout all Hesse, and, in particular, the University of Marburg was declared to be united, although the different congregations remained outwardly divided. Likewise, in 1818, the Union was established in Rhenish Bavaria at the General Synod of Kaiserslautern; the Evangelical Church of Rhenish Bavaria, in its charter of constitution of 1822, recognized “the Holy Scriptures alone as foundation of faith and standard of doctrine, although with due deference to the confessions of the separate Protestant parties;” the General Synod of 1823 introduced a common catechism. Further, the Union was established in the duchy of Anhalt-Bernburg in 1820, in the principality of Waldeck and Pyrmont in 1821, and in the same year in the grand-duchy of Baden, at the General Synod of Carlshurhe. In Baden the United Church was furnished by the General Synod with a national catechism in 1834, and a new national agenda in 1836. Finally, the Union was joined by Rhenish Hesse in 1822, and in 1827 by Anhalt-Dessau. In the remaining German states the Union has not, indeed, been formally established as yet, and the two confessions still exist separately, but essentially the Union is everywhere acknowledged. The Lutheran and Reformed National churches are in Church communion

13 Die Stephansche Auswanderung nach America, mit Actenstücken, von Dr. C. E. Vehse, Dresden, 1840. 8.
with the United churches, and there is no longer any objection
raised if a clergyman of one confession preaches in a church be-
longing to another.

Very remarkable proceedings have also been held in modern
times with regard to the government and ordinances of the Evan-
gelical Church.

In the German Lutheran Church, when, during the period of
the Reformation, the Catholic bishops were no longer recognized,
without being replaced by others, the ecclesiastical government
and jurisdiction were transferred to the sovereigns. At first,
some of the rights of jurisdiction remained with the pastors and
the superintendents, but by degrees they all devolved upon gov-
ernment authorities, i.e. the consistories, and the superintendents
likewise acquired the character of government officials. In con-
sequence, the theory was developed that because by the religious
peace the rights of the Catholic bishops over Protestants were
suspended, the episcopal rights, i.e. the jura jurisdictionis, not
the jura ordinis, devolved upon the sovereigns, and that the lat-
ter, in their states, were now summi episcopi (ex jure devoluto,
or delegato). This theory is the so-called Episcopal System, the
oldest canonical system in the Lutheran Church. It was evi-
dently defective, because there was no proof that the rights in
question had been transferred to the sovereigns by a power au-
thorized to do so; they had merely assumed them because there
was no one else who was competent to exercise them, as a res
nullius. Moreover, it was improper to designate the sovereigns
as bishops, as they lacked the most essential rights of the episco-
al office—the right to teach and to administer the sacrament
(jura magisterii et ordinis). In the seventeenth century, there-
fore, Hugo Grotius (d. 1645) first developed the Territorial Sys-
tem, which was subsequently defended by Thomas Hobbes (d.
1679). In the German Lutheran Church it was first brought
forward by Christian Thomasius (d. 1728). According to this
system, Church authority is an essential emanation of the sover-
eign right, a part of the political power, so that the sovereign
has the same right to command in the Church as in the State.
The fundamental principle of this system was, Cujus est regio,
ejus religio. It was favorably received in Germany, but could
not long maintain itself, for it raised every sovereign to the po-
sition of Pope in his own state; and as he combined the highest temporal with the highest spiritual power, he had the means of constraint of conscience and ecclesiastical despotism more at his disposal than had ever been the case with any Pope. Thus this system was in decided contradiction to the principle of Protestantism, which demands freedom in religious matters. It was therefore soon opposed by another more liberal one, the Collegial System, which was first developed by the Chancellor of the University of Tübingen, Matthäus Pfaff, and subsequently adopted by several theologians—in particular, by the Chancellor of the University of Göttingen, Mosheim, in his Common Canon-law of the Protestants. This system places the Church in the same relation to the State as any other organized society (collegium) permitted by the latter. It appertains to the State to sanction or prohibit it, to exercise a constant control over it, so that it may not in any way become dangerous; and, to this end, to require it to submit all its laws, prescriptions, and resolutions, in order to have them examined with a view to the welfare of the State. The government then has the right to reject, without further ceremony, all provisions or alterations of which it does not approve, and the Church can adopt no new laws or institutions which are not sanctioned by the State. These rights over the Church pertaining to the State are called jura circa sacra, in contradistinction to the jura in sacra, the ecclesiastical rights, the rights of the inner Church power. For, according to this system, the State has no more authority over the inner jurisdiction of the Church than over the inner management of any other society which it has sanctioned. On the contrary, the Church itself has the sole right to the actual Church government: it determines its own ordinances, and chooses its churchwardens, who carry out these ordinances. True, the Church may transfer its government to the sovereign, but the latter then holds it only by transfer, and only until the Church reclaims this authority. The greatest affinity to this collegial system is found in the synodal constitution, according to which the collegial rights of the Church are in charge of synods, the members of which are elected by the Church as its representatives, and are in part ecclesiastics, in part laymen.

In reality, the constitution of the Lutheran Church has not

---

16 In his Origines Juris Ecclesiastici, Tübingae, 1719 (new edition 1756).
followed this change of systems. In most of the German states the Consistorial System prevailed exclusively: the Church was governed by consistories in the name of the sovereign. It was, however, guarded against arbitrary interference on the part of the monarch by a certain custom, according to which he could only exercise ecclesiastical authority by means of consistories which were composed of clerical and secular councilors, and, on occasion of any important changes or innovations, other clergymen had to be admitted to consultation, and opinions obtained from theologians. Certain countries—for instance, Württemberg—had synods in addition to the consistories, but they had no wide sphere of influence. The duchy of Jülich-Cleves-Berg, however, possessed a complete synodal constitution; for in this state the Reformation had spread extensively, notwithstanding that the sovereigns remained Catholic. The new churches, Lutheran and Reformed, were therefore necessarily compelled to regulate and govern themselves, and give themselves a synodal constitution. When the old dynasty became extinct, in 1609, Brandenburg and the Palatinate divided these countries between them; and, soon after, the Palgrave of Neuburg, Wolfgang Wilhelm, went over to the Catholic Church, and commenced to persecute the evangelical churches of his state. Brandenburg, however, considered itself the protector of these churches, and forced the Palgrave, after 1666, to agree to religious compromises and reversals, by which the existing Church systems were recognized and declared inviolable. In consequence, Brandenburg did not interfere with the Church systems in its own portion of the country, in order that the palgraves might have no pretext for any alterations, though it is probable that under different circumstances the consistorial system prevailing in the other states of Brandenburg would have been introduced. In these countries, therefore, both the Lutheran and the Reformed Church were governed by synods which were graduated as general, provincial, and classical synods, while they had their root in the presbyteries of the individual congregations. All that was left to the State was the political and police control.17

In the greater portion of the Reformed Church, i.e. in the national churches which had adopted the Calvinistic faith, the
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synodal constitution, indeed, was universal; but most of the Reformed national churches in Germany had been originally Lutheran, and had retained their old consistorial system.

Upon this varied form of Church government the condition of the Church ordinances likewise depended.

At the time of the Reformation, Church ordinances had been established which determined particularly the organization of the individual parishes and the spiritual labor in each, defined the form of worship, and appointed agenda and liturgies for the use of the clergy. As late as the seventeenth century such Church ordinances were occasionally issued in a revised or entirely new form; but from the middle of the eighteenth century, during the period of enlightenment, so called, they sank into oblivion almost everywhere. The statutes relating to the moral control of the congregations fell into disuse, the clergy in some parishes withdrew almost entirely from the pastoral care of their flock, the communion was neglected, the clergymen became mere preachers, which was, indeed, the title generally bestowed upon them. The old liturgies, likewise, fell into disuse, and the clergy replaced them by other formulas at their own pleasure. The immediate consequence was a great variety of Church ordinances in the different parishes, while a further result was the frequency of insipid, empty, cold, and dry formulas.

All this was connected with the estrangement from religion and the Church which spread in the eighteenth century from France over Germany, and which was favored in no slight degree by the circumstance that the German Protestant churches, for the most part, were wanting in a constitution originated within themselves, which would have afforded the individual members occasion to take active part in the affairs of the Church; for this would have constantly kept alive an interest in the latter. In most countries it was merely a State institution, and was exclusively governed by government authorities—the consistories—who organized the public worship, determined the holidays, appointed the preachers, controlled them, and had charge of the Church property. Thus the Church was apparently nothing but an establishment upheld by the State for its own benefit, in order to hold the people in check; and in this way, naturally, the latter could feel no interest in it. How much a synodal constitution, on the other hand, tends to keep alive such an interest,
and to enhance the influence of the Church, was shown in Jülich-Cleves-Berg, where that institution was much less affected by the increasing infidelity than in other portions of the country.

When, after Germany had cast off the French yoke, religious life received a new impulse, the interest in the Church likewise revived. Its decay was recognized, and the general conviction was that a change in its system and its ordinances adapted to the times was a matter of urgent necessity. With regard to ecclesiastical polity, the collegial system was universally looked upon as the most desirable, and, in consequence, a synodal constitution was demanded. On Church ordinances and liturgy the voices were divided, particularly on the question as to whether, and to what extent, Church discipline should be restored, and whether the simple Protestant form of worship should not be invested with more pomp and ceremony, in order thereby to offer an attraction to the heart and the emotions.

The Prussian government was the first which turned its attention to the necessary reform of the existing ecclesiastical conditions. In 1814 the King of Prussia appointed a committee of clergymen for the purpose of revising the liturgy for the Protestant National Church. Nothing, however, was made known with regard to the labors of this committee; but in 1816, quite independently of it, there appeared a new liturgy for the court and garrison churches in Berlin and Potsdam, which thereupon was prescribed for all military congregations. The author, who was at that time anonymous, became known only long after: it was King Frederic William III. himself. This liturgy deviated greatly from the previous form of worship, by dividing the service into two entirely distinct parts—the altar service and the sermon. The first part consisted of several prayers taken from old formulas from the time of the Reformation, and interspersed with choral singing; this part closed with the Apostles' Creed. The choral singing was intended to be an imitation of that customary in the Greek Church: it was said that the King had been so favorably impressed by the antiphonal chanting of priest and choir which he had heard in the court church at St. Petersburg that he desired and attempted to imitate it in the Evangelical Church. The congregational singing was much curtailed in the new liturgy by this choral music; there was room only for a few verses before and after the sermon.
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Many objections were raised even against this new form of worship. Still more sensation, however, was caused by the Church ritual for the court church, the cathedral in Berlin, more fully elaborated in the same spirit, which appeared in 1821. It was likewise compiled by the King, and, according to his intention, was to be introduced in all Evangelical churches of the kingdom. In this agenda the first liturgic part was still further developed. It contained prayers, the confession of sin, reading of the Epistles and the Gospel, and the Apostles' Creed, interspersed with choral singing. All these were borrowed from formulas of the period of the Reformation, and it was the design of the King that this liturgic part of the service should exert an influence against the rationalism which had penetrated into the Church, and that the preachers should be compelled to remain faithful to the Church doctrine in their sermons as well. As the older Lutheran formulas which are employed in this liturgy are, for the most part, translations and adaptations from the old prayers used during mass, this gave rise to the rumor among the evangelical people that this new liturgy was a revival of the Catholic mass. Its contents were, indeed, thoroughly evangelical; but in form it certainly resembled the mass, inasmuch as, in its alternation of prescribed prayers by the priest and choral singing, it presented an ecclesiastical spectacle which the congregation were obliged to witness in inactivity, as the congregational singing, which hitherto had formed so important a part of the service, was inordinately curtailed. The sermon formed the second part of the service, but was limited by the prescription that it should be without introduction, and commence directly with the text, and should not exceed half an hour in duration.

When the question was first put to all the clergymen of the kingdom whether they were willing to introduce this agenda, and influence of various kinds was exerted to effect such an introduction, a majority of voices was immediately raised against the new liturgy. Objections were made to the limitation of the congregational singing and the restricting rules for the sermon, as well as to the disconnecting of the latter from the remainder of the service, which made it a mere appendix, instead of being, as had hitherto been the case, a principal part of the same. Moreover, it was urged against the old formulas that they were in part incomprehensible, and, therefore, unedifying to the pres-
ent generation: the preachers feared that the new liturgy would be offensive to the congregations on account of its resemblance to the mass, and, though at first attracting curiosity as a new spectacle, would subsequently, by its unbroken monotony, soon cease to stimulate and to edify. At the same time, the right of the sovereign to prescribe new liturgies entirely of his own accord, without consultation with the Church or the Church authorities, was called in question. Among the countless writings, mostly anonymous, to which this liturgy gave rise, this point in particular is considered in the treatise of Schleiermacher, Ueber das liturgische Recht Evangelischer Landesfürsten. Ein theologisches Bedenken von Pacificus Sincerus (Göttingen, 1824).

The reasons for doubting the expediency of the agenda were developed with especial thoroughness in the tract Theologisches Votum über die neue Hofkirchenagende und deren weitere Einführung, abgegeben von Carl Immanuel Nitzsch (Bonn, 1824). Among the defenders of the new liturgy, Augusti, Councilor of the Consistory in Bonn, was conspicuous. He first wrote, anonymously, his Kritik der neuen Preussischen Kirchenagende (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1823), in which, while he made a few unimportant objections to the work, he bestowed upon it, as a whole, the highest praise. But inasmuch as the assertion contained in this treatise, that the regent was authorized by virtue of his sovereign rights to give the Evangelical Church a liturgy conformed to its doctrine of faith, gave great offense, the author defended this particular proposition still further by the pamphlet Nähere Erklärung über das Majestätserrecht in kirchlichen, besonders liturgischen Dingen (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1825), and went so far in it as to admit to his opponents that even the Sultan held the same liturgic right with regard to his Christian subjects.

When the government first put the question to the clergy as to whether they were willing to adopt the agenda, the majority, as well as their congregations, declared against it. But the more evident the wish of the king became that it should be universally introduced, and the more was done for this object by rewards and expressions of dissatisfaction, the greater was the number of clergymen who allowed themselves to be persuaded. When, finally, the majority of the clergy had apparently yielded, more urgent admonitions ensued, which were equal to commands. In 1825 the clergy were given to understand that they must either
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adopt the new agenda or return to the old liturgies still legally valid in their respective churches. In 1826 it was decreed that only such candidates should be appointed to office as would bind themselves to adopt the new agenda. Nevertheless, the matter could not be carried through without further yielding. Many clergymen had promised to introduce the agenda, but did not venture to do so on account of their congregations; others had introduced it, but had arbitrarily altered and curtailed it. In consequence, an abridgment of the agenda was prepared, and its use likewise permitted, while, further, the different provinces were allowed to alter this abridgment in conformity to the custom of their churches (1828). This, indeed, produced an essential alteration in the liturgy, but it will hardly maintain itself long, even in its latest shape. The adhering to obsolete forms of prayer by no means satisfies the wants of the Church, and, therefore, it will ere long be found necessary in the Prussian National Church to prepare a new liturgy.¹⁸

The reigning Grand-duke of Baden, in order to make himself agreeable to the King of Prussia, introduced the agenda in question into his court church in 1830, and attempted to have it adopted in the whole Evangelical Church. But he met with opposition from the evangelical ecclesiastical section of the ministry of the interior. The clergy of Baden showed themselves entirely averse to the Prussian liturgy, and declared that a General Synod alone had the right to introduce a new agenda. This gave occasion, however, for resuming the preparation of a new liturgy, which had previously been contemplated in this state, and the General Synod of 1834 adopted not only it, but also a new national catechism and a new hymn-book.

Ecclesiastical polity, too, has been much discussed of late, although the negotiations on the subject have not yet in all cases led to a definite result. It was quite generally recognized that the decay of the Protestant Church was chiefly attributable to the fact that it had become, in most countries, a mere State institution, and was ruled by government colleges, while the congregations were not allowed any co-operation whatever. It was

asserted that this deadened the interest in the Church, and that many wrong measures had been taken with regard to Church matters in consequence of the congregations not having been consulted in respect to their ecclesiastical wants and requirements. A warmer zeal for the Church could only be awakened by permitting the congregations to participate in the Church government, and this, it was maintained, could be done most effectively by the introduction of a presbyterial and synodal system.

The year of the Jubilee of the Reformation, 1817, in particular, gave rise to desires and efforts of this kind, and Nassau took the lead here, as it had done in the matter of the Union, by introducing, in the same year, a presbyterial and synodal constitution in its National Church. The head of the latter is a bishop, with the rights of a superintendent-general.

In Prussia, the need of a reform in the ecclesiastical polity was strongly felt, and various measures were taken to this end; but no general uniform organization has yet been arrived at.

In the provinces of Jülich-Cleves-Berg, and the county of Mark, the synodal system prevailed before they fell under French rule. It had been retained on the right bank of the Rhine, but on the left bank it had been replaced by the French consistorial system during the French occupation. When, however, the French yoke was cast off, the synods had been reinstated here too. But the Prussian government appointed, in addition, provincial consistories. Thus the constitution of the Church on the right bank of the Rhine was composed of the synodal and consistorial systems, while on the left bank it retained, besides, fragments of the French consistorial system, and, therefore, consisted of three elements, which were by no means in organic connection with each other. In all the other provinces a strict consistorial system prevailed. The Prussian government desired to effect a uniform constitution of the Evangelical Church throughout the whole kingdom, and, at the same time, recognized the necessity of insuring, in it, some influence in Church matters to the congregations. It therefore proposed an amalgamation of the consistorial and synodal systems, by which the supreme government of the Church would be secured to the State, but which, at the same time, would bring more life and zeal into it. In view of this, the government, in 1819, convoked provincial syn-
odds in all the provinces, and laid before them the draught of a new Church constitution, as well as another of a synodal system, on which they were to give their opinions. In these there was great diversity; some of them demanded much more than the government was willing to grant, viz. a pure synodal system. This gave rise to the apprehension that the clergy aimed at a hierarchy independent of the State, and thus this introductory measure remained without further result, except that it was proposed to each parish to elect a presbytery or body of elders, to whom, however, no particular duties nor any special authority were assigned.

Some time previous to this the episcopal office had been re-established in Prussia, without, however, exerting any influence upon the ecclesiastical polity. By a personal order of January 18, 1816, King Frederic William appointed his two court-chaplains, Borowski in Königsberg, and Sack in Berlin, bishops, and declared, at the same time, that this dignity was conferred in recognition of eminent services to the Evangelical Church, and with the view of heightening the outward consideration of the latter. In the same spirit, Borowski was further appointed archbishop in 1829. It was, moreover, of great importance, that on February 7, 1828, the King appointed a superintendent-general for every province, who, independently of the consistories and civil authorities, was to personally inspect Church matters, remove the defects discovered by personal influence, and further the general improvement in every way. At the same time, he was to be director of the provincial consistory, and occupy in it a position next to that of upper-president. This highly beneficial institution, which has had very favorable results for the National Church, has been so far brought into connection with the episcopal office that the title of bishop is frequently conferred upon the superintendents-general.

Since that time the reorganization of the Church in the Rhenish provinces and Westphalia has proved especially important. The Evangelical Church in these states was in urgent need of a new constitution, as the systems existing in the different departments were very dissimilar, and, in particular, the ecclesiastical polity of those on the left bank of the Rhine, which, as has been remarked above, consisted of fragments of the French consistorial system together with the synodal and Prussian consistorial sys-
The new organization was favored by the negotiations with regard to the agenda. These provinces were especially decided in the opinion that any alterations in the liturgy ought to proceed from the Church itself; nevertheless, the synods declared their willingness to accept the royal agenda, with some modifications, if the government would concede a liberal Church constitution. In consequence, there was issued on March 5, 1835, a constitution for the evangelical churches of the Rhenish provinces and Westphalia, in which an important co-operation in Church matters was assigned the congregations by presbyteries and synods, though under the strict supervision of the government.

Mention must be made of a peculiar institution which has recently been established in Rhenish Prussia, and bids fair to exert a very beneficial influence, i.e. the Evangelical House of Deaconesses, founded by a clergyman named Fliedner, at Kaiserswerth, near Düsseldorf, in October, 1836. The Catholic order of the Sisters of Charity, which is devoted to the care of the sick, furnished the idea for this establishment; but in it every thing conventual has been avoided, and the model after which it is formed was taken from an institution of primitive Christianity—the deaconesses. Its object is to train Christian single women and widows for nursing the sick and visiting among the poor, as well as for teaching infant-schools. To this end, it comprises a hospital, an infant-school, and an evangelical asylum for discharged female convicts. The sisters are obliged to undergo a certain time of probation, in order to show whether they are competent for the duties required, before they are definitely accepted. The association bears a religious character, and has certain household rules, but has no resemblance whatever to a convent. The deaconesses who are destined to be nurses are partly detailed to do hospital duty, and partly are sent to private houses to attend to the sick. The institution has already found much favor and support, even from the government, and deaconesses have been called from it to various places. Branch establishments have been founded in Berlin and Dresden for the training of deaconesses, and congregations are furnished with individual sisters for the care of the sick and the dispensing of charity. In London, Paris, Strasburg, Utrecht, and in several cities in Switzerland, institutions have been founded after the same model.
There is no doubt that the most beneficial results will ensue. There are always many women who, alone in the world, can find no suitable sphere of influence, however well they may be adapted to fill such a one, and who feel attracted by a retired yet active life which is not wanting in religious stimulus. To such women this institution offers a refuge, turning their activity into a salutary channel. It will need, however, to beware of the rock of Pietism, while, at the same time, it should not neglect to foster a truly religious spirit among its disciples.

Other institutions have grown up in the German Evangelical Church, whose object is the furthering of the religious and moral cultivation of the people, particularly among the poorer and morally neglected classes. One of the oldest is the establishment of Count von Recke, at Düsselthal, near Düsseldorf, for the education of deserted and neglected children. A peculiar character, however, has been developed by the institution founded by Candidate Wichern at Horn, near Hamburg, in 1833, entitled the "Rauhe Haus." Its prime object was to guard against the moral depravity of youth, and to reform neglected children. It has succeeded, by mild measures alone, by constant intercourse of the undisciplined children with estimable persons, and by the force of example, in producing important results. Almost every trade is practiced in the institution by youths and children, and its inmates have even themselves built the houses which it needed for its extension. To the first establishment there has since been added an educational institution for young men who desire to labor in the field of Inner Missions, as preachers in colonies, as directors of houses of refuge or reformatory schools, prisoninspectors, and the like. While the foreign missions have for their object the spreading of Christianity among the heathen, this Inner Mission aims to introduce and further religious culture among a Christian people.

In other German states, too, much has been done for the improvement of the Church system, but more still has been striven for without ever being realized. In Bavaria, where more than a third of the population is Protestant (viz. 3,000,000 Catholics and 1,300,000 Protestants), the position of the Protestant Church was defined by the charter of May 26, 1818, and special edicts on Church relations of the same date.19

19 Given in Münch's Sammlung aller Concordate, ii. 226 ss. Leipzic, 1831.
§ 7. ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF PROTESTANT GERMANY.

A Protestant supreme consistory was established in Munich, subject to the Ministry of the Interior, as an organ through which the King exercises the supreme episcopal power. Under it are three consistories—in Anspach, Baireuth, and Spires—and under these the deanships. In each deanship a diocesan synod is held annually, which consists of two thirds ecclesiastics and one third laymen: these lay members, however, are chosen by the consistories only on the proposition of the ecclesiastics. Every four years, general synods are to be convoked at the seats of the consistories, for the purpose of consulting about the internal affairs of the Church. To these synods each deanship sends two ecclesiastics (the dean and a pastor), and a lay member chosen by the clergy. Thus an amalgamation of the synodal and congregational systems was intended; but the former greatly predominated. The synods did not afford a true representation of the congregation, as they had not proceeded from the latter by free choice.

In Rhenish Bavaria it was recognized from the first that bodies of elders, or presbyteries, were necessary as foundation of the synods, and they were consequently immediately appointed. Thus the congregations were furnished at the synods with representatives elected by themselves, and although here, too, the number of laymen at these meetings was only half as large as that of the ecclesiastics, their voice, as the voice of the congregations, was yet of great weight. At the synods of Rhenish Bavaria, therefore, a liberal theological tendency gained the preponderance, while in the remaining Bavarian provinces, favored by the government, the consistories and the Protestant National University of Erlangen assigned the dominion to a rigid orthodoxy. The first general synod held in Rhenish Bavaria in 1818, at Kaiserslautern, lost no time in accomplishing the Union, and in the Act of Union the Holy Scriptures were declared the only standard of faith; the symbolical books, though still to be held in high esteem, were not to be regarded as such. The next synod, in 1821, gave the United Church a catechism and hymn-book, in which the same liberal spirit prevailed. All these synodal ordinances received at that time, during the reign of the liberal King Maximilian Joseph, the royal sanction; but in the succeeding reign of King Louis, the Supreme Consistory of Munich began more openly to counteract this liberalism of
the Palatinate. This has been done particularly since 1832, when the liberal members of the consistory at Spires were removed and orthodox members appointed in their place, among whom the consistorial councilor Rust, who had, until then, been preacher and professor at Erlangen, proved himself particularly active in these matters, but in consequence rendered himself very obnoxious to the greater portion of the clergy of Rhenish Bavaria. The orthodox party wished to enforce the opinion that the Act of Union did not annul the normal authority of the symbolical books; in addition to which they made active efforts to do away with the new catechism. This gave rise to a struggle between the consistory and the majority of the clergy, which may possibly, by and by, when the government has again adopted a more liberal course, turn in favor of liberalism.\footnote{Die Protestantisch-Evangelische Unirte Kirche in der Bairischen Pfalz, by Pau- lus, Heidelberg, 1840.}

In the consistorial districts of Anspach and Baireuth the expediency of presbyteries as a basis for the synodal system was also speedily recognized, and measures were taken to follow the example of the Palatinate in introducing them. Several ecclesiastics, however, proposed to establish, with the presbyteries, a strict Church discipline, as it exists in several Reformed national churches. This idea was expressed particularly in the Outline of a Presbyterial Constitution published by Lehmus, dean in Anspach, Nuremberg, 1821. He desired to have the right of ecclesiastical control and discipline conferred upon the presbyteries. They were first to warn the erring ones; then, if this had no effect, to censure them privately and publicly; and, finally, if necessary, excommunicate them. This excommunication, moreover, was not merely to involve the disability to partake of the sacrament and to be a sponsor, but also the loss of a Christian burial, as well as the incapability of taking an oath and educating children. These were evidently compulsory measures in favor of Church ordinances and Christian morality, the unfitness of which was likely to be felt most vividly in recent times. Hence, very decided disapprobation of these proposals was immediately universally expressed; and as it was believed that Lehmus had only given utterance to the secret intentions of the Church authorities in establishing presbyteries, a general opposition arose against the latter measure, by which, as it was sup-
posed, a new mode of spiritual tyranny was to be introduced into the Protestant Church. The order for the appointment of presbyteries had first to be suspended, and, finally, it was left to the congregations to choose them or not, as they pleased.

In the two general synods of Anspach and Baireuth, therefore, the congregations are not yet sufficiently represented, and this is the reason why they have not yet accomplished much. In the supreme consistory and the two consistories the tendency favored by the government prevailed, to reinstate symbolical orthodoxy; and this was the spirit which pervaded the draughts of a new Church constitution, an agenda, and a national catechism, which the general synods rejected in 1833, while, at the same time, they demanded that the congregations should be represented at the synods by lay members chosen by them. Subsequently the Protestant Church in Bavaria was so engrossed by acts of the government in favor of the Catholic Church that it had little time to think of the development and improvement of its own internal affairs. In 1837 Abel took his place at the head of the Ministry of the Interior, and conducted the government entirely in the spirit of a Jesuit ultramontane party. Under his administration, various openly hostile measures were taken against the Protestants. In particular, the formation of new congregations and the erection of new churches were rendered difficult or prevented, even in places where a sufficient number of Protestants were assembled; the Protestant soldiers were commanded, while on duty, to show respect to the host by kneeling; the Gustavus Adolphus Association was entirely excluded from Bavaria, so that branch societies could neither be established there, nor needy congregations receive aid from it. In the beginning of the year 1847, however, the Abel ministry was overthrown. The government has, altogether, entered upon a more liberal course, and thus has also adopted more friendly sentiments toward its Protestant subjects. It is therefore to be hoped that the internal organization of the Protestant Church system may develop without further obstacle.

In Baden a presbyterial and synodal constitution was introduced at the same time with the Union, in 1831. Each congregation has its council of elders (presbytery); the
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diocesan synods are formed of all the clergymen of the diocese and half their number of laymen, who are chosen by the presbyteries; the general synod consists of a number of ecclesiastics, who are chosen by the clergy, and half as many laymen, who are chosen by the laymen of the diocesan synods, and, further, of two members of the highest Church tribunal, a member of the Theological Faculty in Heidelberg, and a government commissioner as president. This constitution has the defect that the synods consist of double the number of ecclesiastics as of laymen. It labored in the beginning under the disadvantage that no regular time was appointed for the recurrence of the general synod, but its convocation left to the government. After the first meeting, therefore, which was held in 1821, none took place for a long time, and the new system could not bear the fruits which had been expected from it. It was only when, under the Grand-duke Leopold, the government had adopted a more liberal course, that a second general synod was held in 1834, which resulted in the relief of the most urgent wants of the Evangelical National Church. It introduced a national catechism, a collection of Church lessons, an agenda, a hymn-book, and various improvements in the form of worship and in the constitution of the Church. At the same time, it ordained that the general synod should in future be convoked once in seven years.

In Württemberg annual synods are held, but they consist only of the president of the consistory and the six superintendents-general or prelates of the kingdom. All these are nominated by the King, and hence are royal officials, not representatives of the Church. The entire Church government, therefore, depends upon the State, although, according to § 71 of the charter of the constitution, every Church is entitled, with respect to its internal affairs, to the right of self-government. In view of this it was proposed, at the diets of 1833 and 1834, that the above promise to the Evangelical National Church should be made good by the concession of a synodal and presbyterial constitution; but, as yet, these propositions have not had any result.

In the other Evangelical national churches, too, the necessity of a reorganization of the ecclesiastical polity and the introduction of presbyteries and synods has been felt and expressed, but with-
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22 Märkl, Ueber die Reform des Protestantischen Kirchenwesens, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Protestantische Kirche Württembergs, Tübingen, 1833.
out results. The most lively discussion on the subject occurred in Saxony in 1831–1834. When the State constitution of that country was completely remodeled and assumed a constitutional character (1830), the clergy of the diocese of Leipsic first expressed their wishes in a petition of October 31, 1830, to the effect that the Protestant National Church and its clergy might be assigned a part in the future representative constitution of the country, and that its autonomy might be restored to it by a presbyterial and synodal system, and secured by the charter of the kingdom. Subsequently, the majority of all the Saxon clergy joined in this petition. The matter was discussed in a very lively written controversy. Bretschneider, Krehl, Rudelbach, and Jaspis declared against a representative constitution of the Church; a far greater number, however, fought for it. At the head of its advocates stood Grossmann, superintendent and professor at Leipsic, who had been the chief originator of the above-mentioned petition, and who persistently defended the liberty of the Church in several treatises, as well as in his capacity of member of the Upper Chamber. Nothing, however, has as yet been accomplished in this matter.

II. SINCE 1840.

New and important developments in all departments of the Church have begun since 1840. They had their roots in the preceding period, and received their impulse and character not only from the old Rationalism and Supernaturalism, but also, and chiefly, from the theology of Schleiermacher and the philosophy of Hegel. Both, however inwardly different they may be, have this in common—that they recognize the claims of the two former standpoints, the Rationalistic and the Supernatural, but, at the same time, themselves strive to attain a higher standpoint, from which the difference between the former is lost to view, inasmuch as from it the truth which appertains to each is accepted, while all that is one-sided is done away with.

Friedrich Schleiermacher (born 1768, in Breslau; from 1810 professor in ordinary at Berlin; d. 1834) had already acquired a powerful influence upon his age by his work Ueber die Religion, Reden an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern (1799 and often). In it he surrenders all the dogmas which were rejected as untenable by the enlightenment of the period, even the personality of
God and the personal immortality of man, and, on the other hand, in inspired diction, proclaims religion to be an immediate sense of the infinite and the eternal, by which alone science, life, and art are imbued with truth. The positive religions he pronounces necessary, as being the terrestrial forms of religion, without which a true and perfect religious development of human individuality is impossible, and demonstrates, further, that Christianity is the most exalted of these religions. These addresses had their origin in Schelling's Philosophy of Nature, and the Pantheism which pervades them is certainly widely different from the Christian conception of God; but it can not be denied that they were well adapted to call forth higher ideas in an age which had sunk to a commonplace impiety, to inspire it with respect for religion, and make it once more susceptible to religious impressions.

A still greater influence was exerted by Schleiermacher's Dogmatics. He regards dogmatic theology as the science treating of the inner coherence of the dogmas accepted by a Christian Church society at a particular time. It is based on the effort to represent, in the form of doctrine, the emotions of the pious Christian heart. It strives merely to develop the substance of the recognized consciousness of God's existence by presupposing immediate certainty of faith, and hence forbears to demonstrate its doctrine to unbelief. Dogmatic theology is therefore totally different from philosophy. Piety in itself is neither knowledge nor action, although a perfect development of piety without either is not to be imagined; but it is rather a disposition and state of feeling. The essence of piety is that we feel absolutely dependent on God. Christianity is the highest communion of piety, and the feeling which distinguishes it from all other religions is that in it every detail is referred to the consciousness of redemption through the person of Jesus of Nazareth. The truth of Christianity can only be testified to through inward experience, and that in such a way that all who feel the need of redemption become assured of the redeeming power of Christ within themselves by actual proof.

Consequently, Schleiermacher does not attach an absolute value to dogma, but esteems it only so far as it corresponds to
the emotions of the pious Christian heart, and expresses them in doctrine. All dogmatic theology is confined to a particular time; every exposition of doctrine, in course of time, loses its original importance, and retains only an historical value. Dogmatic theology, therefore, relates merely to the discussion of the piety of a certain Church and time; the examination of the last causes of supersensual matters is not its task, but that of philosophical theology.

This conception of dogmatic theology obviously contains the truth that it must correspond to the consciousness of faith which actually exists in the Church, and must develop simultaneously with it. Nevertheless, it is necessary to distinguish in it between an immutable element, the genuine religious truth, and the changeable, historical, and speculative part of dogmatics; for otherwise it would appear as if all religious doctrine were subject to constant changes, and presented neither stability nor security. And whereas Schleiermacher did not distinguish between these two elements, he could not determine, without arbitrary assumption, the consciousness of faith, the existence of which in the Evangelical Church he presupposed in his dogmatics, as there is still much dissension in the Church with regard to its historical and speculative element.

Schleiermacher, moreover, went very far in his concessions to modern enlightenment. He assumed that the piety of a Pantheist could be fully equal to that of a Monotheist, and therefore would agree very well with Christianity. Likewise, that piety was in harmony with a view which, relinquishing the continuance of personal existence, looked upon the common spirit of humanity, the source of individual souls, as the true, living unity, to which appertain eternity and immortality, while the individual souls are merely its transient actions. For the Christian, as such, there is no security for an after-life but that which is based on his faith in the eternal continuance of the union of divinity and humanity represented in Christ; for as surely as the human soul of the Redeemer enjoyed a personal continuance, the same can be looked forward to by all mankind.

Another of these concessions is the assumption that Christianity, although outwardly in historical connection with Judaism, is yet, so far as its inner peculiar nature is concerned, in no closer relation to it than Paganism. For in the more exalted forms of
Paganism we find quite as much affinity to and harmony with Christianity as in Judaism. Hence Schleiermacher could not admit the normal authority of the Old Testament. Angels were regarded by him merely as products of the imagination; in the conception of the devil he finds an inner discrepancy, but is in favor of retaining both angels and the devil in the liturgy. The resurrection of the body and the Last Judgment are not to be accepted as positive doctrines, but as a veil for general truths. Eternal damnation is designated as inconceivable.

On the other hand, Schleiermacher refutes Rationalism by his doctrine with regard to Christ. He holds that that which constitutes him the Redeemer is so entire an indwelling of the Supreme Being in his consciousness that this existence of God within him forms his innermost Self, so that thus there can be in him no efficiency not determined by the essence of God. Thus he is the pure exemplar of mankind. In the living communion with Christ, every one renounces being any thing for himself, and thus, too, being regarded by God in any other way than merely in communion with Christ, as a part of his humanity, animated by him, or still in process of development. By virtue of this living communion with him, his perfect fulfillment of the divine will is also ours, so that we, too, are the objects of the divine approbation. The body of those who have been received into the communion of Christ and have received his spirit as a common spirit, forms the Church. The Holy Ghost is the union of divinity with humanity, in the form of the spirit of communion which animates the common life of believers. To have Christ within us and to possess the Holy Spirit is one and the same for each one of us. The Church is, in its perfection, the emblem of the Redeemer; Christ is its archetype. But the perfection of the Church is still in progress.

Schleiermacher has left no school, i.e. no collective whole which adheres strictly to his system; but he has exerted by his Dogmatics a powerful influence over the latest Protestant theology. The conviction that dogmatic theology should correspond to the actual consciousness of faith in the Church, and must therefore reject every thing in it which has no firm foundation, has become very general, even among theologians of the supernatural school. A greater moderation in the mutual estimate of Rationalists and Supernaturalists is also ascribable to him,
as he set the example in recognizing, in a more unprejudiced manner, the claims of the two standpoints. There is, perhaps, no theologian who agrees entirely with Schleiermacher, but there is also not one of the large number of moderate theologians but has been strongly influenced by him; and the ecclesiastical events in recent times, in which the majority of the Protestant theologians have shown a moderation and placability such as have never before been known, were undoubtedly chiefly actuated by the ideas of Schleiermacher. It is only the believers in the symbols and the theologians of the school of Hegel who refuse him all recognition. In particular, he has given a new impulse to the doctrine of the Church as such, which had been much neglected by the Protestants, and directed attention as well to the claims which the community has upon the individual, as upon the rights to which the Church is entitled. It is true, however, that, in consequence of this, the idea of the Church has in some cases been developed in an almost Roman Catholic form, as if the Church were independent of individuals, and simply a standard for them.

In direct opposition to the theology of Schleiermacher was that emanating from the philosophy of Hegel; for as the former gave the essence of religion a place in the emotions, and desired to keep dogmatics far removed from all philosophy, the theologians of the school of Hegel declared religion to consist of the knowledge of the Absolute, and regarded theology and philosophy as entirely coincident.

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel was born in 1770 at Stuttgart, was professor in Berlin from 1818, and died of cholera in 1831. According to him, the Absolute is the identity of the Real and the Ideal, of Being and of Thinking, of the Finite and the Infinite. This unity is not a rigid, immovable Being, but a constant Progress, an uninterrupted overturning and passing of one side into the other. The universe is self-revelation; the world's history the process of the development of God as an absolute Spirit. The aim of God in the creation is that his conception should become objective to him. For this reason, creation is eternal, like the impulse of God to become objective to himself. God is not only thought by us, but he himself is that in us which thinks. The thought of the essence of God is the Being of God; the individuality which clings to the mind
is not the true essence of man; if the mind rises above this form of individuality, it becomes the consciousness of God.

Hegel himself did not propose to place himself in opposition to Christianity. Its essential substance was to be entirely identical with his philosophy. There was to be merely a difference of form, so far as the same substance was to be given, in Christianity, in the forms of the emotions and the perceptions, which his philosophy had exalted to the form of conception. It is in this sense that the theologians of the school of Hegel, Marheinecke in particular, have treated Christian dogmatic theology. Marheinecke, however, does not go back to the simple Scripture doctrine for this purpose, but attempts to deduce the symbolical doctrine of the Lutheran Church from Hegelian propositions. But in striving to prove, in the forms of these dogmas, the truth of the idea, he has, in fact, retained the forms merely to give them an entirely foreign substance. Thus he explains the Trinity in the following manner: God thinks himself, and thus becomes objective to himself. He proceeds from a state of non-distinction to his own distinction from himself, this is the Son; he returns from this distinction to infinite unity, this is the Spirit. This is the process by which God becomes conscious of himself, and reveals himself in creation. Hence the theologians of this school declare the doctrine of the Trinity to be the chief and fundamental dogma of all religion; but this Trinity is certainly very different from the Trinity taught by the symbolical books of the Church. The other positive dogmas, moreover, are treated by this school in a similar manner.

It was only after Hegel was settled in Berlin that his philosophy began to be more widely circulated and to acquire an important influence. He had previously taught at Jena and Heidelberg, without meeting with much approbation. In Berlin he was immediately treated with great distinction by Von Altenstein, Minister of Ecclesiastical and Educational Affairs, as well as several of the councilors of this department, and his philosophy thereby received an external recommendation which seemed to make it the prevailing system in Prussia. It was thought that it presented a thoroughly conservative doctrine, which would establish and confirm anew all existing institutions in State and Church, which would satisfy the thinker, and, at the same time, defend the popular forms against the manifold attacks of Liber-
The philosophy of Hegel was therefore highly recommended by the authorities, and young men who devoted themselves to it could count upon promotion and assistance. In consequence, a Hegelian school of some importance was speedily formed; but there is no doubt that of its numerous adherents many only adopted its forms, without arriving at a thorough comprehension of its doctrines. Thus it seemed more and more as if Hegel were attaining a philosophical dictatorship, and his followers declared openly that in him philosophy had culminated and reached its end; that he had led mankind to the only true knowledge, and that any further development of philosophy was out of the question.

With regard to the highest dogmas of religion—the existence of God and the immortality of the soul—this school was somewhat reticent, and regarded the truth respecting these doctrines as among its mysteries. It neither admitted directly that it taught the existence of a God, who manifested himself only gradually and imperfectly in the consciousness of man, nor that it denied an individual continuance of human beings. It could not, indeed, decidedly disclaim these consequences of its doctrine, but it gave evasive replies to such objections, and strove to repulse its opponents by an indescribably arrogant treatment, declaring plainly that they, being on a lower grade—that of the philosophy of reflection—were not in the least capable of either comprehending or judging of the philosophy of conception. The organ of the school was the Berlin Year-book for Literature (Berliner Jahrbücher für Literatur), of which Hegel was one of the founders.

After Hegel's death, however, in 1831, a portion of his school came forward quite openly with a denial of these doctrines, while another part admitted the possibility of uniting the belief in a God conscious of himself, and a personal continuance of man, with the philosophy of Hegel.

Dr. Friedrich Richter, a Hegelian, was the first to assert, in his work Die Lehre von den letzten Dingen (Breslau, 1833), that, according to the doctrine of Hegel, it was only the common spirit, but not the individual person, which was immortal. He found, indeed, a decided opponent in Goeschel; but other Hegelians expressed themselves more equivocally, and seemed only to find it wrong that this subject was brought up for discussion before the
general public, to whom a mystery of the school was thereby unveiled.

Soon after this the school of Hegel was divided still more decidedly into a right and left side, the former of which retained the religious doctrines above indicated, while the latter denied them. According to the system of Hegel, the positive doctrines of Christianity had developed gradually in the human mind, at first in the indistinct form of perception, until, by the Hegelian philosophy, it had risen to the clearness of conception. A revelation granted to an individual was out of the question in this connection, and thus the conviction of the truth of this system was not based on any external historical authority, but upon philosophical grounds. Hence this philosophy maintains an utter indifference toward the historical person of Christ; it attaches importance to the idea of Christ alone, which it considers identical with the idea of humanity in its development as a whole. Strauss, therefore, thought to satisfy all scientific claims by collecting all the existing doubts of the Gospel history, intensifying them to the utmost, and declaring the history of Christ a myth which had originated among the primitive Christians, in order to represent, in the person of Christ, a type of humanity in its relation to the Supreme Being. Thus, Christ was no longer an historical person; the story of his life was a fiction, although still the expression of externally true ideas, and it seemed as if Christian dogmatic theology were not assailed by these results, but merely brought to a higher comprehension.

This work by Strauss created a very powerful impression among the laity as well as the clergy. It was so universally circulated that every one who laid claim to any cultivation seemed to feel obliged to read it; but it was soon surpassed in its results by other works. The principal organ of this further development was the Hallische Jahrbücher, edited, from 1838, by Ruge and Echtermeyer, which was soon changed into the Deutsche Jahrbücher, but suppressed in January, 1843. They commenced, with regard to theology, in very nearly the same spirit in which Strauss's Life of Jesus was written; but with this they united a political radicalism. Thus, by declaring with every year, with remarkable frankness, that they had surmounted their standpoint of the year before, they gradually rose to open materialism and decided democracy.

*Through Johann David Strauss, Leben Jesu, Tübingen, 1835, 1836, 2 vols. 8.*
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Strauss, too, passed beyond his standpoint in the Life of Jesus in his dogmatics. Christianity here appears as something which has outlived itself; its place is supplied by the religion of the pantheistic idea. In the same spirit Feuerbach wrote Das Wesen des Christenthums (Leipsic, 1841), while Bruno Bauer, in his Kritik der Evangelischen Geschichte (Bremen, 1840), strove to outvie Strauss's Life of Jesus, and to prove that the Gospel history was intentional fiction.

Thus the point was reached to which expression was given in the Preface to the Deutsche Jahrbücher for the year 1843, which was, at the same time, their last word. A reformation of consciousness was there predicted, which would involve, at the same time, a reformation of the world, and which was quickly and inevitably approaching. Among the illusions of the consciousness upon which our present political and religious life is based, that which is here placed first and foremost is the belief in another spiritual world, and in a Hereafter for human souls which brings retribution, and to which, therefore, the misery of this world is directed for consolation. It is only in man that the Absolute acquires self-consciousness and personality; but these personalities are again lost in the Absolute. There is no Hereafter for them, and it is a delusion ministering to despotism to direct the poor and unfortunate, while their lot in this life is so troubled, to a compensation in another world. This world is the sole sphere allotted to man for work; in it alone he must seek for happiness. The Church, which has been chief in upholding the above delusion, must cease, and be changed into a school. It is necessary to organize a true system of popular education which will absorb the rabble, so that the educated and organized people may govern themselves; this way of democracy being the only one by which the highest happiness of this world can be attained.

These views found a strong echo, particularly in certain journals. As has been remarked elsewhere, there has been formed in modern times a system of journalism in Germany, in connection with which a peculiar class, that of the literati, has sprung up. Their aim, to discuss the common interests in their journals, and thus to direct the attention of the governments to the wants of

95 Die Christliche Glaubenslehre in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung, und im Kampfe mit der modernen Wissenschaft, Tübingen, 1840, 1841, 2 vols. 8.
the people and instruct the latter on the affairs of the day, is in itself admirable. It is only to be regretted that German journalism has, in part, taken the French oppositional press for its model; that it takes its ideas chiefly from the same source, without paying any regard to the peculiar conditions in Germany; that it follows its model in opposing the governments, instead of endeavoring to mediate between them and the people, which would be perfectly compatible with the greatest frankness and the strongest love of truth, and that it is partly in the hands of men who, instead of a thorough knowledge of the existing conditions, or a more profound political cultivation, possess only a few general principles and opinions. This system of journalism had its share in circulating the atheistic views above described among the people. They were closely allied to the communistic ideas which had been brought over from France, and the highest aim of which, after all, was nothing but an equal division of property and community of goods. It is obvious that such doctrines, which threatened to put an end to all civil order, could not be indifferent to the governments.

Such was the condition of affairs when Frederic William IV., King of Prussia, assumed the government in 1840. He was immediately met by manifold political demands; and when, in answer to them, he promised, indeed, to further the progress of all existing institutions based on history, but refused all more radical changes, an opposition was formed in Prussia, which, so far as it was expressed (chiefly in the journals), seemed to be very strong. It is true that, with regard to the Church, the King was willing not to interfere with liberty of conscience, but he desired to restore the Symbolical Books to their former importance in the Evangelical National Church, by leaving all those who could not confess them at liberty to leave the Church and to form new religious communions. In this spirit orthodox theologians were called to the universities, and in filling the ecclesiastical offices, particularly those of superintendents and members of consistories, special importance was attached to the orthodoxy of the candidates. In order to counteract the pernicious effects of the Hegelian philosophy, Schelling was called from Munich to Berlin, and commenced his lectures in the latter city in November, 1841. In his youth, Schelling had shared the philosophical opinions of Hegel, but had subsequently separated from him, and for a
number of years had not published any philosophical writings, although it was well known that his views were changed. Moreover, great expectations were generally entertained with regard to this new philosophical system of Schelling, which called itself the positive, historical philosophy, the system of liberty. The central point of this system which Schelling now began to teach in Berlin is Christ, as the personal and sole principle by which the divinity has descended to mankind, and by which humanity can rise to God. Schelling himself has not yet published* any exposition of his new system, nor do his lectures seem to exert the influence which had been expected from them.

These measures of the government brought about a powerful reaction, which had its centre particularly in the Prussian province of Saxony, but also manifested itself very strongly in Königsberg and in Breslau. In the province of Saxony, Rationalism, which had for some time been the predominating principle, began to assert itself very decidedly at the beginning of the year 1840; first in the controversy opened by a Pastor Sintenis, in Magdeburg, on the adoration of Christ. An artist of that city had chosen for the subject of one of his paintings a Catholic legend, according to which an image of the Virgin had restored the sight of a blind peasant-woman. This painting was lithographed under the title of "A Peasant Family at Prayer." A poem which subsequently appeared in the Magdeburg Gazette (February, 1840), related the legend in explanation of the painting, but with sundry alterations, in order to make it less objectionable to Protestants. In particular, the image of the Virgin, which was veiled in the picture, was represented as an image of Christ. In the poem, therefore, the prayer was raised "to the dear Saviour Jesus Christ, who takes pity on us in all our need," and help was given by him. Upon this, Sintenis caused a criticism of the poem to appear in the same paper, in which he pronounced it unevangelical to pray to Christ, as all help comes from God alone, and as Christ himself had directed us to address our prayers to God the Father. Several preachers in Magdeburg, Bishop Dräseke at their head, declared against Sintenis from the pulpit and in the Gazette; their part was taken by the consistory, that of Sintenis by the magistrates, and thus arose a very vehement controversy, to which, however, the ministry put an end in

* Since his death (in 1854), his complete works have been published, 1856 ss.—Tr.
April by defending the consistory, indeed, but at the same time decreeing no punishment for Pastor Sintenis. Bishop Dräseke, who from a formerly very liberal position had turned more and more toward ecclesiastical orthodoxy, became still further estranged from a large portion of the clergy of his province by the above controversy. A treatise, Bishop Dräseke and his Eight Years of Labor in the Prussian State, by G. von C. (Pastor König in Anderbeck, near Halberstadt), 1840, appeared against him. There was no lack, indeed, of writings in his defense, but his position was rendered so unpleasant that he resigned his office of superintendent-general of the province of Saxony.

The above controversy, and the evident favor shown to the belief in the symbols of the Church from the beginning of the reign of King Frederic William IV., caused several clergymen in the neighborhood of Magdeburg, at the proposal of a Pastor Uhlich, of Pömmelte, to enter into closer relations with each other; partly for the purpose of assisting each other with mutual advice, partly to discuss the further development and shaping of Christianity; and thus was formed the association of Protestant Friends, or, as they were called (more by others than by themselves), the Friends of Light. Sixteen clergymen first met in Gnadau on July 29, 1841, and agreed upon this alliance. But their plan immediately met with such favor in the whole Prussian duchy of Saxony, as well as in the kingdom of Saxony itself, that the subsequent meetings in Leipsic, Halle, and Köthen were attended by thousands, clergymen as well as laymen; and, in addition to the general meetings, of which two were held annually, district meetings were convened in various places. The principal leaders of this movement were the pastors Uhlich in Pömmelte, and König in Anderbeck, and Archdeacon Fischer in Leipsic. Its animating principle was the old Rationalism, which, in this case, however, did not, as formerly, exert chiefly a chilling influence by its negative results, but brought warmth and impulse into religious life by its positive substance—such as had already for a long time given rise to a genuine, earnest Christianity among the educated classes—and strove to unite with itself the fervency of so-called Pietism. It was the aim of this association to become fully conscious of Christianity as it actually existed in cultivated minds, to give distinct and joyful expression to it, and quicken it more and more; while, on the other hand, the sym-
bolical doctrines of the Church, as no longer responding to the consciousness of the age, and therefore untrue and detrimental to the warmth of religious life, were to be done away with. A warding-off of all powers inimical to free development, and the culture of the Word of God according to the simple Gospel in the light of our own time—their were the fundamental principles of the efforts of these Protestant Friends. Theirs was a popularized Rationalism, which strove to awaken a new interest in religion and the Church among the people."

In Breslau and Königsberg, too, associations of Friends of Light were formed. Two journals, in particular, became the organs of this movement, i.e. the Blätter für christliche Erbauung, edited by Rudolph Fischer, of Leipsic, and the Zeitschrift für Protestantische Geistliche, of Niemeyer and Franke, in Halle.

The Protestant Friends first came into conflict with the consistory in Magdeburg, in consequence of their clergymen taking the liberty of making changes in the prescribed liturgy, in particular altering the Apostles' Creed or exchanging it for another. The consistory therefore issued, in February, 1843, a general order, by which it prohibited such alterations. Several clergymen of the province of Saxony protested against it, at their head Dean Baltzer, in Delitzsch, referring, in particular, to the fact that the former Saxon agenda had allowed special liberty with regard to the Apostles' Creed, and had accepted the same with omissions and alterations. This controversy respecting the Apostles' Creed extended also to Leipsic. There it had for some time been customary, at the baptismal and confirmation services, to make use of the so-called Confession of Faith of Rosenmüller instead of the Apostles' Creed. Now several clergymen began once more to make use of the latter, and demanded its general reinstatement. Others of the clergy protested, and with them the greater portion of the congregations. A vehement controversy ensued, and the Saxon government adjusted the difference by permitting the use of both creeds.

Another complication was brought about by Pastor Wislicenus, of Halle, by his address delivered at the meeting in Köthen, May 29, 1844, on the question whether the Holy Writ or the Spirit ought to be the standard for Protestantism: he decided in favor

of the Spirit. The query itself was incorrectly expressed, as it placed the Writ in contrast to the Spirit. For the spirit which alone can come in question here is no other than that which has emanated from the Holy Writ, and has been stimulated and developed by it. The question could only be, Is it the letter of the Holy Scriptures or their spirit which is the principle of Protestantism? The erroneous form of inquiry could only call forth a perverted answer, and the majority of those present by no means agreed with the latter. Professor Guerike, of Halle, who had attended the meeting, soon after caused a great excitement by a full report of it and of the address of Wislicenus, which appeared in the Evangelical Church Gazette. Several associations of orthodox clergymen loudly protested against Wislicenus, or, rather, the Friends of Light in general, and declared that such clergymen ought no longer to be tolerated in the Evangelical Church. Wislicenus published his address in an elaborated form under the title, Ob Schrift, ob Geist? (Leipsic, 1845) in which, in fact, he represented plain common-sense as the principle of religion. He was, in consequence, brought to trial; and, as he would not yield, deprived of his office in April, 1846. This movement in the Evangelical Church was strengthened by a similar one in the Roman Catholic Church, in which originated, in 1844, the German-Catholics. In consequence, a portion of the Friends of Light also conceived the idea of separating from the narrow, restricting National Church, and forming a free Church independent of it. Wislicenus, therefore, with a small number who shared his opinions, left the Evangelical National Church in order to form an Independent congregation, which gave up baptism, and admitted Jews to its communion without question.

At the same time a similar schism took place in Königsberg, where a society of Protestant Friends had also been formed, and where the resistance to the Church was fostered by a very lively political opposition. In December, 1844, the military chaplain, Dr. Julius Rupp, notified the consistory in Königsberg that he could no longer accept the Athanasian Creed. A few days later he preached against it as unchristian, and declared the Church, if it did not join in this rejection, to be unworthy of the name of Christian. The Athanasian Creed, as is well known, contains an exposition of the doctrines of the Trinity and the personality of Christ, and declares, in the introduction, that none can be
saved who do not truly believe in these doctrines. It was this declaration, by which eternal salvation is made dependent on the belief in certain speculative definitions, which Rupp designated as unchristian. He was, indeed, not wrong in this, but he should have considered that the Athanasian Creed was no longer, by any means, the true expression of the faith of the Evangelical Church; that but few of the members of the latter still adhered to its definitions concerning the Trinity, and that certainly no evangelical Christian of the present day would ever look upon eternal salvation as dependent on this adherence. And he should further have considered that this creed had become quite unfamiliar to the evangelical people, and that he gave a dangerous impulse to his congregation by attacking a creed of the Church as unchristian. He combated an error which did not exist in the congregation, and at the same time placed in their way a precarious stumbling-block. If the Evangelical Church, as Rupp energetically demanded, is not to regard its dogma as something fixed and immutable, but to purify it constantly, this must at least be done without offense, as, otherwise, the general religious faith of its members might suffer thereby.

Even prior to this time, Rupp had caused dissatisfaction by two addresses delivered before the Royal German Society in Königsberg, in one of which he combated the idea of a Christian State which endeavored to uphold Christianity without morality, in opposition to morality without Christianity, thereby referring more particularly to the Prussian government and its latest course; while in the other he represented the divine laws as divine counsels, to which corresponds a voluntary compliance, called in question the right of the authorities to command, placed woman on a level with man, etc. For these addresses he had already been censured by the consistory, and now the latter demanded that he should acknowledge as an error his course in proclaiming from the pulpit that a creed of the Church was false, and furnish a guarantee that he would in future avoid such a breach of the rules of the Church. Rupp not only refused to comply with this requisition, but even published a declaration that he should never repent of what he had said in the sermon in question. The result was his dismissal from office, September 17, 1845. This was not intended to be a deposition, for he was to receive his salary for two years longer,
and his position was to remain open for him, in case he should change his views, for the same length of time. Simultaneously, the consistory remarked particularly that Rupp had not been called to account because he had expressed his conviction that the Athanasian Creed contained a contradiction against the Word of God, but because he had been guilty of a violation of the laws of the Church.

A portion of the Protestant Friends in Königsberg now joined Rupp, and established, December 16, 1845, an Independent congregation, which proposed to separate from the Church of the consistory and the symbolical books, but to adhere to the Evangelical Church and the Holy Scriptures. Rupp was chosen preacher of the same. His aim was to re-establish degenerate Christianity in this Church. In the same spirit in which, in his previous addresses on the Christian State, he had declared with regard to Christianity that it was not a religion, but a universal vital principle, he proposed to transplant it from the religious field to that of social life, to unite his adherents in a community of brethren, in which the women were to have equal rights of suffrage with the men, and among the members of which the fraternal “thou” was to be the sole mode of address. The right of suffrage was conceded to the women, but the common “thou” met with great opposition, and was not carried. Notwithstanding all this, Rupp entered a protest against the decision of the consistory of September 17, 1845; and when, in consequence, he was notified that he had no right to do so, as he had seceded from the Church, he declared that he had had no intention of withdrawing from the Evangelical Church; and subsequently, moreover, acknowledged the authority of the consistory in all points but the one in reference to which he had protested. When, however, his protest was rejected, he reattached himself decidedly to the Independent Congregation (July, 1846). His vacillating course, indeed, had prejudiced a portion of its members against him; but, nevertheless, the majority were willing to receive him as a preacher once more.

In the course of these events, the King, in August, 1845, prohibited all assemblies of the Friends of Light, so far as they assumed the character of popular meetings, as well as all organizing of societies of Friends of Light. Nevertheless, Uhllich, who had been chosen as preacher by a congregation in
Magdeburg, soon after received his confirmation, which had been for some time delayed, and on his accession to office in October, 1845, bound himself, by the usual formula, to proclaim to the congregation, in truth and purity, the Word of God as it is contained in the Holy Scriptures, and has been reiterated in the Confessions of Faith of the United Evangelical Church, so far as they coincide with each other. Uhlich desired no separation from the National Church, but wished the Friends of Light still to adhere to it, in order gradually to effect a general progress in it.

In Königsberg the prohibition of the meetings of the Friends of Light brought about a second schism. The leader of the Protestant Friends in that city, Détroit, pastor of the French Reformed congregation, had entered into correspondence upon the subject with the consistory, which, in publishing the above prohibition, strongly censured the assemblies in question. At length, in a sermon preached on New-year's-day, 1846, from the text, “Old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new” (2 Cor. v. 17), he declared distinctly that the foundation upon which the Evangelical Church had rested hitherto was in contradiction to the Gospels, and that it was a duty demanded by truth to renounce its symbols. On the following day, the consistory of the French Reformed Church, joined by the whole congregation, addressed a declaration to the same effect to the provincial consistory. In justification of the same, the French congregation asserted that the French Reformed Church had never acknowledged any other ground of faith than the Word of God in the Holy Scriptures, and that, in consequence, they had always regarded the creeds as a mere temporal expression of their faith, without ever having considered themselves bound to accept them as a standard. And that hence, too, the clergy of this Church had only to promise, at their ordination, to proclaim and teach conscientiously, and according to their best knowledge, the Word of God as founded on the Gospel.

Finally, another Independent congregation was formed in Nordhausen. Dean Baltzer in Delitzsch, who had for some time been in conflict with the consistory in Magdeburg, in consequence of free use of the liturgy and non-employment of the Apostles' Creed, was elected in July, 1845, dean of the Church of St. Moritz in Halle, but not confirmed by the administration.
Soon after, in October, 1845, he was chosen pastor of the Church of St. Nicholas in Nordhausen, but again not confirmed, because he constantly refused to make use of the Apostles’ Creed, as prescribed by the Prussian liturgy. This, however, the congregation considered an encroachment upon its Protestant liberty, and on October 19, 1846, it issued the remarkable declaration that it appealed from the ecclesiastical authorities then in office to the entire German Protestant Church, in particular to that portion of it existing in the Prussian states; but that, until such time as the Evangelical Church should receive a constitution, and be competent to give a legally valid answer, it should withdraw from the authority of the existing Prussian ecclesiastical government. It would carry on its Church ordinances and observances as heretofore, and remain in the communion of the Evangelical Church, but would direct its own congregational affairs, without acknowledging any higher authority. When the consistory, upon this, replied that no one could withdraw from the authority of the ecclesiastical government but by seceding from the National Church, and subsequently ordered a new election, a large portion of the congregation decided for secession, united in an Independent congregation, and chose Baltzer for their preacher (January, 1847).

The character of these Independent congregations can not yet be clearly determined. Opposition to the government seems to have had quite as large a share in their foundation as resistance to the old Church authority. Their religious scheme has apparently been drawn partly from the old Rationalism and partly from the radical wing of the school of Hegel, and is therefore not yet clearly developed. This Young-Hegelianism, as it is called, hailed the Friends of Light, as it had hailed the German Catholics, as welcome phenomena. It regarded them as associations which might serve for the adoption and circulation of its ideas. But it is in these Independent congregations, particularly, that it has exerted considerable influence. It may therefore be assumed that in them conflicting elements, particularly Rationalism and Hegelianism, are to be found side by side—the latter, perhaps, in a less distinct form—and that this explains the

27 Delitzsch—Halle—Nordhausen, oder mein Weg aus der Landeskirche in die freie Protestantische Gemeinde, actenmässig dargestellt von E. Baltzer, Leipsic, 1847.
unsettled character of their Confessions of Faith, so far as they have become known. They unite only in the merely formal demands—truth, freedom, and love. But truth, to them, is merely subjective truthfulness, which confesses nothing which it does not believe; freedom is the freedom from all symbols, the most complete subjective liberty of faith. But it is difficult to conceive how a communion of faith, a Church, can exist without any common substance of faith. And as this is wanting, love, too, is equivocal; for love receives its moral character only from the religious faith upon which it rests. And what a position is that of a clergyman of such a congregation, whose office should be “to give expression to the religious consciousness of the congregation,” but who in this case is obliged, without being bound to any higher objective element, to teach according to the decisions of the congregation! The congregation in Nordhausen has set up the following as its dogmas:

1. God is the Father of all, the Living God, the Eternal Spirit, the Omnipresent, the sole Lord of the Universe; his Rule is Truth and Love eternally.

This does not exclude the idea that God, as the absolute, allquickening principle, acquires consciousness in man alone—an idea which, now that it has been expressed so loudly by the Young-Hegelians, ought to have been rejected peremptorily. Baltzer, by laying peculiar stress, in his exposition of this article, upon the essential omnipresence or immanency of God, countenances this idea. We, too, acknowledge an immanency of God by recognizing him as the sole quickening principle in the world; but we confess, at the same time, a God who is unchangingly conscious of himself in his infinity, who is not influenced by the world, and governs it independently.

2. Jesus is Christ, the Saviour of mankind; his Atoning Gospel is Love and Truth for ever and ever.

In a Confession of Faith the substance of this truth should have been distinctly stated.

3. The Spirit is holy in its working, it fills the universe, and causes us to come from God in our birth, to be in God in our life, and to go to God in our death: its blessing is Love and Truth for evermore.

This Spirit is defined by Baltzer as the spirit poured out upon every thing created, as God in us, the foundation of all individual...
The individual, therefore, is a revelation of God, in which God becomes objective to himself and acquires consciousness. And in proportion as man becomes conscious of himself according to his true nature, he recognizes his identity with God.

These propositions, indeed, are so obscure that it can not be asserted with certainty that their sense has been correctly given. But this very obscurity may be interpreted to the effect that the true sense is not intended to appear distinctly, lest it might deter many from accepting these doctrines. At any rate, obscurity is a great fault in a Confession of Faith.\textsuperscript{28}

That these Independent Congregations go far beyond the standpoint of the Friends of Light is shown by the fact that the one in Halle has discarded baptism entirely. The same is asserted of that in Königsberg, but without certainty; the latter, however, has declared publicly that the sacraments are to be retained merely as a custom to be followed at option. Somewhat later, the Independent Congregations made attempts at union with the German-Catholics, which were, however, repulsed by the latter, because the Independent Congregations neither have, nor wish to have, any common positive creed. These manifestations of the Friends of Light, and the kindred movements to which they gave rise, could not fail to call forth the strongest disapprobation on the part of the believers in the symbols, particularly in the Evangelical Church Gazette and the organs of strict Lutheranism. Immediately after the above-mentioned address of Wislicenus on Letter and Spirit, June 6, 1844, the clergymen assembled for the annual Missionary Meeting in Berlin declared almost unanimously that the Friends of Light had fallen off from the true Light of the World, Christ and his Church, and could no longer be acknowledged as brethren in Christ. Quite a number of similar declarations from various associations of clergymen appeared in the public journals. The Evangelical Church Gazette asserted openly that the Pope and the Jesuits stood in much closer relation to the foundations of the Evangelical Church than the Friends of Light, and that hence it preferred the Catholicism of the former to the Rationalism of the latter.

The State could not remain indifferent to this internal schism of the Evangelical Church, nor could it be overlooked that there

was great room for improvement in the constitution and ordinances of the latter. Prussia, therefore, in January, 1846, appointed at Berlin a conference of delegates from all the German evangelical states—from which only a few states excluded themselves—for the purpose of a general discussion of the principles and measures which ought to be adopted with regard to ecclesiastical matters. All that was aimed at by this conference, however, was a mutual understanding, and its resolutions were not intended to be binding for the individual governments. Nothing official was ever made known concerning this conference. Soon after it took place, the Prussian government convoked a General Evangelical Synod of the Prussian National Church, which was in session from June 2 to August 29, 1846. The members were nominated by the government, and hence the resolutions of the synod, too, were not to be decisive, but merely advisory. Eight committees deliberated upon all the conditions of the Church, and prepared the synodal resolutions which were thought necessary. The proceedings are given in full in an official publication.

It must be admitted that the synod has exercised great discretion and circumspection in its consideration of all the different affairs of the Church, and shown a highly-to-be-appreciated liberality in making allowance for the sound demands of the age. In particular, it has proposed a Church constitution for the Eastern portion of the monarchy which would combine the consistorial and presbyterial systems, and advanced some projects for the preparatory education of the clergy which are worthy of consideration. The most important of their deliberations, however, was that upon the obligations of the clergy with regard to the Confessions of Faith. It rejected all obligation to use a formula—and, consequently, also the symbols of the Church—as being incompatible with the Union as well as with the present standpoint of theological science. It held that in the form of ordination a more general reference to the symbols was sufficient, which would receive its substance from an added material confession of belief in the fundamental truths of salvation. This confession was to be explained by an order of instruction, which was to form a part of the Church ordinances. This was to con-
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tain, besides an enumeration of the symbols in use and a definition of their degree and extent, a detailed statement of the corresponding points of faith to be found in these symbols. The candidate to be ordained was to be made thoroughly acquainted with the formula of ordination in advance, and, at the ordination, to signify his acceptance of the confession by a solemn affirmation; no oath was to be required.

This confession was to be accepted as the common Confession of Faith of the United Church; but, aside from it, the attachment of individual congregations to the Lutheran or Reformed type of doctrine and of worship was to be allowed entire liberty, although the Church communion was to be maintained, and a progressive adjustment of the existing differences striven for. For this reason individual congregations should be permitted to adhere to certain Lutheran or Reformed symbols, so that a distinction might be made between the ministerial obligations entered into for the entire Church by ordination and those imposed for individual congregations by call, and that the latter might be stricter than the former.

In case of complaints concerning abuse of the liberty of instruction, a difference should be observed between heterodoxy, which goes beyond the established system, and attacks upon the grounds of evangelical faith; the former might be kept in check by fraternal and official admonitions, but the latter would authorize a course of discipline with regard to which the presbyteries and synods must be consulted.

The formula of ordination which was annexed to these propositions as an example, without laying claim to actual adoption, met with extraordinary opposition from the extreme parties. Uhlich attacked it in the treatise Siebzehn Sätze in Beziehung auf die Verpflichtungsformel Protestantischer Geistlichen, ausgegangen von der Synode zu Berlin, 1846.

But the Evangelical Church Gazette declaimed against it still more vehemently, pronouncing it a concession made to Rationalism, in order to reconcile believers and semi-believers, but by which the symbols were abolished, and hence the true character of the Evangelical Church was lost. A treatise also appeared in defense of the synod.

30 Dr. Julius Müller, Die erste General-Synode der Evangelischen Landeskirche Preussens und die kirchlichen Bekenntnisse, Breslau, 1847.
The Prussian government has not yet expressed any direct opinion with regard to the resolutions of the General Synod. It does not seem willing to adopt them. On the contrary, it appears still to desire that the National Church should, so far as is compatible with the Union, adhere to its symbols, and that all those who can not agree to the latter should secede from the Church and form separate congregations. It therefore issued, March 30, 1847, an Edict of Toleration, in which the conditions are expressed on which it will permit the forming of such congregations outside of the National Church. Secession from the Church can only take effect by a declaration made personally before the local magistrate. If the new religious societies are sanctioned by the State, their members remain in the enjoyment of their civil rights and honors. By a decree of the same date, civil marriage was permitted to such persons as separated from the Church. Soon after this, Uhlich was challenged more decidedly, in case he wished to remain in the National Church, to return to its Confession of Faith. By this he was compelled to secede from the National Church, and he has been followed not only by a large portion of his congregation, but also by quite a number of other clergymen and congregations in the Prussian duchy of Saxony.

One of the most remarkable phenomena in the latest history of the German Evangelical Church is the Gustavus Adolphus Association, which succeeded a former Gustavus Adolphus Foundation existing in Dresden and Leipsic.

On November 6, 1832, two hundred years had passed since Gustavus Adolphus fell on the field of Lützen for the evangelical faith. This anniversary was not only solemnly observed in Sweden, but a religious celebration was also held on the spot where the event had occurred. During this celebration the wish was generally expressed that a monument might be erected to the fallen hero on this same spot, which, until then, had merely been marked by a large rough stone. As the sum which was collected for this purpose, particularly in Leipsic and Dresden, soon increased to a considerable amount, this gave rise to the plan of using the surplus for a permanent fund. Thus, in 1833, particularly through the efforts of Superintendent Grossmann in Leipsic, the Gustavus Adolphus Foundation was established. The
surplus capital was invested, and the interest devoted to the relief of distressed brethren in the faith, particularly needy Protestant congregations in Catholic countries. The administration alternated annually between two principal societies, of which one had its seat at Leipsic, the other at Dresden; the statutes of the foundation were ratified in October, 1834.

The capital was increased chiefly by a collection in churches and homes in Sweden which was granted by the King for six years. In November, 1842, it had already reached the sum of fifteen thousand five hundred thalers.

When, subsequently, in consequence of the complications at Cologne, the arrogance of the Catholic Church against the Evangelical Church increased, and in various Catholic countries, especially in Bavaria, the latter suffered more and more oppression, Court-chaplain K. Zimmermann in Darmstadt published in his Church Gazette of October 31, 1841, an appeal to all Protestants, in which he proposed to them to form an association for the purpose of assisting oppressed Protestant brethren. As this proposal immediately met with universal favor, the Gustavus Adolphus Foundation expressed to Zimmermann the desire that there might be no division of forces for this common object. In September, 1842, a large number of friends of the cause held a meeting and resolved upon the union. In September, 1843, at a second meeting at Frankfort-on-the-Main, the statutes were ratified. The Gustavus Adolphus Foundation remained unchanged, but became a member of the great association, which took the name of "Evangelical Association of the Gustavus Adolphus Foundation." After Prussia, too, had joined the society at the third general meeting, held at Göttingen in September, 1844, rival principal and branch societies were founded in the whole of Protestant Germany; and, the more became known of the religious needs of so many Protestants who lived scattered about among Catholics, and either had no religious institutions at all, or, in their straitened circumstances, could hardly maintain those which they had, the more general became the enthusiasm for the new society, in order, through it, to come to the aid of the oppressed brethren in the faith. The Bavarian government alone, which at that time was still swayed by an ultramontane party, showed itself inimical to the association. It declared that the
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name of the latter alone forbade its sanctioning it, as Gustavus Adolphus had been Bavaria’s greatest enemy, and had devastated it sorely. The chief objection of the administration, however, was to the relief afforded the Protestant Church. It not only prohibited the formation of Gustavus Adolphus societies in the kingdom, but also forbade the oppressed Protestant congregations in Bavaria to receive assistance from the association. The Austrian government, indeed, did not permit the formation of branch societies, but allowed its Protestant subjects to accept aid, and subsequently merely limited this permission to the necessity of applying for it, in each separate case, to the Protestant consistory at Vienna. During the fiscal year ending November 5, 1845, 56,896 thalers were collected. Thus the association was extended more and more, and had acquired a very widespread influence, when its internal peace was suddenly broken in upon by a disturbance created by Dr. Rupp of Königsberg.

The statutes determine (§ 1) that the association shall consist of members of the Evangelical Protestant Church, and (§ 2) that its activity shall be extended to Lutheran, Reformed, and United congregations, as well as such as can give authentic proof of their conformity with the Evangelical Church. In the year 1843, when the statutes were drawn up, the necessity of defining these points more distinctly was not yet felt; the association was clearly conscious of its intentions, and nothing had as yet occurred to make more explicit provisions advisable. Its aim was to form itself from the great Evangelical Protestant Church communion, in order to relieve the religious need of other members of the same communion. In declaring, therefore, that this communion comprised Lutheran, Reformed, and United congregations, it gave loud expression for the whole of Germany, and even for those countries where the Union had not yet been effected, to the inner unity of these congregations, as well as their fellowship in the same Church communion, which had been acknowledged by the general religious consciousness, particularly since the last centennial celebration of the anniversary of the Reformation (1817). This was one of the greatest blessings which the association wrought out for the inner relations of the Evangelical Church, and which won it the hearts of so many, notwithstanding that the little flock of strict Lutherans for that very reason kept aloof from it.
The congregations which were to be assisted were, of course, such as belonged to the same great Church communion; the aim in view was to do good to the brethren in the faith. They were therefore designated as Lutheran, Reformed, and United; but, remembering the Waldenses, and not wishing to exclude them from assistance, the founders of the association had added, "and such congregations as can give authentic proof of their conformity with the Evangelical Church." This clause was unsuitable, and has subsequently especially contributed to bring about disturbances. For to what degree should conformity with the Evangelical Church be proved—as within the limits of the latter a great variety of views exists—and how was it to be proved? The clause should have been put in this form—"who are in ecclesiastical communion with any of these congregations;" this would have included the Waldenses, who maintain a communion with the Swiss Reformed Church. For where the first question was one of outward assistance, the outward Church communion was the most natural condition. But in drawing up the statutes it could not, of course, be foreseen that such deplorable differences would arise on this very point.

A condition of the membership of the Gustavus Adolphus Association, therefore, was membership of the Evangelical Protestant Church communion, but this was the sole condition. Hence, all varieties of opinion of the Evangelical Church were admitted—Rationalists and Orthodox, Mystics and Friends of Light—and this was a second blessing wrought by the association. At its meetings, all present felt that they were merely members of the great Evangelical Protestant Church communion, fraternally united for the purpose of aiding the brethren in the faith who were in religious need. By being united in love and for an object of love, they drew nearer to each other in general, became more vividly conscious of the points which they still retained in common, laid aside many prejudices which they had entertained against each other, and learned to regard each other with mutual esteem. This, at a time when the Protestant Church was threatened with inner schisms, was likewise a very important benefit, and was chiefly the feature which gained the association general favor, although strict believers in the Church symbols were thereby deterred from joining it. Attempts were made, indeed, particularly at the general meeting in Göttingen in 1844, to pass
the resolution that the congregations to be assisted must confess to certain symbols, but they were rejected decidedly, because it was plainly felt that the association would thereby assume a totally different character.

The sole requisite, therefore, which remained for the members of the Gustavus Adolphus Association, as well as for the churches which desired to be assisted by it, was, that they should belong to the Evangelical Protestant Church communion. But it was, at the same time, necessary that this requirement should be regarded as indispensable, if the association was to continue to exist. For, if it had admitted minor Protestant Church communions or sects; and if, hence, it were composed of, and intended to aid, various communions, the question would primarily arise where the limits of admission should be drawn, and whether all fanatic and even all unbelieving parties should be accepted if they applied "and called themselves evangelical."

Furthermore, every Church communion would naturally endeavor to assist chiefly the needy congregations belonging to it, and this would occasion dissensions prejudicial to the society, from which many members, moreover, would withdraw entirely, being unwilling to give assistance to sects. So long, on the other hand, as the society confines itself to one Church communion, it is equally interested in all the needy congregations of the same. It examines the applications for aid merely according to their urgency, and its decisions can not be influenced by peculiar considerations.

Finally, all sects have the tendency to make converts and to increase their numbers. The opportunities for so doing which would be afforded by the meetings of the association would not be left unimproved by them. But in this way these meetings, instead of ministering to active charity, would soon become the scene of theological controversies.

All this was considered a matter of course when the association was founded; nor had any one reason to examine into these things more closely until Rupp gave occasion for so doing.

Since the accession of the present King of Prussia,* Königsberg had been the seat of various political and ecclesiastical movements. Even before Rupp came upon the scene, there existed there an ecclesiastical and a liberal party in direct oppo-

* Frederic William IV.—Tr.
sition to each other. When the Gustavus Adolphus Association was in process of formation, the liberals in that city gained the precedence of the Church party, convoked the first meeting, and carried their motions in the course of it. The consequence was that the whole ecclesiastical party withdrew. Subsequently, moreover, the association was weakened still more by further withdrawals. At first, when it was decided that neither Jews nor Catholics could be members, and, later, when the German Catholics, too, were declared inadmissible, a large number seceded on both occasions; hence the association always remained small, in proportion to the size of the city, and has not done much to further the objects of the foundation.32

Rupp was nominated by the branch society of Königsberg as deputy to the meeting of the Prussian Provincial Association, and by the latter again as one of the deputies to the principal meeting to be held in Berlin in September, 1846. His election took place at the time when he declared himself belonging once more to the National Church, but immediately after this he again joined the Independent Congregation. Protests arose from several quarters against his admission to the association, which, therefore, had to be put to the vote. By the statutes (§ 10), the directors of every principal society have the right to be represented at the principal meetings by a duly authorized deputy. This deputy may be chosen, without restriction, from among all the members of the entire association. According to § 1, however, none but members of the Evangelical Protestant Church can become members of the association; therefore none but members of that Church can be admitted as deputies. Rupp had notoriously, and according to his own acknowledgment, seceded from the National Church; this, however, formed a part of the great Evangelical Protestant Church, and in seceding from it he also withdrew from the latter. He declared his intention, indeed, of still remaining a member of the Evangelical Church, but he could do so only in the sense in which all members of Protestant sects lay claim to the same. He had withdrawn from the communion of the Protestant Church, and thus the Berlin chief assembly could not do otherwise than declare that he could not be admitted as deputy, because he was no longer a member of the association.

32 It numbered only 454 members.
This decision, at any other time, would have appeared natural and necessary, but, in view of the religious movements then in progress in Prussia, it gave rise to serious dissensions. As the Prussian government was so much in favor of ecclesiastical orthodoxy, many liberals desired that Rupp should be admitted, so that, on the part of this chief assembly, at which the entire German Protestant Church seemed likely to be represented, a declaration would thus be made to the Prussian government to the effect that the tendency of the latter was opposed to the spirit of the German Protestant Church, and that the liberals, which it rejected, were acknowledged as brethren in all the rest of Protestant Germany. In proposing this, however, they overlooked that the chief assembly was compelled to keep the objects and the statutes of the association strictly in view, and could not feel itself authorized to make any further ecclesiastical demonstrations.

The decision of the Berlin chief assembly has subsequently been made a subject of examination by all individual Gustavus Adolphus associations, and has mostly been discussed very vehemently. By far the majority of the votes were against the above decision, in reality because it was thought necessary to declare against a system of un-Protestant compulsory instruction which seemed to prevail in Prussia, although the attempt was made to attribute the rejection to other causes: as, for instance, that, according to the sense of the statutes, every Protestant Christian might become a member of the association; that the deputies to the chief assembly were merely required to exhibit a formal authorization, etc.

It cannot be denied that the true grounds for decision were not taken from the domain of the Gustavus Adolphus Association, but from that of ecclesiastical liberalism; and that in consequence of this occurrence the association was seriously endangered. For, if it were to admit all Protestant sects as well as the new Independent Congregations which had been formed in Prussia, it would soon become an arena for all kinds of efforts on the part of the different Church parties, while a large portion of those who have the chief aim of the society—the relief of oppressed brethren in the faith—in view, and who are unwilling to assist sects and new congregations, would in such a case have withdrawn.
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The chief assembly in Darmstadt, in September, 1847, put an end to this controversy, which threatened the entire existence of the association, in a very shrewd manner. It did not attempt to give an opinion on past events, but determined for the future:

1. That the authorization of the deputies to the chief assemblies should all be confined to the examination of their certificates.

2. That, on the other hand, the chief assembly should be entitled, in case of necessity, to resolve upon the inadmissibility of a deputy on account of any lacking condition of membership.

3. That this resolution, however, in case it is to be taken with regard to a deputy who claims to be a member, must be passed, after previous communication with his principal association, at the next chief assembly.

It is true that the main question with regard to the admissibility of sects to the association was here evaded; but this period of universal passionate excitement was, indeed, no fit time for decision. The year 1848, with its violent political storms, has rendered the Gustavus Adolphus Association entirely inactive; but it was to be hoped that this most efficient society would soon manifest its continuance by deeds, and these hopes have not been disappointed.

There remains to be recorded the latest time—since 1848.

In close connection with the democratic tendency which became prominent after 1848 was the prevalence of religious unbelief. Political dissatisfaction, which, until then, had frequently vented itself on ecclesiastical ground, now came forward boldly and undisguisedly; and thus religious opposition lost for many the charm which it had formerly had as a cloak for political opposition. Hence a great degree of lukewarmness manifested itself in most of the German Catholic congregations, as well as in the Free churches. On the other hand, the necessity was urged from many quarters of submitting the constitutions of the National churches to a thorough reformation. It was claimed that the Church had hitherto been a servant of the State, and made use of by the latter for keeping mankind in blind obedience and patient endurance of all wrongs: that it directed men to the joys of a future life in order to console them for the deprivations of this world, and to make it possible for the governments to destroy the rights of their subjects with impunity.
The Church, it was asserted, should be separated from the State, and as political constitutions were rebuilt from the foundation by a national assembly formed by universal suffrage, the Church, too, ought to be thoroughly reconstructed by similarly constituted assemblies. In particular, there should be an entire liberty of doctrine, and all authority of the clergy be abolished. It ought to be optional with each individual to attach himself to any Church he liked, or to none at all, or to form with others a new religious society. All Church communions should have equal rights in the State; the latter should have nothing to do with religious matters, and leave all churches completely at liberty.

For the most part, all these assertions were merely a cloak for the shallowest unbelief. The doctrines of the left side of the Hegelian school—of Strauss, Feuerbach, Ruge, Bruno Bauer—penetrated, partly through popular treatises, deep into the midst of the people. It was loudly declared that men ought to renounce Christianity, as, chiefly by its doctrine of resignation, it was to blame for the sad condition of public affairs. Many did not hesitate flatly to deny God and immortality, and to assert that man, limited to this life, had no other task than to make it as agreeable as possible.

If the utterances concerning religion and the Church which were chiefly made public in those days had been taken as a standard of the religious spirit prevailing among the German people, the result would have been very disheartening. Such an impression, however, would have been false. Party voices alone were heard at that time, and the democratic unorthodox party, from which such utterances emanated, was but small in most of the German states, with the exception, perhaps, of the Lower Palatinate and Baden. In similar times of excitement and of revolution, that party generally takes the lead and has the most to say which is most closely united and pursues its aims with the greatest recklessness and courage. It speaks and acts in the name of the people—even though it forms but a small portion of the latter; the majority, partly from timidity, partly from indecision, remain silent lookers-on, or, perhaps, even become tools of the party; but as soon as another party takes the helm, they serve it as zealously as they served the preceding one. This explains the change which has taken place in public opinion during
the last few years. The democratic party has been compelled to retreat into the background, and the mass of the people now follow other spiritual impulses.

The irreligious party in question, at the time when it was in authority, caused the opinion to prevail pretty generally that the churches should be entirely reconstructed from their foundations by constituent assemblies, to the election of which all adult Church members were to contribute in equal degree, and that these assemblies should be entitled to decide without restriction as well upon the doctrines as upon the constitution of the Church. At that time the governments, too, for the most part, agreed to this apparently general demand; but no such constituent Church assembly has taken place anywhere but in Oldenburg, where, in consequence, the Church was made entirely independent of the State, and received a free synodal constitution. In many countries such constituent assemblies would have led directly to a falling-off from Christianity, inasmuch as, in all probability, the unbelieving party would have gained possession of the majority of votes. This, however, has not been the case in Oldenburg; but whether the new ecclesiastical polity, as well as the new State constitution (likewise founded by a constituent assembly) could be maintained, was another question.

When, after the dissolution of the Frankfort National Assembly and the quelling of the disturbances in Saxony, the Palatinate, and Baden, in 1849, democracy was vanquished, other opinions asserted themselves with regard to ecclesiastical matters as well. It was still maintained, indeed, that the entire dependence of the Church upon the State, as it had existed hitherto almost everywhere, must give room to a more liberal Church constitution; but, on the other hand, it was urged that the Church could not be separated from the State without being in danger of dividing into sects and being led to destruction. The idea of constituent assemblies was therefore given up, and the necessity recognized of developing the new constitutions from historical conditions; while, at the same time, it became evident that reforms in the department of the Church should be entered into with the utmost caution, as, otherwise, they might cause irremediable injury.

With regard to doctrine, infidelity was now met by a very decided reaction. In Prussia there was a considerable increase in
the party of the strict Lutherans, who rejected the Union, and formed a Church communion entirely independent of the State. In other countries, too, this strict Lutheran party grew up or augmented, unconditionally upholding the old symbols, and striving to bring back Lutheran dogmatics to their most rigid form. No benefit can accrue to the Church from this party; it is in decided contradiction to the scientific culture of the times, and therefore repels the educated classes; and even though, for the present, it may have gained some influence by its contrast to infidelity, which, in its most undisguised form, has alarmed all the well-intentioned, it will not be able to assert its power, but will always form only a small sect of the great Church.

In view of this tendency, the conviction has generally gained ground that it will certainly be necessary to bring about a mediation between the Church dogma and modern scientific culture, in order to restore the former to general recognition; that it must be brought back to its essential substance, and freed from many unproductive additions, and that, in this purified form, it must be newly established in a manner adapted to the demands of the times. Upon this point of view is based the Deutsche Zeitschrift für christliche Wissenschaft und christliches Leben, which was founded in Berlin by Neander, Nitzsch, and Müller.

In addition to this, the sense of the importance of the age in which such serious developments in the department of the Church are taking place induced the adherents of the Church to hold frequent free meetings for the discussion of its interests. As early as the summer of 1848, such meetings took place in various cities, particularly at Berlin, Leipsic, Wittenberg, Gnadau, Frankfort-on-the-Main, etc. They paved the way for the first so-called Church-diet (Kirchentag), held at Wittenberg (September, 1848), which was attended by visitors from various portions of the German Evangelical Church. This Church-diet has since been repeated annually—at Wittenberg in the autumn of 1849, at Stuttgart in 1850—and has assembled members of all the Evangelical churches of Germany.

At these Church-diets two plans in particular have been much discussed, which are of great importance to the Evangelical Church.

1. The idea of an Evangelical Church Alliance. This idea of a fraternization of all such Protestant Christians as adhere to the
evangelical dogma, and therefore agree in all essential doctrines, originated in England, and was there realized by the great meetings which were held by the members of various Protestant parties—at Liverpool in 1845, and at London in 1847. As the union of the Lutheran and Evangelical churches has not yet become universal in Germany, and has even lost many of its adherents of late, it could not be otherwise than advantageous to establish an Evangelical Church Alliance, by which the Evangelical churches might enter into friendly relations with each other in opposition partly to infidelity, partly to the attacks of the Romish Church, without, therefore, yielding up their peculiar institutions and doctrines.

2. The idea of Inner Missions. This idea originated with Candidate Wichern, the founder of the "Rauhe Haus" in Horn, near Hamburg—a reformatory institution for neglected and erring children—and is developed in his treatise Die Innere Mission der deutschen Evangelischen Kirche, Hamburg, 1849. The title "Inner Missions" is given to the total of the efforts to obviate the different phases of necessity among the people, arising from sin and its results, through the Word of God and the offices of brotherly love. This is, without doubt, a truly Christian idea; but it is to be wished that its realization may be kept in close connection with congregational relations and the existing Christian pastoral office, as has always been the case. It is most important that the special cure of souls and the Christian charitable institutions in the congregations should receive a new impulse; but it is dangerous to place itinerant preachers and colporteurs of Bibles and tracts in the ranks with the regular pastors, as this may easily lead to schisms and the formation of new sects. In the Romish Church, after the thirteenth century, the mendicant friars occupied the same position with regard to the secular clergy. They gave rise, indeed, to many an impulse and much spiritual quickening, but also caused many dissensions and abuses. In like manner, it is to be desired that the Christian charitable institutions may always remain in connection with the churches, instead of being centralized; for it is only by being made a congregational matter that they can acquire a permanent activity and secure permanent interest.
§ 8. HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCH IN DENMARK, HOLLAND, AND SWITZERLAND.

The theological sciences in the three countries named above have always been under the influence of German theological literature; consequently, the great theological revolution which took place in Germany was repeated here, although somewhat later.

In Denmark, Rationalism, which had also been imported from Germany, found general favor among the clergy. On the other hand, a rigidly orthodox party was formed here, too, in modern times, which, though small in number, opposed the Rationalists. At its head stood Pastor Grundtvig, Dr. Rudelbach, and Magister Lindberg in Copenhagen. They edited, from May, 1825, a theological monthly, in which they criticised, with a degree of severity and acrimony rarely met with, the writings not only of Rationalist theologians, but also of all those who did not adhere closely to the symbolical books. Grundtvig, before long, commenced a formal attack upon Dr. Clausen, professor of theology in Copenhagen. Clausen published, in 1825, a very meritorious exposition of the Church polity, doctrines, and rites of Catholicism and Protestantism, which was subsequently translated into German. Grundtvig fancied that he discovered in it an entirely false conception of Protestantism, and therefore immediately published A Protest of the Christian Church against the Pseudo-Protestantism of Professor Clausen, in which he demanded of the latter that he should either make a public apology to the Church, or else resign his office and renounce Christianity; otherwise he therewith declared him a false teacher. Clausen answered this scandalous attack by prosecuting its author, and the royal Supreme Court imposed a fine upon the latter. Grundtvig therefore resigned his office, and devoted himself to the study of ancient Norse history, in which he had already accomplished much. Dr. Rudelbach, through his connection with the Paleological party in Germany, was called to Glanisha, in Saxony, as superintendent in 1829, and thus Magister Lindberg remained for some time alone upon the field. Grundtvig, however, accepted another pastorate, and the negotiations which were commenced

1 Neustadt-on-the-Orla, 1828, 3 vols.
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in Denmark with regard to the introduction of a new agenda were taken advantage of by this party for the commencement of new controversies. The Danish agenda dated from the time of the Reformation, and was so antiquated that various preachers in modern times had begun to deviate from it occasionally. At the instigation of Grundtvig and Lindberg, complaints were entered against several of them, and, in 1828, a government order was issued to the effect that the clergy were to adhere strictly to the agenda. Soon after, however, a revision of the old agenda was resolved upon, and this task allotted to the Bishop of Seeland, Mynster. He published, in 1839, a draught of an altar-book and Church ritual, in which great regard was paid to the old forms, but which, nevertheless, was strongly opposed by the Paleological party in question. The latter, however, has since altered its demands in a remarkable manner. Grundtvig at first declared that this new altar-book, if it were sanctioned, would merely introduce restraint of conscience: he now demanded utter ecclesiastical liberty, even to such a degree that all parochial relations should be dissolved, entire liberty of instruction granted, and every one be allowed to follow his own inclinations in choosing a pastor. It was hoped that in this way an Old Lutheran Church, distinct from the National Church, might be founded. The government has not yet ratified the agenda.²

In Holland the developments of German theology were watched with much interest; but the deliberate character of the nation, and the rigid Church polity, caused them to be followed only at a certain distance. The outward relations of the Church, however, had already undergone a change after the invasion of the French in 1795. Until then, the Reformed Church had been the prevailing National Church, and, by a strict constitution, had succeeded in maintaining the external authority of the symbols. Now, all religious parties had equal rights conferred upon them: the Reformed Church was to receive a new constitution; but this was not accomplished during the French rule, and the Church remained, during this whole time, without a legal organization. These conditions, however, served to open the way for a more liberal spirit.³

* On Engelstoft's history of this Altar-book (written in Danish), see the Halle Letter.-Zeitung for 1841, p. 481.
* Roynard's Orat. de Commutatione, quam sublit Theologia in Nederlandia, Traj. ad Rh. 1850.
Up to the middle of the eighteenth century, the strict Calvinist system still prevailed in Holland, and the exegesis was completely biased by dogmatic prejudices. But after that time, Semler's and Ernesti's writings, which urged grammatico-historical interpretation and developed its principles, were introduced and appreciated. In consequence, exegesis on grammatico-historical principles was cultivated with special zeal, all the more that the study of philology had always been a favorite one in Holland. These investigations could not fail to lead to the discovery that various doctrines of symbolical theology—in particular, Calvin's *decretum absolutum*—had no foundation in the Holy Scriptures, and hence they were gradually given up, and a simple Scriptural system of instruction was substituted. It was the aim to derive the doctrinal system, according to the rules of grammatico-historical interpretation, from the Holy Scriptures. It was recognized, at the same time, that local and temporal conceptions (which are mentioned rather than taught in the Bible) do not belong to this system, and the attempt was made to bring that which had been arrived at in this way into harmony with other perceptions of reason. This is the essential character of the present theological school of Holland. No consistent Rationalism, which expressly allows the reason an opinion also on the substance of the Holy Scriptures, has as yet appeared there. The modern philosophical systems which have become prominent in Germany since Kant have met with no favor in Holland, and could have no attractions for the unimaginative Dutch character, which hates all philosophical speculation. Of all theological disciplines, Biblical exegesis is that which is most cultivated in Holland; but the Dutch exegesis is justly censured for devoting itself with too much diffuseness to mere verbal explication, to the neglect of a more profound investigation of the sense and reasoning of the Biblical writers and a keen discrimination of their logical connection. The above beneficial change in the prevailing theological spirit also made itself felt, after the abolition of the old rigid Church constitution, by its influence on the Church service. Until that time a metrical version of the Psalms had been used as a hymn-book; but in 1807 the Evangelical Hymns were introduced, being partly translations of German hymns, partly written by Dutch poets, which were much better adapted to promote religious edification than the old psalms.
After the foundation of the kingdom of the Netherlands, the Dutch Reformed Church received from the King, January 6, 1816, a new order of constitution, by which the old constitution was renewed in a manner adapted to the times, but which, in particular, gave the State more influence over the Church than it had previously possessed. According to this constitution, every congregation has a Church council, which consists of the preachers and elders, together with the deacons, who have charge of the Church charities. A number of congregations form a classis, to the meetings of which each congregation sends its preachers and one or more elders, and a standing committee from which remains in constant activity. Several classes are united under a provincial Church government, which has three sessions a year, and to which a preacher from each classis is appointed, as well as an elder from some other classis, which varies annually. The highest Church tribunal is the synod, to which is sent a clergyman from each provincial Church, and, in addition, an elder from some one province, which likewise varies with every year. The three Theological Faculties of the kingdom each furnish a deputy, who, however, possesses no vote, but merely gives his opinion first in all matters. This synod meets annually in presence of a government commissary; its resolutions, before taking effect, must have the royal sanction. It went into operation as early as 1816, and issued the regulations needed for the establishment of an ecclesiastical system in a very liberal spirit. In particular, it modified the obligation of the clergy with regard to the Church symbols by requiring that they should merely bind themselves to teach the doctrine which, in conformity to the Word of God, was contained in the symbols of the Dutch Church. Altogether, the antagonistic relations between the different Protestant parties ceased entirely; Reformed clergymen preached in the churches of the Lutherans, Remonstrants, and Mennonites, and there was even some talk of a union of all Protestant communions.  

Here, too, however, there was no lack of a reactionary party. At its head stood the most distinguished of the Dutch poets, Wilhelm Bilderdyk. He was a fanatical adherent of the House of Orange, attributed all the evils of modern times to the French

---

* Rhinwald's Repertor. vol. xi. art. 2; vol. xiv. 174. J. C. W. Augusti, Beitr. zur Geschichte und Statistik der Evangelischen Kirche, Leipsic, 1837, ii. 333 ss.
Revolution, and hoped every thing good from the strictest return to the old conditions. In this spirit, too, he treated Dutch history, which he taught as a private lecturer in Leyden. He was a decided adversary of all opponents of the House of Orange, even of the noblest characters whom the Netherlands have produced, such as Oldenbarneveld, Hugo Grotius, etc. Moreover, he was a zealous defender of the Dordrecht orthodoxy, although he himself was inwardly far removed from it, and secretly adhered to a gnostic cabalistic theosophy as the supreme wisdom. The school of Bilderdyk produced two men who were the first to combat more openly all innovations—Isaac da Costa, an advocate, who was likewise a poet, and a physician named Abraham Capadose, a Jew by birth, who had been led over to Christianity by Bilderdyk.

Da Costa opened the controversy with a treatise, Complaints against the Spirit of the Times (1823). In it he attacked the political as well as the ecclesiastical tendencies of the age, its extravagant desire for liberty, its aversion to all restraint, its infidelity and immorality, and prophesied, from these signs, the destruction of all governments if the world did not return to the old faith. But by this old faith he understood the rigid Calvinistic Dordrecht system, with its unconditional doctrine of predestination. The strange religiously fanatic and politically aristocratic spirit by which this man was animated likewise manifested itself in his declaring the abolition of slavery to be a chimera, because the negroes, as descendants of Ham, were still under the curse of Noah. Capadose, soon after this, came forward with even greater vigor in his work Vaccine Opposed (1823): he went so far in his delusion that, although himself a physician, he rejected vaccination because it interfered with God’s agency. Nevertheless, a few individuals declared themselves in favor of these fanatics, as, for example, Bilderdyk, who even published a treatise in defense of Da Costa; but, on the whole, the party of these obscurants remained quite insignificant, and never acquired any general influence in the Church. It was not till 1832 that a preacher, Hendrik de Cock, in the province of Groningen, advocated rigid Calvinism from a strictly ecclesiastical standpoint, at the same time demanding a more limited formula of obligation for the clergy, and the reinstatement of the old psalms instead of the Evangelical Hymns. He
was joined by a preacher named Scholte and a small band of fanatics, who created much disturbance. Both clergymen were deposed on account of irregular proceedings, and, in consequence, formed separate congregations, which counted several thousand members. This gave the Reformed National Church occasion, to directly confess and confirm its more liberal tendency.  

German Reformed Switzerland has always attached itself so closely to German literature that, with reference to intellectual progress, it can be counted as a part of Germany. Thus all the religious and ecclesiastical developments which have taken place in Germany are to be met with in this portion of Switzerland too. In Basle, where the Herrnhuters had for a long time had a community and many adherents, a pietistic tendency became prominent, and centred in the Missionary, Bible, and Tract societies which were formed there. The same spirit pervades the instruction given in the House of Missions in that city, which has already sent a large number of young men as missionaries to all parts of the world. The government, however, desires to promote a more rational education, and has proved this particularly by attracting many German scholars to the Basle University, in the hope of re-establishing that institution, which had entirely fallen into decay. Thus De Wette, who was deprived of his office in Berlin in 1819, was called to Basle as professor of theology in 1822, and gave to the study of theology there a new impulse and a new direction. In Zurich, on the other hand, Rationalism predominates, the champion of which, in the whole of Switzerland, is Dr. Johann Schulthess, professor at the Academy of that city. Aristocratic Berne, however, has always fostered orthodoxy, although none of the theologians attached to its Academy have become more generally known for scientific activity. Time will show whether the change of constitution effected in 1831, by which the ruling aristocracy was overthrown, will bring about a revolution in theological opinion.

The religious fanaticism of recent times was heightened in Switzerland particularly through the influence of Madame de Krüdener. On her departure from Switzerland, she left behind no small number of converts, or Awakened, who held special conventicles, and separated more or less from the Church. But a

---

horrible occurrence took place in Wildenspuch, in the northern part of the canton of Zurich, in 1823, which was occasioned by this religious fanaticism, yet, at the same time, served as an effective warning for the future. The chief actress in this occurrence was a peasant-girl, Margaretha Peter, who, as early as 1816, had come into contact with the sectarians in Mühlhausen and Basle, but subsequently, particularly through her acquaintance with Madame de Krüdener, gave herself up entirely to religious fanaticism. Margaretha soon acquired considerable distinction among the Awakened, even at a distance. This roused her spiritual pride; she seceded from the conventicles of the Herrnhuters and established others on her own account, in which she played the principal part. She related to her adherents visions of departed spirits, angels, and even Christ himself, which she professed to have had, and nourished them and herself from sources drawn from the most extravagantly fanatic books founded on the Apocalypse. While she proclaimed abstinence from marriage as the chief means of attaining inward perfection, she entered into a relation with a shoemaker which she herself designated as spiritual love, but which soon resulted in an adulterous connection, in which the deluded girl gave birth to a child. This event, by which her spiritual pride was greatly humbled, contributed to render her completely insane, in which state she was constantly having visions and fighting the devil, without shaking the confidence of her adherents even by the maddest freaks. Finally, she declared to them that, in order to save so many thousand souls, it was necessary that blood should flow—first, with the assistance of the others, killed her sister Elizabeth, and then caused herself to be crucified, accompanying both acts with the promise that she, as well as her sister, would rise again in three days.

Similar fanatics existed in the canton of Thurgau, whose perversion was also attributable to the influence of Madame de Krüdener. The terrible events in Wildenspuch, however, had the result that both the clerical and the secular authorities paid more attention to these disorders, so that they have since diminished perceptibly.6

In consequence of the French Revolution of July, 1830, dis-

turbances also arose in most of the Swiss cantons, with the aim of obtaining thoroughly democratic constitutions, and were directed partly against aristocratic forms of government and the rule of individual families, partly against the preference given to the capitals, which alone governed the country through their citizens. In several of the cantons, therefore, the constitutions were altered and new governments organized, and seven of them—Zurich, Berne, Lucerne, Solothurn, St. Gall, Aargau, and Thurgau—concluded, on March 17, 1832, a concordat, by which they mutually guaranteed their new constitutions. Joined to this political liberalism was the endeavor to further the enlightenment and education of the people, in order the better to fit them for the assertion and exercise of their new rights. Unfortunately, however, these efforts were often too exclusively directed toward the promotion of a one-sided intellectual culture, by which religious fervor and an attachment to the Church were not infrequently endangered. It was owing to this tendency, too, that the academies at Zurich and Berne were converted into universities. Inadequacy of means prevented both institutions from acquiring great importance, but they made themselves suspected by foreign powers by extending calls to various German scholars of reputation who had fallen into discredit with their governments, chiefly by their political course, in order to increase their own advantages. One result of this measure was that all German governments prohibited the attendance of these universities.

The new administration of Zurich, in particular, gave considerable offense to its people for some time. It was elaborating an improvement of the educational system, and established a seminary for school-teachers; but it seemed as if religious culture were entirely neglected in the latter, and the teachers who graduated from it gave cause for displeasure, both by their instruction and by their conduct. The clergy were taken but little notice of, and it seemed to be the object in view to deprive them more and more of their influence, and particularly of the supervision of the schools. The heads of the government openly displayed their indifference to the Church, and their example had so pernicious an influence that the corruption of public morals increased perceptibly. The dissatisfaction of the greater part of the people with this irreligious tendency finally reached a crisis
when, in February, 1839, the government, in spite of the opposition of the Theological Faculty and the Church council, extended a call, as professor of Church history and dogmatics, to Dr. Strauss, whose celebrated name promised new lustre to the University of Zurich, and who, at the same time, could be obtained without difficulty, as he had, for the moment, no hope of any appointment in Germany. Nor did the liberal heads of the government deny that it was their intention to effect a reformation of theological culture and of the spirit of the Church. They declared openly that the latter was stationary and antiquated, that something new must be created, and that a reorganization was indispensable; and Burgomaster Hirzel even forgot himself so far as to directly compare Dr. Strauss with Zwingli. But at this attempt to overthrow the old faith the people assumed an attitude which was as calm as it was firm and decided. They formed congregations, district associations, and a central committee, for the protection of their menaced interests; the government was compelled to desist from its purpose, and allow Strauss a pension before he had entered upon his office (March, 1839). But now the people demanded security against those plans of the government which had occasioned the call of Dr. Strauss. It claimed free representation of the Church in a synod composed of ecclesiastics and laymen, and that the Church council should be allowed an influence in the appointment of theological professors and members of the council of education, as well as in the religious instruction in schools. When these demands were only partially acceded to at the meeting of the Grand Council held in June, and, in particular, the mixed synod was rejected, the religious disturbances assumed a more and more threatening aspect. And when, finally, the rumor was circulated that the government was secretly demanding assistance from the confederate cantons for the maintaining of its constitution, and that foreign troops were to be called to aid, the people flocked to Zurich from every quarter on September 6, in order to obtain reassuring explanations from the authorities. Unfortunately, a momentary encounter took place between the military and the people, in which a number of persons were killed; but, on the whole, the greatest order was maintained. The government, acknowledging the common will of the people, was dissolved, and a new one formed, without any alteration
being effected in the constitution. The new government immediately granted the popular wishes for the confirmation of the National Church and the promotion of religion. The moderation shown by the people in struggling, with the loftiest enthusiasm, for its religion, and, even after its victory, allowing its vanquished opponents to withdraw unharmed and unmolested, is deserving of the highest esteem. In comparing this religious movement with the fanatical agitations to which religious zeal has so often led in Catholic countries, no unprejudiced mind can fail to be filled with respect for the Church and the religion to which this nation is attached. 7

A similar occurrence took place in Berne in 1847. The university gave a call to Professor Zeller, of Tübingen, who, like his teacher, F. Chr. Baur, belonged to the Hegelian school, as well as to that party which, by bold criticism, completely remodeled the oldest history of Christianity. Against this appointment, likewise, a strong opposition was raised, but it could not prevail. Zeller entered upon the position of professor of theology in Berne in the spring of 1847.

In French Switzerland, which consists of the cantons of Geneva and Vaud (capital Lausanne), great disturbances were occasioned by Mystic sectarians. 8

Here the most important city in respect to ecclesiastical matters is Geneva. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries it had such high distinction in the Church that it could be regarded as a Reformed Rome. The Reformed Congregations of France and England looked upon it as their Mother Church; young men flocked to it from all quarters in order to pursue their studies at its academy. It had the reputation of being the centre of ecclesiastical orthodoxy and theological learning. These conditions were altered particularly after the dissolution of the French Reformed Church under Louis XIV. Until that time, Geneva was continually incited to foster the theological sciences by the excellent French Reformed academies at Sedan

7 Des Zürcher Volkes Kampf und Sieg für seinen Christenglauben; Februar bis September, 1839, Zurich, 1839. 8. Der Kampf der Principien im Canton Zurich im Jahre 1839, von einem Augenzeugen ; in Ilgen's Zeitschrift f. hist. Theol. x. iii. 94. Die Straussischen Zerwürfnisse in Zürich von 1839, von Dr. H. Gelzer, Hamburg and Gotha, 1843.

8 Kirchenspaltung im Waadtlande von Leopold, see Niedner's Zeitschrift, 1846, p. 553.
and Saumur. When the latter were abolished, and all theological science died out in the French Reformed Church, after the banishment of its clergy, Geneva remained the sole French theological educational institution. It had now, indeed, to supply the whole French Reformed Church with preachers, who ministered to it in secret; but theological science came to a stand, as there was a total lack of external communication, and, for the same reason, began to retrograde. The highest value began to be attached to the practical activity of the clergy, particularly to pulpit oratory, while the theoretical departments of theology were neglected. In this way, as well as through the influence of the French philosophy of the eighteenth century, the dogma of this Church became freer and more moderate; a popular theology was developed, which laid peculiar stress upon the moral part of Christianity, but did not examine closely into its dogmatic substance. Hence, as early as the middle of the eighteenth century, the Encyclopedia of D'Alembert asserted with regard to the clergy of Geneva that, in reality, they confessed to a natural religion alone; and although the Genevese ecclesiastics at that time protested against the article in question, it yet appeared distinctly, from their own declarations, that they had departed entirely from the symbol of Calvin.

Owing to the general indifference to Church dogmas, no further controversy on this subject ensued on that occasion. It was only when, in the most recent times, fanaticism and zealotry, following in the train of the newly awakened interest in religion, frequently became prominent, that French Switzerland, and particularly Geneva, became the scene of religious controversies and schisms.

It must, however, be observed that at the commencement of these controversies the Church of Geneva had by no means degenerated or become disordered. The ecclesiastical conditions were strictly regulated; a religious spirit and a purity of morals prevailed to a degree which is rarely met with in large cities. No reproach could be made to the clergy (la vénérable compagnie) with regard to any neglect of their duties, nor was there the slightest blemish upon their moral reputation. Their sermons, indeed, were mostly of an ethical and generally religious character. They not only did not combat the positive doctrines of Christianity, but, for the most part, did not discuss them at
all. Strangers who visited Geneva have censured its clergy for paying too much attention to a florid style in the pulpit, for displaying too much grandiloquence in their sermons, and declaiming too theatrically. It must, however, be remembered that the French character demands these things, and that what we should consider excess appears, to a Frenchman, quite suitable for the pulpit, so that he would find fault with a greater simplicity. All great French pulpit orators have fallen more or less into the same error.

Under these circumstances, it was but natural that the impulse to the controversies in question should not proceed from the midst of the Genevese Church, but that it should be given by strangers.

This was first done by Madame de Krüdener, who came to Geneva as early as 1813, remained there for some length of time, and held conventicles. One of her chief adherents there was a young student named Empaytaz, who subsequently accompanied her in her wanderings, and finally became the originator of the controversies in Geneva. In 1816, after peace had been generally restored, many Englishmen made their appearance in French Switzerland, and especially in Geneva, for the most part as agents of the great English Bible and Tract societies, in order to found, and as much as possible direct, similar societies upon the Continent. Among these Englishmen many were inclined to Methodism, and sought to gain friends for it in Switzerland. One of those who were most active in this direction was a Scotchman named Halden, and he succeeded in winning for his cause a young Genevese clergyman by the name of Malan, tutor in the College of Geneva, who also played an important part in the subsequent controversies.

These individuals took great pains to spread abroad in Geneva the accusation that the clergy did not teach pure Christianity, that they withheld its most important and essential doctrines, and did not themselves believe in them; and that, therefore, instead of feeding their flocks like faithful shepherds, they were leading them to destruction.

Empaytaz opened the controversy with a treatise, Considérations sur la Divinité de Jésus-Christ (1816), addressed to the students of theology in Geneva, in order to prove to them that the doctrine of the divinity of Christ had its foundation in the
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Scriptures, and was expressed in the Reformed symbols; that the whole Christian religion was based upon it, and that, therefore, the Genevese clergy had had no right to reject it. Joined to this declaration were admonitions to the students not to allow themselves to be led astray by their unbelieving academical instructors.

Not long after this, Malan created a sensation by a sermon preached about Easter, 1817, and subsequently printed, from the text, *L'homme ne peut être sauvé que par Jésus-Christ*. In it he spoke of the sinfulness of man, owing to which he was utterly lost, and totally incapable of doing any thing for his own salvation; that hence the belief that we could accomplish any good works through our own strength was pernicious, and that nothing remained to us but to accept the mercy of God offered us in the redemption.

Upon this the *vénérable compagnie* issued, on May 3, 1817, a regulation by which it determined that all clergymen, as well as such persons as desired to be ordained as clergymen, should bind themselves not to make any assertions, in their sermons, either with regard to the manner in which the divine nature of Christ is connected with his person, or with regard to original sin, the operation of grace, or predestination. In case they should have occasion to mention these subjects, they were to employ, as much as possible, the words of Scripture, and in their explanations not to go beyond these same Scriptural expressions.

A third party now joined in the controversy who was impelled by entirely different motives, and adopted a totally different course from that of the other opponents of the Genevese Church. This was an advocate named Grenus. He had been notorious for his immorality, but was now old, in poor health, and morose, and took part in this controversy from no interest in religion, but merely with the intention of deeply mortifying the clergy of Geneva. He looked at the matter entirely from a judicial point of view, and endeavored to show that the Genevese clergy, in swearing to the constitution, had also sworn to the dogmatics of Calvin; that they were guilty of perjury, and should therefore be deposed from office for violation of the constitution. In this spirit he wrote several treatises full of the bitterest and most venomous attacks against the clergy of Geneva, until the police interfered and brought him to trial on a charge
of calumny. He was pronounced guilty and sentence was passed upon him, but his death forestalled its execution.

The sectarians, however, had nothing in common with Grenus, although his activity was directed in their favor. We will therefore return to them.

In consequence of the regulation referred to above, a young country pastor named Bost was deposed because he would not submit to it. He came to Geneva, joined Empaytaz, and the two placed themselves at the head of a religious association composed chiefly of Englishmen and a few Genevese, which, in the autumn of 1817, divided entirely from the National Church, under the name of La Nouvelle Église, and held separate assemblies at a private residence. They confess the rigid Calvinist orthodoxy, which, according to their opinion, is the only true Christianity, and was the doctrine of the primitive Christians.

Malan did not join this new Church, but continued to give his instruction in the spirit of his previous declarations, asserted the doctrine of the total depravity of human nature, and a very extreme theory of atonement; and when, in spite of the admonitions of his superiors, he would not discontinue this mode of teaching, he was dismissed in November, 1818. Nevertheless, he did not leave the National Church, although he began to hold devotional meetings (réunions de prière) at his house, which were soon well attended. But as, on these occasions, he continued to declaim against the unbelief of the Genevese clergy, and, in addition, discharged pastoral functions contrary to the Church regulations, he was deprived of his spiritual office. Upon this he declared his secession from the National Church, and gave his meetings the character of an independent society.

From the very beginning of these schisms these sectarians have never ceased to cast upon the Genevese clergy, in foreign countries, the aspersion that they have fallen off from true Christianity. By their doctrines of unconditional predestination and the necessity of an inner conviction of having obtained the grace of God, they have often had a very pernicious influence upon their adherents, so that no small number of the latter have become insane, or have been driven to suicide. On the other hand, they were the constant objects of derision of the Genevese rabble, and frequently met with personal abuse from them, on some occasions even giving rise to a mob by their meetings. The
people gave them the name of Momiers (maskers), i.e. disguised hypocrites. At present there are three Independent Congregations in Geneva. At the head of the one (Église de Témoignage) is Malan, as pastor; at the head of the other, Empaytaz; and of the third, Bost. Together they form one Church, in which, however, there is no lack of difference of opinion. Malan and Empaytaz are strict predestinarians, but the other clergymen look upon the doctrine of election as a mystery, with regard to which they do not presume to decide.

A new phenomenon appeared in 1831. A number of ecclesiastics and laymen of the National Church formed in Geneva an Evangelical Society (Société Evangélique), for the purpose of defending the old Scriptural doctrine against the Socinian errors which had found their way into the Church, and founded, with this intention, an École de Théologie, opposed to the Académie, the theological school of the State. This institution was opened January 30, 1832. Of the teachers attached to it, the two principal ones were Germans—Steiger and Hävernick—but it attracted only a small number of pupils. This Evangelical Society found more favor among the French Reformed. A similar association was formed in Paris, and from these two central points—Paris and Geneva—many agents were sent, after 1835, to travel through France in order to sell Bibles and found new congregations entirely separate from and independent of the National Church, as has been related in the ecclesiastical history of France.

When the schisms of the Church commenced in Geneva, and the heterodoxy of the Genevese clergy thus came to light, the clergy of the canton de Vaud, who had, for the most part, retained the symbolical doctrinal system, very generally sided with the assailants; and the clergymen of Lausanne, at their head Dean Curtat, even dissolved all connection with the unbelieving clergy of Geneva. But since 1820 the Momiers, in particular wealthy Englishmen, gained ground also in the canton de Vaud. They there met, indeed, with more orthodoxy than in Geneva; but it seemed to them a mere dead belief in the letter, and they therefore established conventicles, in order thus to foster a living Christianity. Several younger clergymen joined them, and were especially sought after by the members of the societies, while worthy older pastors were neglected, and schisms arose in the
congregations. Upon this, Curtat, too, declared himself against the Momiers; the conventicles were forbidden by the government, and the clergymen who would not yield were deposed. Three of these now also signified their intention of leaving the National Church and forming an independent society. The Grand Council of the canton, however, did not accede to this demand, but, in 1824, prohibited all sectarian assemblies under severe penalties. Nevertheless, Separatist churches were subsequently formed in several cities, and for a long time were molested only by the insults of the rabble, as the authorities seemed to ignore their existence. It was not till the year 1829 that the measures of the government were renewed, and the churches in question were closed, without, however, effecting a suppression of Separatism in that canton. Thus the Momiers increased the number of malcontents, who, in consequence of the French Revolution of July, brought about a revolution also in the canton de Vaud (1830), and established a more liberal constitution. In consequence, the Momiers regained liberty of worship, and soon became very powerful. The wealthy English attracted the rich and aristocratic portion of the inhabitants; the younger clergymen inclined more and more to Methodism. Thus the Methodists, through their connection with the aristocracy, acquired an important influence on the government, the academy in Lausanne, and the National Church. It is true that an opposition arose against them, which strove to make the Church more and more independent of the State; and in 1838 the Grand Council, contrary to the advice of the Council of State, abolished the Helvetic Confession of Faith, and declared the Bible the sole standard. But now the Methodist clergymen, who were already quite numerous, began to complain of the unbelief which was gaining ground, and held separate meetings of believers, which assumed more and more the form of a Church within the Church. It was particularly the increasing influence of the Methodists upon the government which occasioned the revolution of February 14, 1845. By it a complete democracy was established, which was looked upon with great disfavor by the aristocrats, who formed the nucleus of the Methodist party, as well as by the clergy, who desired authority in the Church, and the independence of the latter of the State. The pulpits, therefore, resounded with the most vehement invectives against the new order of things, which
was particularly accused of promoting communism and atheism. The government now resolved to have a proclamation read from the pulpit, on the occasion of taking the vote for the constitution, in order to refute the above reproaches. A number of clergymen, however, refused to read this proclamation, under the pretext that the pulpit should not be made a political arena, notwithstanding that similar government orders had formerly been read in that way, and those who now refused were the very ones who had most abused the pulpit by political invectives. When the government threatened to enforce obedience, one hundred and sixty clergymen sent in their resignation (November 13, 1845). The authorities, however, adhered to their order. Several clergymen revoked their resignation, but the rest, with their followers, decided to establish a Church association independent of the National Church, notwithstanding the consent of the government was not forthcoming, and could not, indeed, be expected.  

§ 9.

HISTORY OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN GERMANY.

The German Catholic hierarchy had fallen into great decay at the time of the redeliverance of Germany. By the cession of the left bank of the Rhine, many German bishoprics had formerly been divided. The French portions of these, according to the French concordat of 1801, were united with French bishoprics; but the German portions fell into a tedious provisional state. After the property of all the bishoprics and cathedral chapters had been secularized, in 1803, according to the decree of the imperial deputies (Reichsdeputations-Hauptschluss), it was necessary to give the dioceses new boundaries as well as to endow them anew; but the matter was much delayed by the ceaseless
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changes in the kingdoms and states, as well as by the imprison-
ment of the Pope. Hence the majority of the German bishops,
with their cathedral chapters, had died out when, in 1814, the
Treaty of Paris promised a more lasting condition of state af-
fairs, and seemed to give a firm foundation to the adjustments of
ecclesiastical matters. At that time there were only five German
bishops, nearly all of very advanced age, left outside of Austria.
One of them, the Bishop of Fulda, died in the same year (1814).

The great political revolutions which had taken place, together
with their consequences, had not remained without great influ-
ence on the internal conditions of the Catholic Church in Ger-
many. The higher hierarchy had lost, with its secular posses-
sions, a large portion of its strength: as it gradually died out,
the hierarchical supervision diminished all the more. A liberal
party could therefore develop with impunity even among the
Catholic clergy, as also a party closely allied to the Protestant
Pietists; while things could be taught and printed about the
Catholic dogma and constitution which formerly would have
been strongly reprehended. The convents, which had been the
seat not only of the most rigid orthodoxy, but also of gross super-
stition and ultramontane doctrines of canon law, were abolished;
the monks were no longer formidable to the secular clergy, and
had lost their influence with the people; and thus nothing stood
in the way of a wider diffusion, even among the latter, of the lib-
eral as well as the Pietistic principles which had sprung up.

By the Treaty of Paris of 1814, many Catholic provinces of
Germany had fallen under the jurisdiction of Protestant princes.
Austria and Bavaria were the only two great states whose mon-
archs confessed the Catholic faith; while the Protestant rulers
of Prussia, Würtemberg, Hanover, Baden, and Hesse had many
Catholic provinces added to their possessions.

It might have been expected that under these Protestant gov-
ernments both the liberal Catholic and the Pietistic tendencies,
which had grown up spontaneously until then, would continue to
develop quietly; but we find, on the contrary, that, immediately
after the treaty in question, a rigid Catholicism, often verging on
Ultramontanism, of which no trace had appeared in a long time,
became prominent in Germany too, and that even men who had
formerly shone in the first ranks of the liberals went over to it.
The cause of this was partly the same which restored the pre-
ponderance to the strict Catholic principles in the adjoining Catholic states—France, Spain, and Italy; partly, too, the example of these countries had an influence, androused imitation; and partly the above condition of things resulted, as a reaction, from the circumstance that these Catholic provinces were now under the rule of Protestant princes. The delusion that the Protestant governments would make it their aim gradually to convert the Catholic Church to Protestantism, and to curtail its old rights, caused great excitement in many Catholic countries. The opinion that the Protestants, proud of a superior cultivation, looked down with contempt upon the Catholics, and regarded their faith as a mere superstition, revived the interest in Church matters even in those who had grown very lukewarm; and the idea that the existence of Catholicism was at stake gave a new impulse to the zeal for the Church. In the provinces which formerly belonged to France, indifferentism had become very prevalent among the educated classes; but even those who had entirely ceased to attend church stepped into the ranks decidedly when the Catholic interest was in question, although for them it was merely a political one, to which they, as born Catholics, considered themselves attached. On the other hand, as has been remarked, it frequently happened that Catholics who had previously held very liberal opinions now went over to Ultramontanism, and declared themselves in favor of the strictest comprehension of the dogma, as well as for the Papal system in Church polity.

The latest history of the Catholic Church in Germany, therefore, has to consider:

1. The new organization of the Church government by concordats between the German states and the Pope.

2. The struggle between the liberal and ultramontane parties, together with the state of theological science among the Catholics.

3. The tendency to mysticism in some portions of Catholic Southern Germany.

4. The relations existing between Catholics and Protestants.

However urgent the necessity of a new division and organization of the dioceses, as well as the filling of the episcopal offices, the negotiations entered into with the Roman See on this subject did not reach a speedy termination. At the Congress of Vienna, the Curia had demanded the restoration of all ecclesiastical prin-
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cipalities and convents, as well as the restitution of all secularized Church property; and when this demand was not acceded to, had entered a solemn protest against the Vienna decrees. It was, therefore, in no haste to enter into any agreements concerning a new ecclesiastical organization with the German princes who had taken possession of the Church property in question, because it would thereby appear to confirm the secularizations which had taken place. So many important revolutions had succeeded each other within the past few years that the new condition of affairs did not at first meet with much confidence; and thus Rome seemed to be inclined to wait for the possible arising of more favorable conjunctures. On the other hand, the secular states intended for the future to guard their sovereign rights against ecclesiastical interference, and to take the opportunity offered by the new organization of ecclesiastical affairs to make the necessary provisions for this end. Rome was, of course, reluctant to enter into these intentions, and this delayed the conclusion of the requisite agreements.

It would perhaps have been better if the German sovereigns had made common cause in these negotiations with Rome, because a more extensive and more powerful alliance would have more easily succeeded in obtaining favorable conditions; but their interests were too varied; and, moreover, a negotiation which required at every point the consent of so many courts threatened to become too protracted and complicated. Hence, the larger German states began to negotiate with Rome separately, and only the minor South German princes joined in a common negotiation.

Bavaria first concluded a concordat with Rome, June 5, 1817. The Bavarian agent, Bishop Baron von Häffelin, who at that time was over eighty years of age, had formerly been one of the most active members of the Order of the Illuminati, as well as a zealous friend of enlightenment. Like many others, however, he had changed his course of late, and now concluded a concordat which was as favorable to the Papal See as it could possibly be under existing circumstances. As a reward the Pope conferred upon him the dignity of cardinalis ad honores. By this concordat Bavaria received two archbishoprics and six bishoprics, i.e. the archbishopric of Munich and Freysing, with the bishoprics of Augsburg, Passau, and Ratisbon; and the archbishopric of Bam-
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Complaints were justly raised to the effect that this number of bishoprics, which, together with their cathedral chapters and seminaries, all had to be endowed by the State, was far too large for Bavaria, as one archbishopric and four bishoprics would entirely suffice for the ecclesiastical wants of the kingdom. It was also a ground for censure that the King promised (Art. 7) to have several convents for both sexes re-established, which were to be devoted partly to the instruction of youth, partly to the care of the sick, and partly to the support of the clergy. It was claimed, and with good reason, that such a re-establishment would occasion the State an almost useless expense, as convents were the most unsuitable institutions for the education of youth; as monks, likewise, were not well adapted to replace the pastors in the cure of souls, their aim being generally merely to promote and encourage superstition; and as the orders devoted to the care of the sick were the only ones in favor of which any thing could be said. Art. 9 of this concordat conferred upon the King the permanent power of nominating the archbishops and bishops as well as the deans of the chapters. The provosts were to be appointed by the Pope. The canonships, which were vacated in the *menses papales*, were to be filled by the King; the remainder in part by the bishop, in part by the chapter. The Pope reserved for himself the confirmation of the archbishops and bishops, for which annats were to be paid, as formerly. By this the churches were deprived of the old canonical privilege of free election; the Pope bestowed it upon the King, in order thus to gain other advantages. The right of the Pope to nominate the provosts for all chapters placed in his hands the means of rewarding faithful adherents in Germany, zealous defenders of the Papal system, and officious spies. Art. 13 was also questionable, in which the government promised to prevent the circulation of all books which would be designated to them by the bishops as dangerous to pure doctrine and good morals. It was to be feared that in this way the cultivation of learning might be much imperiled by such prohibitions of books as were issued from a limited ecclesiastical standpoint. Finally (Art. 10), the return of a Papal nuncio to Munich was announced. This, too, caused dissatisfaction; for the Papal nuncios had always interfered in the rights of the bishops, and, at any rate, they served as Papal emissaries, who
gave an exact report of all ecclesiastical conditions existing in Germany. In particular, the Protestant subjects of Bavaria were much disturbed by this concordat. The first article promised that the Catholic religion should be protected in Bavaria, with all the rights and privileges which belonged to it by divine appointment and by the canonical decrees. By the promise of prerogatives here given to that Church, the principle of civil equality between Protestants and Catholics which had hitherto been maintained, was apparently intended to be annulled; the reference to the canonical decrees seemed to justify this construction, for, according to them, all non-Catholics were virtually without rights. And, furthermore, the Protestants could not but be alarmed at the censorship allowed the bishops in Art. 13, for the latter thus obtained the right to banish the whole Protestant literature from Bavaria. The Protestants were, however, reassured by the State Constitution which was established May 26, 1818, which insured complete liberty of conscience to all the inhabitants of the realm, as well as equal civil and political rights to the three Christian Church communions existing in the kingdom. It can by no means be denied that there is an irreconcilable discrepancy between the prærogativi, quibus frui debet ecclesia Catholicac ex canonicis sanctionibus, as they are promised in the concordat, and this decree of the State Constitution; but the government hitherto has always given the preference to the latter.

The other German states with which Rome had to confer with regard to the organization of the Catholic Church had Protestant sovereigns. The decisions respecting these national churches, therefore, although they too were based on negotiations, were not given in the form of concordats, or agreements, between the temporal and spiritual powers, but in the shape of Papal bulls; because it is not consistent with the Papal dignity to conclude open and acknowledged treaties with non-Catholics on affairs of the Catholic Church. Hence the Pope, in these bulls, gave himself the air of deciding upon the Church matters in question entirely of his own free impulse and by his own authority; but they did not become valid until the sovereigns confirmed them and proclaimed them to their subjects as laws. As these bulls were the result of previous agreements, they are es-

1 Das Baierische Concordat im Verhältniss zum Religionsedict, in Lippert's Annalen des Kirchenrechts, 2 pts. Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1832.
sentially concordats, and are usually called so; in form, however, they are not entitled to the name.

The Bavarian concordat was followed by that of Prussia, or the bull *De Salute Animarum* of July 16, 1821. By it the whole Catholic population of Prussia was divided among two archbishoprics and six bishoprics. In the eastern part of the monarchy the archbishopric of Gnesen and Posen was established, under which was placed the bishopric of Kulm. The two bishoprics of Breslau and Ermland were declared exempt. In the western portion of the kingdom, on the other hand, the archbishopric of Cologne was restored, and the three bishoprics of Treves, Münster, and Paderborn assigned to it. All chapters were allowed the free election of their bishops; the Pope reserved for himself the appointment of the provosts and the filling of such canonships as might become vacant in the six Papal months; upon the bishops, finally, was conferred the filling of the deanships, as well as that of the canonships which should become vacant in the remaining months of the year. These decisions, indeed, seemed to contain much that was questionable with regard to the nominations for vacant offices, and, in particular, to allow the Pope too great an influence on the National Church. It is, however, quite certain that, aside from the bull officially published with regard to Prussia, a secret agreement was entered into with the Pope, by which he bound himself to adapt his nominations to vacant offices to the wishes of the government; and that, in addition, the chapters have been secretly instructed by Rome to choose, when the election of bishops falls to them, only such men as are approved of by the king.

Next followed the concordat with Hanover, through the bull *Impensa Romanorum Pontificum Sollicitudo* of March 26, 1824. By it the two bishoprics of Hildesheim and Osnabrück were restored, both of which were to be exempt from any metropolitan connection, and to be directly under the Papal See. The nominations to the episcopal see and chapter of Osnabrück, however, were postponed, as the means for endowment were wanting, and it was decided that, for the present, the Bishop of Hildesheim should also rule over the diocese of Osnabrück by a vicar-general stationed there, who should be appointed *episcopus in partibus* by the Pope, in order that he might perform the episcopal official functions in the diocese. The elec-
tion of bishops was intrusted to the chapters; the nomination of the canons was to fall alternately to the bishops and the chapters. Previous to each election, the list of candidates was to be submitted to the State authorities, which were to have the right to strike out the names of such candidates as did not meet with their approbation. The office of provost in the chapters was not created, and consequently no nomination was reserved for the Pope in those bodies. The annats were fixed at a moderate rate. This concordat is quite as fair to the Catholic National Church as it is regardful of the rights of the government.

The remaining German states, particularly Würtemberg, Baden, the two Hesses, Nassau, and the Hanseatic cities, appointed a commission in 1818 to meet in Frankfort-on-the-Main, in order to determine the principles according to which they would conclude a joint concordat with Rome. In so doing, they intended not only to assert the rights of the State with the Church, but also the claims of the German Church and bishops with the Pope of Rome, in accordance with the principles of the modern liberal Catholic canonists; to make the German Church more independent of Rome, and, at the same time, to establish the possibility of a more liberal scientific culture of the clergy. Of the results of these conferences which have been made public, the following are the most prominent:

- The boundaries of the dioceses are to be conformed to the political limits of the German states, but in such a manner that several states can be united in one diocese. The bishops are to be elected as follows: An electoral college, consisting of the cathedral capitularies and the same number of rural deans of the diocese, is to nominate three candidates, from whom the sovereign chooses a bishop. The sovereign can confer the exclusiva before the nomination, or he can refuse his sanction to the latter and order a new election. Only those candidates are eligible who for eight years have either held a high ecclesiastical position or devoted themselves to pastoral duties. The Papal sanction must be obtained by the archbishop, and must be given within four months, if the Pope raises no objection to the person of the candidate chosen. Should such objections exist, they will be decided upon by a tribunal convened in the province where the election takes place. In case the Pope should still delay his

* Vater's Anbau, ii. 63. Deutsche Blätter, iv. 49.
sanction, the archbishop is to assume his original right of confirmation. The bishops are not to take the oath of fealty to the Pope which has been common since Gregory VII., but merely to promise him, by a simple formula, canonical obedience and a faithful discharge of their pastoral duties. All exemptions from the episcopal jurisdiction are abolished. To the bishop alone belongs the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline. In cases of excommunication, however, or in sentencing ecclesiastics to heavy penalties, he must ask the consent of the State authorities. Further, the bishop may prohibit the use of certain printed books in churches and schools, but also only with the sanction of the government. In all Church matters he alone can grant the necessary dispensations, and may also, in case of need, divest both secular and monastic ecclesiastics of their clerical character and restore them to the state of laymen. The cathedral capitularies are to be chosen alternately by the sovereign and the bishop; the dean of the cathedral is appointed by the sovereign from the chapter. The chanting of the canonical hours is to be abolished. The scientific theological education of the Catholic clergy is to be carried on by Catholic faculties which are to be established in conjunction with the national universities. With each episcopal see there is to be connected a theological seminary, at which the candidates for the priesthood, after having completed their three years' course at the university, are to spend a year in preparation for their practical duties. Diocesan and provincial synods are to be held regularly. At the provincial synods the archbishop will preside. Further rights of the archbishop are, the consecration of the bishops of his province, the second instance in appeals from episcopal judgments, the *jus supplendi*, when the bishop neglects his official duties, and the care of orphaned churches. The sovereign possesses, with regard to the Church, the *jus majestaticum circa sacra*; no ecclesiastical decree can be published or be valid without the sovereign *placet* or *videt*. When any abuse of ecclesiastical power takes place, all who feel injured thereby are entitled to an appeal to the government, the *recursus ab abusu*. No convents are to be restored. No Papal nuncio can ever reside permanently in the German states. When any appeal is made to Rome from an archiepiscopal judgment in Church matters, the Pope is obliged, according to the decrees of the Council of Basle, to authorize synodal judges
in the province to give a verdict; no proceedings can take place before judges from other provinces. No tribute shall be paid to the Roman Curia for the confirmation of bishops. For the preservation of civil order, uniformity is to be restored between the Catholic and Protestant festivals, and to this end those holidays hitherto observed by Catholics or Protestants alone are to be transferred to the following or preceding Sunday.

These principles, it is true, were entirely in agreement with the point of view of the liberal German canonists; but when, soon after, an embassy went to Rome to negotiate a concordat upon these foundations, serious difficulties arose there, as might have been expected. The envoys, after long delay, received a diffuse "statement of the sentiments of His Holiness upon the declaration of the united Protestant sovereigns of August 10, 1819," in which forty-four points were mentioned, with regard to which the Pope declared that he could not accede to the propositions made. In the first place, he objected to mention being made of the bishops alone as rulers of the Church, and claimed that the Pope, by virtue of his primacy, ruled and directed the Church in general as its supreme head. Further, he insisted that the education of the clergy should be carried on solely in seminaries which were exclusively dependent on the bishops; their being educated at universities was utterly rejected, because the extreme liberty prevailing at these institutions was dangerous to future ecclesiastics, and the teachers connected with them did not give sufficient guarantee for the truth of their doctrine. The participation of rural deans in the election of bishops was also rejected, because this proposition involved the tendency to introduce a spirit of democracy into the Church; and this seemed to be merely the first step towards subsequently admitting the whole clergy, and perhaps even the people, to the election in question. No less decided was the declaration that the nomination to an ecclesiastical dignity in the Catholic Church could not be left to a non-Catholic sovereign; that such a one could neither be allowed to choose a bishop from three elected candidates, nor to fill vacant canonships. With regard to the confirmation of elections, the Pope would not be bound to any special length of time; neither the informatory proceedings nor the consecration of bishops should appertain to the metropolitan, but they were to be conferred by the Pope upon a bishop at his discretion. In like
manner those propositions were rejected by which the jurisdiction of the metropolitans seemed likely to be re-established in its old extent. The existing Papal reservations were to remain. The disciplinary power of the bishops was to be free from all interference of the State authorities.

The respective principles and demands of the negotiating parties diverged too far to make a general agreement possible, and both sides therefore dropped other subjects of discussion, and contented themselves with arranging a new circumscription of the dioceses, as well as the revenues of the bishops and their chapters. This was the sole substance of the Papal bull Provi-da Solersque of August 16, 1821. By it an archbishopric and four bishoprics were established for the states of the South German Protestant princes. The archbishopric of Freiburg was to comprise the grand-duchy of Baden and the two principalities of Hohenzollern. For the grand-duchy of Hesse the bishopric of Mayence was founded; for Electoral Hesse, that of Fulda; for Württemberg, the bishopric of Rottenburg-on-the-Neckar; for Nassau and the free city of Frankfort, that of Limburg-on-the Lahn. After the governments had accepted this bull, they immediately designated the bishops in order to propose them to the Pope for confirmation. At the same time they caused the principles agreed upon at Frankfort some time previous to be drawn up in the form of a system of Church pragmatics, submitted the latter to the newly elected bishops, and called upon them to acknowledge the Church Constitution which it contained as that of the province, and conform to it exactly. This demand was made in secret, but the matter was betrayed by certain persons in Fulda, and the Church Pragmatics appeared in print. At this the ultramontanes were highly indignant, and the Pope was all the more reluctant to confirm the election of the bishops that several of them, as liberal theologians, were looked upon with disfavor in Rome, and now, in addition, were suspected of having secretly agreed to the Church Pragmatics. The Curia, moreover, wished to have the manner of the future election of bishops regulated before the confirmation was granted; and in order finally to obtain bishops for their Catholic subjects, the Protestant princes were compelled to yield in this matter. Upon this the bishops designated were at last confirmed; but, at the same time, the Pope issued the bull Ad Domi-
nici Gregis Custodiam of April 11, 1817, by which it was decreed that, in future, episcopal elections should be effected by the chapters alone, but that the latter should submit the lists of candidates to the sovereign, who should be at liberty to strike out any names of which he disapproved; and, further, that such canonships as might become vacant should be filled alternately by the bishops and the chapters; but that the sovereign, in this case likewise, should have the right to strike out, from the lists of candidates previously submitted to him, the names of those to whom he objected. The sovereigns concerned did not, however, resign the intention of carrying through the principles previously agreed upon, at least in their essential substance; on the contrary, they published them as national laws in a joint proclamation of January 30, 1830. By this it was decreed that all ecclesiastical ordinances, even those issued by the Pope, were subject to the sanction of the State before being made public; that no ecclesiastical disputes could be brought before foreign judges; that no tribute could be demanded either by native or foreign spiritual authorities; that provision should be made at the universities for the scientific education of candidates for the priesthood, and seminaries be established for their subsequent practical training; that in cases of abuse of spiritual power an appeal to the State authorities was admissible. Against this proclamation there appeared a Papal rescript of June 30, 1830 (Tübingen Theological Quarterly, 1830, iv. 787), in which it was called "a scandal of innovations."

In the majority of the allied states these ordinances seemed to meet with a willing reception from the Catholic clergy; it was only in Electoral Hesse that they encountered opposition, from the rigidly Catholic spirit of the clergy in Fulda. In Württemberg and Baden the university studies of the Catholic clergy had been regulated previous to this time, inasmuch as Baden has an entirely Catholic university, Freiburg; and in Württemberg a Catholic Theological Faculty is attached to the National University of Tübingen. Hesse-Darmstadt established, November 27, 1830, a Catholic Theological Faculty at Giessen; Hesse-Cassel, in conjunction with Nassau, did the same at Marburg. The latter state, however, met with such vehement opposition on the part of the Episcopal Curia at Fulda that it abolished the faculty in question, and left the education of its Catholic clergy to the Episcopal Seminary in Fulda.
It is evident, however, that the conflict between the Papal pretensions and the demands of these states is by no means at an end, but is only allowed to rest temporarily, because Rome has no opportunity of asserting its claims. The controversy between Prussia and Rome excited the ultramontanes in this case too, and they attempted, particularly in Württemberg and Baden, to recover greater privileges for the Church by representing its condition as that of a complete subjection by the State. They failed in their efforts, however, especially after the propositions of the Bishop of Rottenburg at the Württemberg Diet had been rejected (1842).

We now take up the history of the progress of ecclesiastical and theological culture among the Catholics in Germany.

Under Joseph II., and by the Congress of Ems, a more liberal tendency had gained ground among the Catholics in Germany, which was much strengthened by the subsequent political events, by the French Revolution and the secularization of the ecclesiastical states consequent upon the dissolution of the German Empire. The mania for liberty which, through the French Revolution, spread over the whole of Europe seized also upon some parts of the Catholic Church. In the German portion of it, too, many voices were raised in favor of liberty of conviction, ecclesiastical independence, and the uprooting of superstition and Church despotism; and even though but few yielded themselves up entirely to the vortex which threatened to destroy the whole Catholic Church in France, the new doctrines, so far as, in fact, they could not but force themselves upon every thinking individual, found general access. As, immediately after, the diocesan division of Germany was annulled by political changes, and, in consequence, the German bishops lost their power, and gradually died out, the German Catholic Church was deprived of a close, menacing, and strict supervision, and the clergy could the more fearlessly adopt such liberal views. The aim of these liberals was to reconstruct the Church according to reasonable principles. They feigned, indeed, to uphold the unassailability of the Catholic doctrine as it is found in the Holy Scriptures and in actual common tradition, and has been expressed by ecumenical councils, but they dropped many points which until then had been considered a part of it, pronouncing them later additions, which
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could only be looked upon as theological opinions, not as dogmas. At the same time, they endeavored to prove the rationality of those doctrines which they acknowledged as such, and to this end not unfrequently permitted themselves modifications and interpretations that were in strong contradiction to Roman Catholicism. They wished to remodel the form of public worship according to the demands of the time; instead of the Latin ritual, they proposed to introduce a German liturgy; all superstitious ceremonies were to be abolished. With regard to Church polity, they demanded that the Church should acknowledge the right of supervision of the State, and that in this way the abuse of spiritual power should be prevented. The Pope was to be nothing more than a bishop-in-chief, who should exercise a general superintendence over the Church, but should have neither dominion nor power over the same. His aim was to be to guard, as centrum unitatis, against any deviation from ecclesiastical orthodoxy. Should he discover any such, he might try the effect of admonitions. In case these proved fruitless, he could call for an investigation, or, in important cases, even convolve a general synod. He himself, however, was not to be entitled to interfere by a judgment.

The man who for a long time could be looked upon as the head of this liberal movement was Benedict Maria Werkmeister, who was first a Benedictine monk, then pastor, and finally, for many years, upper ecclesiastical councilor in Stuttgart, and as such represented the State in the direction of the Catholic Church in Würtemberg (d. 1823). The most distinguished of his writings are, Thomas Freikirch, oder freimüthige Untersuchungen über die Unfehlbarkeit der katholischen Kirche (Frankfort and Leipsic, 1792); An die unbescheidenen Verehrer der Heiligen, besonders Mariä (Hadamar, 1801). In particular he exercised great influence by means of the Jahresschrift für Theologie and Kirchenrecht der Katholiken, which he edited at Ulm from 1806 until his death, and for which he himself furnished the greater part of the articles; for in it nearly the whole dogmatic system, the ecclesiastical polity, and the form of worship of the Catholic Church are discussed from the above-mentioned liberal point of view.

Like Werkmeister in Würtemberg, Wessenberg, as vicar-general of the diocese of Constance, was active in a similar spirit.
But in his case the tendency to criticism was less prominent; he rather strove, by his writings and his official influence, to awaken a rational religious spirit, and tacitly let it wear off the excrescences of Catholicism. Thus he promoted the culture of his clergy by pastoral conferences which he established; gradually introduced a German liturgy; imperceptibly abolished superstitious usages, and the like.

But this development of liberalism in the Catholic Church has been interrupted since 1814. When the Papacy was restored, and seemed to fall back into its old place, the episcopacy was about to be reinstated in Germany, and it could be foreseen that the future German bishops, by their relation to Rome, would be forced to suppress the liberal tendency which had gained the upper-hand, an ultramontane party suddenly emerged from obscurity, and many even who until then had belonged to the liberals now went over to Ultramontanism. A vehement struggle consequently arose between the ultramontanes and the liberals, the former accusing the latter of having seceded from Catholicism, and they charging the ultramontanes with being hirelings and slaves of Rome, and in part renegades. The following journals became the chief organs of the ultramontane party:

The Literary Gazette for Catholic instructors in religion, which was begun in 1810 by Felder, in Landshut, but subsequently, under its new editor, Mastiaux, who formerly belonged to the liberals, assumed a thoroughly ultramontane character, which it continued to maintain under its next editor, Von Kerz.

The Catholic, which, commenced in 1819, first appeared in Mayence, then in Strasburg.

The General Friend of Religion and the Church, edited by Benkert, in Würzburg, since 1828.

Among the journals, on the other hand, which advocate liberal views, the most distinguished, next to the Ulm Jahresschrift, is the Theological Quarterly, edited by the Catholic professors of Tübingen since 1818. Subsequently, however, after Professor Möhler joined the editorial staff, this journal inclined to a stricter Catholicism; although it is, nevertheless, still remarkable for its dignified and learned character.

The aim of the ultramontanes is to restore the whole condition of the Church, if possible, to the standpoint which it occupied in the Middle Ages. Hence they strive to enforce the dog-
matic system, as it has been developed by scholasticism, in its whole rigidity, and decry the slightest deviation from it as secession from the Church. In order to bind the clergy to it, they urge their being educated solely in seminaries—where the future priests, from their boyhood, are under strict supervision and conventual discipline—and oppose their attendance of mixed universities. They desire that the Pope should possess unlimited authority over the Church; that the bishops shall do nothing without the Papal sanction, and shall consult Rome in all cases that are of the least importance. They maintain that the State should assert no rights whatever over the Church; would have entire freedom of correspondence with Rome, and look upon the decree, universally accepted at that time, that all ecclesiastical ordinances must have the placetum regium before being published, as an abomination. They would have no alteration in the form of worship, and protest against any interference with the different kinds of superstitious ceremonies, as well as pilgrimages. They would have the convents restored, and the Order of Jesus, in particular, reinstated every where; and demand that the schools should be entirely removed from the supervision of the State, and be solely under that of the Church.

They strive to further their aims partly by writings, partly by covert intrigues through State officials who are under their influence, as well as by secret denunciations of the liberal clergy at the Papal Court. This last method is facilitated for them by the nunciature in Munich, which is glad to receive communications of that kind. They have in this way exercised much control over the appointments for the new bishoprics and chapters. In particular, however, they have been active in their official capacity for the revival of the old superstition among the people by the re-establishment of superstitious ceremonies, pilgrimages, brotherhoods, and the fostering of a belief in miracles.

Among the various attempts at miracles which have been made in modern times, the miraculous cures of Prince Hohenlohe created particular sensation in Germany. * Alexander, Prince of Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst, episcopal councilor in Bamberg, a young priest of very slight theological learning, had already endeavored, in different ways, to make himself conspicuous as a

* On Prince Hohenlohe, see Biography of Anselm von Feuerbach, by Ludwig Feuerbach, ii. 165.
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as a converter of Protestants and as an ascetic writer, when, during a visit to Würzburg, in 1821, where he became very popular as a preacher, he was impelled thereby to come forward as a worker of miracles. Encouraged by the example of a peasant, Martin Michl, who for some years past had had the reputation of healing the sick by his prayers, alleging Mark xvi. 17, 18 as his authority, and maintaining that such miraculous power was inherent in every true believer, but especially in consecrated priests of the higher orders, the Prince, in conjunction with this same Martin Michl, applied this means in the case of a Princess of Schwarzenberg, who was sojourning in Würzburg for the purpose of a cure; and as it was apparently successful, he was soon beset by numberless sick and infirm persons, who desired to be healed. Among these, too, several apparent cures were effected; and the failure of the majority of cases was attributed to want of faith in the subjects. The excitement with regard to these miracles thereupon became general. It was thought that the Prince was destined to give new glory to the Catholic Church, and hopes were cherished of a general conversion of the Protestants, and the like. Even the then Crown-prince of Bavaria, Louis, believed himself to have regained his hearing through Prince Hohenlohe, though this was soon found to be a delusion. Hohenlohe sent a triumphant report of his achievements to the Pope; but Rome is too experienced to enter implicitly into matters of this kind. The Prince received an answer in general evasive terms, with admonitions to exercise humility. The whole farce, indeed, soon came to an end. Having returned to Bamberg, his actual place of residence, Hohenlohe endeavored to display his miraculous power there too; but he was now surrounded by sensible men, and not by a crowd eager to believe in miracles; and thus all his attempts were unsuccessful. The voice of reason began to make itself heard, and the writings of Upper Judicial Councilor von Hornthal, as well as of a clergyman named Brenner, were particularly instrumental in enlightening the public judgment. It was proved that Hohenlohe, in his character of prince and priest, had indeed made, by his benedictions, and still more by his admonitions, often accompanied by threats, to make use of the affected limbs, an impression similar to that which is produced by other strong affections of the emotions, particularly by fright; but that this impression had been, at the same time, a
very dangerous one. During the excitement caused by the commands of the Prince, many persons had believed themselves to have regained the use of their limbs, and had therefore, for the moment, been regarded as cured; but subsequently the infirmity had returned with redoubled force, and in some cases death had even ensued in consequence of the exertions undergone by the patients. Very few had been cured, or had obtained relief permanently. Moreover, the miraculous power of the Prince had had no effect whatever on other ailments than paralysis. The excitement caused by his miracles, therefore, soon ceased in Bamberg and its vicinity, and the Prince, whom his adherents would at first have been glad to see installed in a Bavarian bishopric, found it advisable to leave Bavaria, where he found himself looked upon with disfavor, and repair to Austria. In Vienna, too, however, it was found expedient to remove him, and he received, in 1825, a position as canon at Grosswardein, in Hungary, where, being ignorant of the language of the country, he was, of course, forced to remain inactive. It was only in distant countries, chiefly in Ireland and North America, that the tradition of his power, for some years longer, worked new miracles among the Catholics to whom it had penetrated. Sick persons there would agree with the Prince, by letter, upon certain days and hours when he was to pray for them, and when they, after confessing, would receive the sacrament. And thus, for some time, rumors continued to arise of miracles which had been worked in this way; but soon they, too, died out, and Prince Hohenlohe was forgotten.

We add one more example to characterize these efforts to revive superstition by the influence of miracles. In Zons, a small town near Cologne, several persons fancied that they had seen, in the church, a flame hovering above the crown of an image of the Virgin standing upon the altar (1823). The matter was investigated, and it was found that the supposed flame was merely the reflection of the tapers, or of the sun, thrown from the heavily gilded crown in certain directions. Nevertheless, Herr von Kerz, the ultramontane editor of the Literary Gazette for Catholic Instructors in Religion, took this opportunity to issue an anonymous treatise, On the Fancied and Real Miracle in Zons (Mayence, 1823), in which he not only asserted the truth of the miracle, but also upheld through it the doctrines of the Assump-
§ 9. ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN GERMANY.

On the other hand, however, liberalism, too, did not remain inactive in the Catholic Church of Germany, either in combating the above ultramontane efforts by refutation and derision, or in striving to effect the necessary reforms in the Church. One of the most remarkable cases of this kind was introduced by a treatise, The Catholic Church in Silesia, described by a Catholic clergyman (Altenburg, 1826), the author of which was soon known to be Professor Johann Anton Theiner, of Breslau. In it all the defects of the Catholic Church, in doctrine, constitution, and ritual, were mercilessly exposed, and an adequate reformation demanded. Soon after, in November, 1826, several Catholic clergy addressed a petition to the Prince-bishop of Breslau, in which they requested an alteration of the forms of public worship adapted to the times. But the prince-bishop found it impossible, under the existing circumstances, to accede to these wishes without a schism with Rome. The Papal government, which was also appealed to, recognized that the greater portion of the Catholic people were by no means ripe for such reforms, and was not willing to favor the originating of a schism. These movements, therefore, caused a lively correspondence, but had no permanent result, as the spiritual authorities silenced the malcontents both by kindness and force.

After 1830, the liberal party seemed once more to regain a decided preponderance, inasmuch as the ultramontanes had lost their support in France, and the diffusion of political liberalism had also promoted liberal opinions in the Church.

One of the aims which this party is pursuing with peculiar zeal is the abolition of the celibacy of the clergy. Since the reign of Joseph II., a large number of treatises on this subject have appeared; quite as many, indeed, have taken the opposite side, but the attacks upon celibacy have become more and more decided, and its opponents have come forward more and more boldly from the obscurity in which they first wrapped themselves. In modern times it has been asserted with increased vehemence, that the secular princes have the right to annul the law of celibacy on their own authority, inasmuch as it is a disciplinary law, which has nothing in common with the Church doctrine; that such disciplinary laws could be pro-
claimed only with the *placet* of the temporal power; and that, therefore, it likewise appertains to the temporal power to revoke the *placet* under altered circumstances. In consequence, this subject has been frequently discussed at the South German diets: first in that of Würtemberg, in 1824; next, in 1828, a petition was addressed by twenty-three Catholics in Freiburg to the Baden Diet, to the effect that it might use its influence in favor of the abolition of the celibacy of the clergy; but the Chambers declared that they were not authorized to interfere in this matter. On the other hand, a similar proposition made at the Darmstadt Diet in 1830 was more successful, and the Chambers resolved to express to the government their wish that it might do all in its power to promote the abolition of celibacy. In 1831 Freiburg renewed its former petition to the Baden Diet, with the addition of the signatures of one hundred and fifty-six Catholic clergymen of Baden. It met with a more favorable reception on this occasion, and was referred by the Chambers to the government. In May, 1831, an association of Catholic clergymen was formed in Würtemberg, with the aim of using all legal means for bringing about the abolition of celibacy, followed by another, soon after, in the diocese of Treves, which is said to have been composed of eighty Catholic clergymen. The Würtemberg government, however, expressed its disapprobation of the former association, because, without accomplishing its object, it would only occasion a disturbance among the Catholic churches. The Bishop of Treves likewise issued a pastoral letter disapproving of these efforts, and it is hardly to be expected that much will be effected by them. For although it is evident that a large portion of the educated Catholics, as well as many clergymen, in South Germany urgently desire the abolition of the law of celibacy, and although the condition of the Catholic clergy would doubtless be much improved thereby, because in that case its ranks would no longer be filled up solely from the lower classes, but from the educated classes as well, and it would doubtless undergo a morally beneficial reform through the influence of family life, yet it is just as certain that the majority of the Catholic people would still greatly object to married priests; would, at least at first, withdraw from them, and not be willing to receive the sacraments from them. Rome, moreover, is the decided opponent of the marriage of priests, because by it
the interests of the clergy are more strongly bound to the State, and can no longer remain unconditionally devoted to the hierarchy. In this spirit Pope Gregory XVI., in a special bull in 1832, vehemently declared himself against the impious attempts to abolish the sacred celibacy of the clergy.

It is difficult to predict whither these discordant efforts will lead, particularly as they do not refer to one point alone, but to the conception of the Catholic Church in general. Among the Catholics in Germany enlightenment has made rapid progress in modern times, and Baden and Württemberg, in particular, have become the centres of this enlightenment. The groundlessness of many Catholic doctrines, the inadequacy of the Catholic form of worship, and the superstition pervading many of its usages are generally recognized by the educated Catholics in these countries. Theological science too has been cultivated among them with quite as much thoroughness as liberality. The theological faculty in Tübingen has always distinguished itself by this tendency; since the appointment of Professor Möhler, indeed, a rigidly Catholic spirit seems to have gained ground in it once more; but this can hardly be more than a transient condition. The theological faculty of Freiburg, too, has, on the whole, maintained a liberal character, and one of its professors, Hug, has long been known as a candid and learned Bible student, although, at the same time, he contrived with great shrewdness to retain the respect of the other party as well. None but liberal men were appointed to the new Catholic theological faculties at Marburg and Giessen. Of these Johann Nepomuk Locherer, formerly pastor in Baden, subsequently professor in Giessen, wrote a Church History which is as free from prejudice as any Protestant work of the kind could be.

Since 1837 the liberal party has given fewer signs of life, because the controversy prevailing between the Prussian government and the hierarchy has once more brought the ultramontane party into the foreground. It took the lead in the dispute; and as the latter seeks to represent itself as a defensive struggle of Catholicism against Protestant pretensions, the other Catholics do not venture to contradict this party even in its most extravagant assertions, which would seem to revive the whole spirit of the Middle Ages, in the fear of being decried as traitors to their Church. Nevertheless, liberalism has by no means entirely dis-
appeared among the Catholics, even though it is obliged to keep more in the background.

Judging from appearances, the existing disagreement between the liberal German Catholics and Rome can not fail finally to lead to a rupture. The former will become more and more urgent in their demand for the redress of their grievances, the satisfaction of their claims, and ecclesiastical liberty. Rome can not yield without alienating its most faithful adherents in Spain, Portugal, Ireland, etc. The liberal party, therefore, will probably appropriate that which the Curia is not willing to give them; and then it will depend upon circumstances whether the latter will overlook this arbitrary measure, as it often does in cases where opposition would be vain, or whether it will resist, and, by the determined use of spiritual weapons, bring about a schism. In like manner, time must show whether, in such a case, the whole German Catholic Church, or at least that of each State, is uniformly sufficiently educated to remain undivided, or whether a schism will take place in it too between the Roman Catholic and the German Catholic Church.

Such a schism can not be long delayed if Rome continue, as it has done since the reign of the last Pope, Gregory XVI., to pursue with anathemas all peculiar efforts and tendencies which deviate in the least from the old course. In this connection the condemnation of the dogmatic theology of Hermes is chiefly remarkable. Georg Hermes, Professor of Theology in Münster, subsequently in Bonn (d. 1831), made it his aim to give to Catholic dogmatics a firmer philosophical foundation, and to prove the entire rationality of its doctrines. His mode of demonstration, however, displeased the mystic theologians, who demanded trusting acceptance, without demonstration; and Hermes, even during his lifetime, was frequently assailed in consequence. But as he did not deviate in the least from Catholic orthodoxy, he had many advocates among the Catholic bishops, who respected and favored his treatment of theology, as adapted to the times. After his death, however, his opponents continued their efforts against his writings, and finally succeeded in occasioning the Papal rescript Dum Acerbissimas of September 26, 1835, in which the dogmatical writings of Hermes were condemned as being opposed to the Catholic faith. The numerous adherents of the author were greatly exasperated by this, and declared
the Pope's condemnation to have been obtained unfairly and by misrepresentation. They finally yielded apparently; but while professing to acknowledge the dogmatic substance of the Papal bull, they, at the same time, assume that the doctrines expressed by Hermes are not in contradiction with it. By this condemnation, Rome has roused the indignation of a large portion of the German Catholic clergy, and thus caused itself no small injury.

Even at an earlier period this liberal tendency had caused many individuals to leave the Catholic for the Evangelical Church; for example, Prince Constantin Alexander Salm-Salm, who went over, in Stuttgart, in 1826; the two brothers Counts Benzel-Sternau, in Frankfort, in 1827; Johann Wilhelm Fischer, priest and professor at the gymnasium in Landshut, in 1827; L. M. Eisenschmid, priest and professor in Aschaffenburg (these last two have been transferred to Protestant gymnasia—the first to Hof, the second to Schweinfurt); K. A. Baron Reichlin-Meldegg, priest and professor in Freiburg, in 1832.

Of late the liberal tendency in the Catholic Church has come forward again more decidedly, and this was occasioned by the ultramontane clergy themselves, who, encouraged by their apparent victory in the Cölogne matter, overwhelmed their congregations with pretensions of all kinds, and attempted to force upon them antiquated ceremonies, entirely unsuited to our age.

At Treves there was preserved the seamless coat of Christ, for which the soldiers cast lots. The same is shown in many other places: not having made its appearance anywhere, however, before the Middle Ages; at Treves it is proved to date from 1121.

Formerly this holy coat was solemnly displayed from time to time, but this had not been the case since 1810. Now, however, Bishop Arnoldi announced that for six weeks from August 18, 1844, it would be exposed for adoration in the cathedral. During this time hundreds of thousands (in all 1,100,000 persons) flocked to Treves from the Rhenish provinces and the adjoining French departments; the cathedral gained a considerable sum from the oblations of the faithful. It is only to be wondered at that so few miracles were attributed to the holy coat: one young girl alone, a Countess of Droste-Vischering, thought herself cured by it of a contracted limb. This cure was effect-

\[ Der \text{ heilige Rock zu Trier, und die zwanzig andern heiligen ungenühten Röcke, by Gildemeister and Von Sybel, Düsseldorf, 1844, 8.}\]
ed by the rupture of a sinew in consequence of an exertion of physical force, but would have been brought about as well by a less painful operation.

Among the educated Catholics many took exception to this adoration of the holy coat. A Silesian priest, Johannes Ronge, who had been suspended from a chaplaincy in Breslau on account of his liberal opinions, but whose character was universally respected, gave words to this disapprobation in a letter to Bishop Arnoldi, dated October 1, 1844, which soon appeared in all the journals, and in which he declaimed vehemently against this and all similar superstitious observances. As the episcopal see of Breslau had just become vacant, the cathedral chapter of that city deprived Ronge of his priestly office and anathematized him; but his letter found all the more favor with liberal Catholics, and from all sides he received, from Catholics as well as Protestants, letters of approbation and honorary gifts.

Another event occurred simultaneously. Various members of the Catholic congregation at Schneidemühl, near Bromberg, had, for some years past, convinced themselves, by the reading of the Holy Scriptures, of the want of foundation of many Catholic doctrines. In March, 1844, a vicar, Czerski, came to the place, who entertained the same views, and to whom, in consequence, the above-mentioned Church members attached themselves. When this became known, Czerski was suspended; but upon this he and a large number of members of the congregation seceded from the Church, in order to form a Christian Apostolic Catholic congregation, requesting permission of the government to do so in October, 1844, and receiving the same. This step met with favor from many Catholics in Germany. Ronge, too, joined the society in question, and formed another congregation in Breslau. That in Schneidemühl declared itself for the communion in both forms, against the worship of saints and images, the remission of sins by priests, and indulgences; against appointed fasts, the use of the Latin language in public worship, and the enforced celibacy of the clergy; against the prohibition of mixed marriages, as well as the pretension of the Pope to be Christ's visible vicar on earth.

* Heiligen Rock-Album, Leipsic, 1844.
* Offenes Glaubensbekennniss der christl.-apostollisch-katholischen Gemeinde zu Schneidemühl, Stuttgart, 1844, 8.
The movement originated by Ronge was responded to in Germany by all friends of a rational Christianity, and soon so-called German-Catholic congregations were formed in many places. But Ronge, ere long, was joined by many political malcontents, who were less impelled by religious motives, it being quite common at that time for political dissatisfaction to vent itself in ecclesiastical matters, because it could there express with impunity its disapproval of existing conditions. When, therefore, the new Church held its first general assembly in Leipsic at Easter, 1845, and established a confession of faith, the latter was expressed in such general terms that Czerski and his adherents, who retained the Apostles' Creed, and acknowledged the divinity of Christ, took exception to it, and separated from the rest. Later attempts at reunion could not heal this breach. Ronge and his preachers, after this, traveled about in Germany, caused great sensation, and attracted many malcontents to their Church; but this society, too, finally came in contact with the most recent infidel philosophy; many of its members turned to pantheism, and no longer respected even the limits of the Leipsic Confession of Faith. In particular, it was affected by the political ideas of 1848. One of its most distinguished preachers, named Dowiat, declared distinctly, in 1849, that the religious side of his activity had only been a cloak for political designs. This Church will hardly have a long existence, as it casts aside its religious character more and more, and offers nothing to religious need. Czerski and the congregations adhering to him have, on the other hand, renounced German-Catholicism altogether, and remain faithful to the Apostles' Creed.

One of the most remarkable phenomena of modern times in the Catholic Church of Germany is the so-called Mysticism, or, more correctly, Pietism, in Bavaria.

It had its origin in Dillingen, a small university town in the diocese of Augsburg, which had formerly been a special seat of the Jesuits. Attached to the university as Professor of Ethics and Pastoral Theology from 1785 to 1795, was Michael Sailer, an ex-Jesuit, but directly opposed to Jesuitism in his sentiments and his aims. He was as pious as he was intellectual, and not only combated in his pupils the setting of too high a value on outward devotional forms and sanctity of works, but also strove
to counteract a one-sided consideration of religion by the reason, as well in scholastic theology as in the promulgators of modern enlightenment. On the other hand, he recommended the fervent reception of Christianity, and particularly, as its central point, the doctrine of redemption, into the heart and the emotions. To this end he advised the study of the writings of Catholic so-called mystics, such as Fénélon, as well as of Protestant writers, like Lavater, etc. He was joined in his efforts by Feneberg, at that time instructor in the gymnasium at Dillingen, and these two acquired a strong influence over the young students of theology. Thus the doctrines of the sinfulness and helplessness of man, from which God's mercy alone, working within him, can deliver him, as well as the idea of an inward yielding-up to Christ, being led by him, and following his guidance, became the fundamental principles of this tendency. The immediate consequence of their diffusion among the students showed itself in their attaching but little value to outward devotional exercises, such as the worship of saints and images, indulgences, and external good works. This was soon observed in Augsburg, which was at that time the chief seat of the Jesuits, and Sailer and Feneberg were removed from Dillingen.

But the seed sown there sprang up in many places, and occasionally brought forth fruit which the first founder of this school, Sailer, had himself not expected. His pupils, become clergymen, worked on in the spirit of their teachers, and found great favor with many congregations. The necessary consequence of that rigid Catholicism which insists merely upon blind obedience to its outward behests, but seeks to suppress all individual inner life, because it strives for freedom, is spiritual torpor and death. It is therefore but natural that when an inner life is offered for this, deeper natures will accept it eagerly. Hence this tendency found easy access with the people. Naturally, however, it opened a door for various forms of fanaticism. The scattered clergymen in question lacked, for the most part, an experienced leader. They adhered chiefly to the writings of the older Pietists, and the contents of many of these were very fanatical; in addition, they entered into more intimate fraternal alliances with Protestant Pietists, particularly with those in Basle. Sailer therefore had a similar experience to that of many other heads of schools; his pupils pursued the course designated by him far beyond the
point which he had reached, and he tolerated these extravagances because he regarded their spirit and motive as good and efficacious. The parish of Seeg, in the Allgau, not far from the Tyrolean frontier, to which Feneberg had been transferred, now became the centre of this movement. But Sailer, too, remained in friendly relations with all his pupils.

Nor can it be denied that this inward stirring-up was very salutary to many Catholics. By whatever extravagances it may occasionally have been accompanied, it yet awakened a spiritual life within them which had been suppressed by the mechanism of the Church.

These mystics, however, had much to suffer from the attacks of their brethren in the faith. The liberal Catholics looked upon them as having strayed from one superstition into another. But they met with the bitterest hatred and the most vehement persecution from the bigoted Catholics, who know no salvation outside of the Church. For the connection with the latter was no longer the chief thing with the mystics, but it was the inner union with Christ, which is bound to no outward demonstrations. In their opinion, the Protestants were often better Christians than many Catholics. All mere form, all empty pomp and ceremony in public worship, were displeasing to them. Thus they were an abomination, particularly to the great mass of Catholic priests, who merely maintained their external priestly dignity, but exerted no moral or religious influence whatever, and who therefore could not obtain over these mystics the dominant clerical authority which they were accustomed to exercise. Hence the unceasing persecutions of the latter in Bavaria, which have continued until quite recently. Two things are remarkable in this connection: in the first place the fanaticism which has developed from this movement, chiefly in consequence of persecution; and, further, the leaning toward Protestantism, as the faith favoring a free and quickening religious growth, which has become more and more prevalent among these mystics.

The men who gained particular distinction by the persecutions raised against them as mystics are Boos, Gossner, Lindl, and Pöschl.

Martin Boos was at first a priest in the bishopric of Augsburg, but on account of his doctrines was twice arrested and impris-
oned, and finally, in 1799, compelled to leave the diocese. On Sailer's recommendation, Bishop Gall, of Linz, in Austria, received him, and after occupying various other ecclesiastical positions, he at length, in 1806, obtained the living of Gallneukirchen. In this large parish Boos worked unmolested for several years, until, under the next bishop, he was accused of teaching false doctrines and arrested. The secular authorities, however, took his part sufficiently to enable him to leave Austria in 1816, and return to Bavaria. But here new persecutions arose, and in consequence he went to Prussia in 1817, was appointed instructor in religion at the gymnasium of Düsseldorf, and in 1819 obtained a parish in Sayn, near Coblenz, where he died in 1825.  

At the time of his removal from Gallneukirchen, a large portion of his congregation were deeply concerned about the treatment of their beloved pastor. They were still more disturbed when his successor accused him of heresy, vehemently opposed the use of the Bible introduced by him, and began to recommend and revive the old ecclesiastical mechanism. The zealous adherents of Boos gave loud expression to their disapprobation of this course, and when the pastor attempted to alarm them by excommunicating two of their number, he only brought about the result that these latter, with several other members of the congregation, declared their intention of going over to the Protestant Church (1821). The number of these seceders soon increased to one hundred. Every thing was done to turn them from their intention, but in vain. The six weeks of instruction from a Catholic priest which, by the Austrian law, all those who desire to leave the Catholic Church are obliged to receive, were deferred. In 1824 the miracle-worker Prince Hohenlohe appeared on the spot, in order to exert an influence by threats and persuasions. His efforts remained as futile as those of several Liguorians, who went to Gallneukirchen for the same purpose. Finally, a few of the seceders were admitted to examination and then allowed to join the Protestant Church; but with others the objection was raised that their religious opinions deviated quite as much from the Lutheran and Reformed doctrines as from the Catholic, and that they therefore could not belong to either of

* Martin Boos, der Prediger der Gerechtigkeit die vor Gott gilt, sein Selbstbiograph; herausgegeben von Johann Gossner, Leipzig, 1836.
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the tolerated churches, and consequently were fanatics whose belief could not be sanctioned. Not infrequently, indeed, their assemblies were broken in upon and they led off to prison. Thus this matter remained undecided for some length of time.

Ignatius Lindl, after suffering much persecution on account of his mysticism, became parish priest in Grundremmingen, on the Danube, not far from the Württemberg frontier. Having formerly stood in relations to the mystics in Basle and to Madame de Krüdener, he now made common cause with the Protestant Pietists in Württemberg, and diffused among his own congregation a similar inclination to an inner piety which was, indeed, not free from fanaticism. Meanwhile his persecutions recommenced, and the spiritual authorities were about to confine him in a religious establishment, when he received a call to Russia, where at that time Minister Golitzin, under the influence of Madame de Krüdener, strongly favored Pietism (1816). A large portion of Lindl's congregation now declared their intention to follow their beloved pastor, and, in consequence of diplomatic negotiations, really received permission to emigrate to Russia. Nearly two thousand persons accompanied Lindl, who first went to St. Petersburg, and officiated there as a Catholic priest until his congregation were settled in their new homes on the banks of the Volga. In 1820 he joined them in the town of Sarata, and there became their pastor, with the title of provost. He introduced a thoroughly Protestant form of worship; abolished the mass, auricular confession, and the like; assumed the dress of a Protestant clergyman; and even married, with the consent of his congregation, without, however, formally going over to the Protestant Church. Of course, he became the object of the most vehement hatred of the Catholics in general, and several attempts to assassinate him were even made at Odessa.

In the meantime, however, a change took place in the favorable disposition of the government toward the Pietists. Such arbitrary reformers within an established Church began to be considered suspicious, and Lindl was ordered to leave Russia (1824). He went to Berlin, there formally joined the Protestant Church, was then received into the ranks of the Evangelical candidates for the ministry at Cologne, and subsequently settled in Barmen, in the Wupperthal, where he became superintendent of a mission-school and assistant pastor.
Johann Gossner held successively several ecclesiastical offices in Bavaria, and was also subjected to much persecution, and even imprisonment, on account of his Pietism and his connection with Protestant mystics, particularly those in Basle. Finally he held a benefice attached to the Church of Our Lady in Munich, but then left Bavaria, and in 1819 accepted the position of instructor of religion at the gymnasium in Düsseldorf, vacated by the withdrawal of Boos. The following year, 1820, he went to Russia, and took Lindl's place as Catholic priest in St. Petersburg. Here he was at first greatly favored by the government, which, among other things, allowed him a splendid hall in which to give lectures on the Bible. But when the views of the administration changed, Gossner, too, was expelled from Russia (1824), joined the Evangelical Church in Berlin, and was there appointed pastor of the Jerusalem Church.

Thomas Pöschl had been appointed pastor of the parish of Ampfelwang, near Linz, at a time when that tract of land still belonged to Bavaria. He there labored in a spirit of Pietism—circulated mystic tracts, held devotional meetings, and gained in a high degree the confidence and love of his flock. But, at the same time, he entertained and diffused certain enthusiastic expectations, in particular those of a speedy general conversion of the Jews, and of the approaching end of the world. In consequence, he was arrested in 1814, when the region in question had once more become Austrian, and imprisoned at Salzburg. But his congregation, deprived of their pastor, chose a leader from their midst, a peasant named Joseph Haas, who directed their devotional meetings. Through the continued reading of mystical works, however, they fell into the strongest fanaticism, so that, on Good-Friday, 1817, they went so far as to put to death a young girl at one of their meetings, in the delusion that she was dying for her fellow-men, after the example of Christ. Pöschl, who was informed of these abominable proceedings in his prison, expressed the greatest abhorrence of them. Nevertheless, he was now transported to Vienna, and confined in a monastery. He died in a religious institution of that city in 1837. Although the remaining mystics were entirely free from such fanaticism, their zealous Catholic opponents have yet taken occasion, from

these events, to bestow upon them, as heretics, the name of Pöschlians.\textsuperscript{10}

Though Sailer had never entered into any of these fanatical extravagances of the mystics, he was yet regarded as the originator and the head of that school. Before, therefore, being confirmed by the Pope, in 1822, as coadjutor of the diocese of Ratisbon, he was obliged to send to Rome a written demonstration of his orthodoxy and a renunciation of pseudo-mysticism. Although he did not, in consequence, materially alter his opinions, he still was looked upon by many mystics, from that time, as a seceder. He subsequently became bishop of Ratisbon, and died May 20, 1832.

Somewhat later, a remarkable occurrence was brought about by Pietism in a Catholic congregation in Baden. A young man by the name of Henhöfer was appointed parish priest, in 1818, in the village of Mühlhausen, on the domain of a Baron von Gemmingen, near Pforzheim. He, too, imbibed Pietistic views from a pupil of Sailer, zealously preached faith and repentance in accordance with them, declaimed against attaching any value to mere external forms of worship and the sanctity of works, and held devotional meetings, in addition to the public services in the church. A large portion of the congregation concurred in his views; the remainder entered a complaint against their pastor. Henhöfer was in consequence summoned to Bruchsal, there to vindicate himself before the episcopal court; was retained there for several months; and, after an examination, deposed from his office in August, 1822. A strictly Catholic successor to his parish was appointed to remedy the injury which had been done to the congregation. But when he strove to give particular prominence to those doctrines which they had begun to look upon as doubtful, and to revive all outward ceremonies of the Church, he only repulsed those among them who were evangelically inclined; and they, with the lord of the manor and his household at their head, declared their intention of going over to the Evangelical Church. They did so April 6, 1823, numbering nearly two hundred persons in all. The government of Baden showed great consideration for the Catholics in this matter. Henhöfer

\textsuperscript{10} Salat, \textit{Versuche über Supernaturalismus und Mysticismus, mit historisch-psychologischen Aufschlüssen über die vielbesprochene Mystik in Baiern und Oesterreich}, Sulzbach, 1823, 8.
was appointed Evangelical pastor in Graben, near Carlsruhe, in order to avoid personal annoyances. The Catholic congregation of Mühlhausen were allowed to retain their whole undiminished church property, although so many of their number had left them and formed an Evangelical society for themselves. In order to enable the latter to erect the necessary buildings and pay the salary of a preacher, large sums were contributed from every quarter; in particular, Court-chaplain Zimmermann, in Darmstadt, issued, to the same end, a collection of sermons, to which contributions were furnished by the most distinguished Evangelical pulpit orators of Germany.  

Even much later than the events above described, in 1832 and 1835, several cases have occurred where priests have been removed on account of their tendency to Pietism, and, with a number of their congregation, have gone over to the Evangelical Church.

In the valley of the Ziller (Zillerthal), which formerly belonged to Salzburg, but is now Tyrolese, and where various Evangelical elements had remained in existence from former times, many of the inhabitants to whom their countrymen, returning from abroad, had communicated the Bible have, since 1830, formally seceded from the Catholic Church and adopted the Gospel. They lived under a ban, without sacraments and burial with religious rites, and were shunned like lepers by the other inhabitants of the valley. Their requests to be allowed the free exercise of their religion remained without result; but they obtained permission to emigrate. They applied to the King of Prussia, who received them very graciously in 1837, assisted them liberally, and suffered them to establish themselves near Schmiedeberg, in Silesia. Their number amounted to four hundred and forty-eight.

This Pietism in the German Catholic Church is far more dangerous to it than liberalism; for Pietism is actuated by religious enthusiasm in opposing the mere outward formalism of the Church, combats it from conscientious motives, and offers in-


stead something far higher—namely, an inner union with Christ through faith and repentance. No harmony can exist between it and the Catholic sanctity of works. It fears no outward persecutions; nor would it fear even martyrdom, in order to retain the inward treasure which it possesses in its living faith. True, there are many among the liberal Catholics who also defend with enthusiasm the cause of pure religion against the ecclesiastical corruptions of Romanism; and they, too, have that willingness to sacrifice every thing for the truth without which nothing great can be achieved in religious and ecclesiastical matters. But the majority of the Catholics have only attained a negative enlightenment with regard to the Church, such as is afforded by a superficial cultivation of the reason alone.

These liberals deride and scoff at the superstitious doctrines and ceremonies of their Church; but they have not found a substitute for these in any other religious conviction which has developed within them. It has happened to them, as is so often the case in religions which are full of various superstitions, that, after they have convinced themselves of the groundlessness of many doctrines which were taught and impressed upon them in their youth as religious truths, religious truth in general has become doubtful to them; at least, they hesitate to yield themselves up unconditionally to any religious conviction, and to allow themselves to be inwardly penetrated and quickened by it. Such liberals like to remain in their Church if the priests will only leave them in peace; for as they have no positive interest in religion and the Church, and are not willing to attach themselves inwardly and truly to any Church, they can only look upon the going over from one Church to another as a mark of weakness and narrow-mindedness. And the Catholic priests, in those regions where the temporal power does not lend them its aid for the restraint of conscience, are glad to practice indulgence, so that those who are inwardly seceders may at least outwardly remain attached to the Catholic Church. But where the temporal power assists the clergy in enforcing adherence to the Church, those merely negative liberals are quite ready to make pretense of being faithful Catholics, and obey all the behests of the Church; for such negative liberalism can, of course, furnish no motives for sacrifice. Pietism, further, is more dangerous to the Catholic Church, because where it once gains ground it seizes upon...
the common people, often upon whole congregations; while liberalism is limited to the educated classes. As the Reformation of the sixteenth century could never have been accomplished by mere intellectual enlightenment and the liberalism of learned men, and owed its origin and success solely to an enthusiasm pervading all classes of society, so, too, at the present time, no reformation of the Catholic Church but one founded on true religious enthusiasm can meet with complete success. In consequence, Pietism is far more obnoxious to the common Catholic clergy than liberalism, and they have given vent to their hatred in the coarsest and most furious utterances. Yet notwithstanding all the persecution to which it has been subjected, it has not yet been entirely suppressed in the Catholic Church of Southern Germany.

In conclusion, we have to examine the relations between the Catholics and Protestants in Germany.

The great revolutions in the German states, by which so great a part of the dominion of the hierarchy formerly reigned over by Catholic princes fell under the rule of Protestant sovereigns, of course made no favorable impression upon the majority of the Catholics. In particular, the fear prevailed that the new rulers would attempt to oppress the Catholic Church, and grant the Protestants greater rights and privileges than the Catholics. This fear was partly founded on the consciousness that in most Catholic countries such oppression was the fate of the Protestants, and that those of that faith who would come under Catholic rule must expect a like experience. Moreover, the Catholics, in fact, often met in Protestant writings with very disparaging opinions with regard to the superstitions, abuses, and pretensions of their Church, which could certainly not inspire them with great confidence toward the Protestants.

Added to this, it frequently happened that, in consequence of the changes referred to, Protestants established themselves in countries which had previously been purely Catholic, and gradually began to form congregations. This increased the anxiety of the Catholics, lest Protestantism should spread more and more, and strive to gain the upper-hand. But the same feeling prevailed in Protestant countries, e.g. Saxony, when Catholic congregations were established there from time to time. This was the result, in each case, of a total unacquaintance with the other
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Church; and after a few years these apprehensions disappeared. By the German Act of Confederation of 1815, Art. 16, equal rights were guaranteed to the three Christian churches. In the kingdom of Hanover, by a decree of September 23, 1824, the distinction between the established and the tolerated religions was abolished entirely.

The Protestant governments showed great consideration for their new Catholic subjects with regard to their religion, sometimes even going further in the matter than Catholic rulers; so that the fear of oppression among the Catholics soon died out. The ultramontanes alone, who would have wished to make the Church entirely independent of the supervision of the State, occasionally gave expression to such fears, in order to intimidate the government and induce it to be still more indulgent.

The more Protestants and Catholics now came into contact with each other, the more inevitable it became that religious controversies should sometimes arise between them. But it was the celebration of the jubilee of the Reformation, in 1817, which roused these polemics to a long unexampled vehemence.

In preparation of the jubilee and its celebration, many treatises appeared, mostly in popular form, some of which related the history of the Reformation, while others demonstrated its value. In so doing, it could not be avoided that the condition of the Catholic Church at the time of the Reformation was denounced upon, and the reproaches cast upon the latter and the Evangelical Church by the Catholic party denied. Many Catholics, to whom the jubilee of the Reformation, which was celebrated with such enthusiasm, was in itself an offense, looked upon the above statements as an insult to their Church, and came forward in defense of the latter; while others went still further, and strove, by the revival of old calumnies, to represent the Reformation as the work of ignoble intentions, and the Reformers as selfish, immoral men, and thus lower both in the public esteem.

The controversy thus originated gave rise to innumerable treatises, of which few, however, were of any value. On the Catholic side, Protestantism was particularly accused of annuling all authority in religious matters—of making religion an object of choice—and thus, in the end, doing away with it entirely. In this assertion, singularly enough, the fact was overlooked that religion is a necessity of man, and therefore can not be put aside.
by him; and that religious conviction is neither a matter of choice nor of the will, but that, on the contrary, the will must bow under this conviction.

It must, however, be frankly confessed that the polemic writings on the Protestant side were hardly superior to those on the Catholic. The chief fault of this lay in the great want of familiarity of the Protestants with the Catholic Church, its doctrines as well as its constitution. It is indeed no small task to become thoroughly acquainted with the entire Catholic Church system; the majority of the Protestants, even clergymen, knew it only from the fragments which are quoted in the descriptions of the condition of the Catholic Church shortly before the Reformation. With so superficial a knowledge it was impossible to combat the Catholic Church; for, however deficient its system may be in the requisite foundations, it is yet constructed with such admirable ingenuity, all objections are so fully foreseen and removed, that, if an attack is not directed against the groundwork, but against individual doctrines, it is not easy to meet with unprotected weak points. It must be remembered that this system is the product of the highest shrewdness of many centuries. Nevertheless, every Protestant clergyman, who possibly knew the Catholic system merely by hearsay, thought himself capable of contesting it, because in the form in which he was familiar with it its absurdities were apparent. Thus, of course, there was no lack of gross errors, which were all the more offensive that they were connected with much arrogance and with the ostentation of great intellectual superiority.

The most common mistakes of the Protestant disputants consisted in their not being able to distinguish between disciplinary rules and rules of faith, and between dogmas and theological opinions in the Catholic Church; and that they put an entirely wrong construction upon many Catholic dogmas and religious observances, or at least explained them incorrectly.

Thus a very frequent subject of attack for the Protestant disputants was the infallibility of the Pope, in connection with which they overlooked that it has never been generally accepted as a dogma in the Church, and at present* is so little recognized that even the German ultramontanes do not venture to give expression to it. Nor did they consider that those Catholics who

* At the time when Gieseler wrote.—Tr.
accept that infallibility apply it merely to a formal decision in matters of faith, and not by any means to disciplinary laws and to historical facts, not even to the personal convictions of the Pope. Furthermore, these Protestant assailants of the Church did not correctly understand the nature of the Catholic indulgence; it was frequently supposed to signify a permission to sin. In like manner, the Catholics were often reproached with the worship of saints, whereas they merely allow them to be venerated; and other things of a similar nature.

This undeniable ignorance of Catholicism, moreover, favored the efforts of the Catholic clergy to make converts, which became very prevalent at this time. For if a Protestant from a purely Protestant state came to a Catholic country with the most absurd notions of Catholicism, and did not find the people as stupid and narrow-minded as he had thought them; and if, in addition, he received new explanations of many Catholic doctrines, it not seldom happened that he thought himself misinformed with regard to Catholicism, and proved all the more accessible to the palliating, disingenuous interpretations of wily makers of proselytes.

Manifold controversies were also occasioned by the question of mixed marriages. In those provinces where the Catholics were in the majority, their priests required that in cases of mixed marriages the Protestant party should promise in advance to have all the children to be expected brought up in the Catholic faith. If this demand was not acceded to, they refused to consecrate the marriage. As the Catholics consider marriage a sacrament, and its solemnization must be preceded by confession and the communion, the priests were possessed of ample means to influence the Catholic, and, through him or her, the Protestant party. The governments, it is true, prohibited such requirements, but were not always obeyed.

It was chiefly the Prussian administration, which, in the Rhenish provinces and in Westphalia, had to struggle with these pretensions of the Catholic clergy, without being able to master them. It could not tolerate such arrogance of one Church toward another, nor the interference of Catholic priests with the rights of conscience of members of other confessions, because it is the duty

---

12 Die katholische Hierarchie in den grossen Deutschen Staaten, by Knies, in Droysen's Allgemeine Monatschrift für Wissenschaft und Literatur, May, 1853, p. 394.
of the State to protect the rights of all its churches as well as those of all its subjects, nor can it look with indifference upon such incessant controversies between the religious parties as were caused by that arrogance and created dissension among the people. The Prussian government had no object in view but to grant equal rights to all the churches under its rule, and therefore required that the parents should be free to decide to which Church their children should belong; but that in those cases where they could not agree, or where, on the death of one of the parties, nothing had been settled, the children should be brought up in the Church of the father. In the eastern provinces of the monarchy this arrangement had long been adopted; it was only in the western provinces that the priests still refused to consecrate mixed marriages unless a promise were given that all the children should be brought up Catholics. The bishops appointed after the concordat, in particular the highly cultivated and liberal Archbishop of Cologne, Ferdinand August, Count Spiegel (since 1825), fully acknowledged the justice of the demand of the temporal government, but thought themselves incapable of making any change without the concurrence of the Pope. In consequence of their report, as well as of negotiations on the part of the government with Rome, a Papal rescript was finally issued (March 25, 1830), in which, indeed, mixed marriages were greatly disapproved of, and the clergy were directed to warn against them, but which also decreed that those Catholics who contracted such marriages should not be subject to Church discipline; that Catholic priests, while they were not to formally consecrate these unions, might yet lend a passive assistance to them, and that they should be considered valid even though solemnized by Protestant clergymen. It was not expressly prescribed that the affianced parties should give a promise that their children be brought up in the Catholic Church, and thus it could be supposed that the Pope was willing to drop that condition. In 1834, therefore, the bishops of the Prussian Rhenish provinces and Westphalia agreed, at the suggestion of the government, that the requirement of such a promise should henceforward be omitted altogether, and resolved, at the same time, that the assistentia passiva should only take place in such cases where carelessness in matters of religion was manifested in the contraction of mixed marriages.

Thus this difficult matter seemed to be arranged in the best
way, chiefly through the agency of the Archbishop of Cologne, Ferdinand August. This enlightened and peace-loving prelate further deserved great credit for his services in restoring public order, promoting the higher culture of the clergy, and establishing amicable relations between the different confessions. In this he had a special helper and adviser in Professor Hermes. The theological school of the latter soon took the lead in the Rhenish provinces: the chairs not only of the faculty at Bonn, but also of the seminaries at Cologne and Treves, were filled with followers of Hermes, and hundreds of their pupils by degrees went out to labor as pastors. Even though this school was somewhat one-sided, it yet accustomed its disciples to think clearly, and favored scientific enlightenment in other departments. When, through the efforts of Archbishop Spiegel, the Theological Faculty at Bonn had in 1834 even received an acknowledgment from the Pope, all ecclesiastical affairs seemed to be thoroughly regulated, and the government had reason to congratulate itself upon the results attained.

But Archbishop Spiegel died August 2, 1835, and immediately after, in September of the same year, the ultramontanes induced the Pope to issue the rescript against the doctrine and the writings of Hermes. It was now all the more important to fill the archiepiscopal see with a kindly disposed, liberal man. Nevertheless, the choice of the government fell upon an individual who was the contrary in every respect, and who on a former occasion, as vicar-general in Münster, had shown himself intolerant, narrow-minded, and full of spiritual arrogance and pride. This was Baron Clemens August von Droste-Vischering, at that time Suffragan-bishop of Münster. Rumor attributed this appointment to the influence of the then Crown-prince of Prussia, who was attracted by this man's mediævally monastic asceticism. But the government soon had reason to regret its choice. Archbishop Clemens August entered upon his office in May, 1836. Soon complaints arose that the promise with regard to the religion of the children was still required by the priests in mixed marriages, and that Catholic women in childbed who were not willing to have their child brought up a Catholic were refused churching. The archbishop, who had promised to adhere to the above-mentioned agreement, was called to account by the government in consequence, and at first tried to extricate himself by various
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subterfuges, but finally declared that he could observe the agreement in question only so far as it accorded with the Papal rescript on the subject, and appeared to assume that the requirement of bringing up the children in the Catholic faith was not annulled by that rescript. At the same time, he sought to give effect to the brief against Hermes, although it had not yet been submitted to the government for the affixing of the *placet*; forbade the theologians studying in Bonn, through their confessors, to attend the lectures of the Hermesian professors, and thus caused nearly all the theological students of his diocese to leave the university. In addition, he drew up, equally without the sanction of the government, eighteen theses directed against the theology of Hermes, which the clergy were to subscribe. In one of these theses he made it the duty of the clergy to appeal from him to no other authority than the Pope, thus intending to completely paralyze the rights of the State with regard to an abuse of the spiritual power. Furthermore, he persecuted such priests as had been denounced to him as Hermesians, assumed entirely new rights in respect to educational matters, and finally dismissed all the teachers in the theological seminary on the ground of their belonging to the school of Hermes. These transactions could not be regarded with indifference by the government, if it did not desire the Catholic hierarchy to acquire unlimited influence and become a state within a state. Numerous attempts were made to bring the archbishop to reason; but when he would not yield, he was conveyed, on November 24, 1837, to the fortress of Minden, and thus suspended from his official duties, which were transferred to the chapter. At the same time, his chaplain, Michelis, who had been his chief tool, was taken to Magdeburg. It would have been better if the archbishop had been brought before a tribunal, and judged according to law, in which case much of the ensuing disturbance in the Rhenish provinces would have been avoided; for he was by no means popular in the latter region, and his legal condemnation would have given much satisfaction. The excitement which arose was caused more by the arbitrary course of the government, which showed great disregard of the existing laws, than from any interest in the archbishop. The greatest indignation was exhibited by Rome. The Pope, on December 10, communicated the affair to the cardinals in a passionate allocution, in which he made it
appear that the archbishop had strictly adhered to the Papal brief in the matter of mixed marriages, and had only been arrested because he had not agreed to the crafty perversions of the Pope's meaning which the temporal power had permitted itself. All the negotiations of the Prussian ambassador in Rome remained without result, and had to be given up. Rome would not yield; Prussia was not at liberty to do so. Time alone can heal the breach, particularly after the death of the archbishop. This occurrence had several very serious results:

1. After the above declaration of the Pope, the bishops of Western Prussia withdrew from the agreement which had been entered into. And this was not all; but in the eastern part of the monarchy also, where a milder system had for a long time prevailed, the bishops felt compelled to conform to the express declaration of the Pope. In consequence, the Catholic priests everywhere do not solemnize mixed marriages, unless the promise be given to bring up the children in the Catholic faith. Archbishop Dunin of Posen was on this account legally deposed and sentenced to imprisonment; but this new martyr merely fanned the flame of Catholic fanaticism.

2. The Catholic clergy in Prussia, altogether, is strongly irritated against the State, and the latter has been obliged to make great concessions in other matters likewise. Thus it formerly made a practice of designating the men who were to be chosen bishops by the cathedral chapter; but in 1839 it proposed to the chapter of Treves several individuals from whom to choose. None of these, however, was elected; but, instead, a man who was disapproved of by the government, and to whom, therefore, the placet was refused, which gave rise to a new complication.

3. The polemics between Catholics and Protestants have been revived with the greatest animosity. Ultramontanism has gained new ground in Germany. It is to be hoped, however, that the more boldly it now pushes its claims, the more it will repel the enlightened German Catholics.4

King Frederic William IV., immediately after his accession to the throne, opened new negotiations with Rome, and by judicious yielding has effected a compromise. Its conditions are not definitely known, but the point of mixed marriages has been con-

4 Ueber die kölnische Angelegenheit. Darstellung, Betrachtung und Vorschläge von Irenaeus, Leipsic, 1838.
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ceded by Prussia. On the other hand, the archbishop has been induced to renounce the administration of his diocese, and has received, in the person of the former Bishop of Spires, Johann von Geissel, a coadjutor, who entered upon his office in March, 1842.

Since the accession to the throne, in 1825, of Louis I., King of Bavaria, the strict Catholic party has been greatly favored in that country, chiefly by the poetical tastes of the king, which give him a great predilection not only for classical art, but also for the art and religion of the Middle Ages, as well as for all mediæval features and conditions. Hence a reaction against the liberal principles of government of his predecessor, Maximilian I., soon became apparent. The administration made it their aim to place the public instruction in charge of the clergy; the religious pomps and ceremonies which had been abolished during the previous reign—such as processions, miracle-plays, midnight masses at Christmas, and the like—were revived, convents re-established, etc. In the newly founded University of Munich an ultramontane party was soon formed, which exerted great influence, and at the head of which stood Professor Görres, formerly distinguished by extreme liberalism, even Jacobinism. The clergy, particularly the higher dignitaries, felt much elated, and permitted themselves many arbitrary measures and arrogant proceedings.

The French Revolution of July, 1830, caused this spirit to become even more prominent in Bavaria. The fear of the political propaganda of liberalism led to a decided political stability, and to a still greater encouragement of ecclesiastical ultramontanism; the chief instigator of these retrogressions being the privy secretary of the cabinet, Grandaner.

In 1831 the number of the newly established convents already amounted to forty-two, and this amply sufficed to fulfill the conditions of the concordat; but the zeal in the matter only increased, and many Benedictine convents, in particular, were founded, in order to assign to them the instruction in the gymnasia. The principal promoter of these institutions was Ignatius von Riegg, Bishop of Augsburg. According to him the restoration of the convents furnished the sole anchor of the government and of religion in these tempestuous times. Thus he was instrumental in founding the first Benedictine convent, that of St. Stephen, in Augsburg, in order to place in its charge the Catho-
lic gymnasium of that city. Its newly appointed abbot, Barnabas Huber, was obliged to import the first monks with whom to fill it from Austria and Switzerland. He also paid a visit to the Jesuit College at Fribourg, in order to acquaint himself with the system of education and instruction practiced there. In reality, this party wished nothing more than to draw the Jesuits themselves to Bavaria; but it could not at that time accomplish its object, and had to be satisfied with introducing individual Jesuits, under different names, into various spiritual offices. This Congregation, as it is called in Bavaria, especially increased in importance after the liberal Minister of the Interior, Prince Ludwig von Oettingen-Wallerstein, was deposed in 1837, and Herr von Abel, who had seceded from the liberal party and entered into the service of the Congregation, had become his successor. At the same time, the controversy between Prussia and Rome contributed to make the ultramontane party now come forward without disguise and to increase in numbers. Among the scholars attached to the University of Munich, its chief adherents are Görres, Ringseis, Phillipps (who was called thither from Berlin), and the theologians Wiedemann, Döllinger, and Windischmann. The preachers Irenæus Haid and Eberhard work upon the people, and, by their shameless attacks upon the Protestants, recall the darkest times of the seventeenth century. Processions are held with the greatest pomp and display on all church festivals; pilgrimages take place in unlimited number, and associations have been formed, with the royal sanction, for the purpose of organizing them. Full indulgences are granted in superabundance, and consecrated rings of indulgence are sold.

The educated classes in Bavaria are by no means satisfied with this change in the tendency of their government. The most decided disapprobation of the re-organization of convents has several times been expressed in the Lower Chamber, but without result. The disposition of the Estates likewise manifested itself in 1840 by the proposition, adopted by both Chambers, to assign the fourth part of all charitable foundations and bequests to the poor and the schools (*quarta pauperum et scholorum*).

During this period the Protestants, too, had to suffer much oppression, notwithstanding that they composed one third of the population. Their complaints had repeatedly been laid before
the Assembly of the States; finally, during the session of 1840, forty of the forty-three acting Protestant deputies united in a direct appeal to the King, in which three points of grievance were stated.

Firstly, the obligation laid upon Protestant soldiers to bow the knee before the Host. By an order of the Minister of War of August 14, 1838, it was decreed that at the Church parades even non-Catholic soldiers should be directed to bow the knee. At first this was demanded of the militia (Landwehr) as well, whenever they attended a solemn service; but subsequently Protestants were permitted to withdraw in such cases. But the decree remained in force with regard to the soldiers of the line, and was justified by the plea that the act was a salutation which even a Protestant soldier had no right to omit if commanded to perform it by his superior. On the other hand, it was remarked with truth that genuflexion was a form of adoration, and, for the Protestants, an infringement upon their liberty of conscience.¹⁵

Secondly, the obstacles to Protestant divine worship, inasmuch as in many places the Protestants, notwithstanding their sufficient number, were denied the formation of congregations.

Thirdly, the course adopted with regard to mixed marriages. In fact, complaint was made that the Catholic priests, in cases of such marriages, if the promise were not given to have the children brought up in the Catholic faith, not only refused to perform the marriage ceremony, but also, contrary to law, often refused to publish the banns and to grant the dimissories; and that, in drawing up the latter, they would insert the clause, most offensive to Protestants, that no canonical obstacle to the marriage was known to exist, further than the ecclesiastical prohibition of mixed marriages. (This formula, indeed, might be tolerated by the Protestants, and their objection to it would seem to have arisen from exaggerated sensitiveness.)

A further cause of complaint was, that in individual cases children who, according to the existing laws, should have been brought up Protestants were, in consequence of ministerial decrees, being educated in the Catholic faith. For instance, a Catholic officer, whose wife was a Protestant, had agreed, in the marriage articles, to have the children follow their mother’s per-

¹⁵ Die Kniebeugung der Protestanten vor dem Sanctissimum der katholischen Kirche in dem bairischen Heere, Ulm, 1841.
§ 10. ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS IN AUSTRIA.

Catholicismus und Protestantismus in Oesterreich, Leipsic, 1846.

Under the Emperor Francis I., many of the reforms of Joseph II. with regard to the Church have been discontinued, while others have remained intact. Thus a certain bigoted piety has of late been zealously fostered in Austria, and great care taken that quite as few liberal ideas in religion as in politics should pass the frontier. To this end a strict censorship prevails, to which not only all books published in the country are subjected, but which also carefully examines all works imported from abroad, entirely rejecting a large portion of them as dangerous and pernicious, and sanctioning the transmission of another portion only to such persons as have special permission to possess them. The spirit of the government is further characterized by an imperial decree of 1818, which directs all officials to attend public worship on Sundays and holidays, at the principal church of their place of residence. In 1827 the civil authorities and the episcopal functionaries were ordered to watch over the execution of the above command, and to take action against all officials who did not conform to it. When the interest in Bible societies spread from England over the Continent, a Hungarian Bible Society was organized at Presburg in 1812; but it was soon suppressed, its Bibles were confiscated, and a prohibition was issued against giving away foreign Bibles, or selling them at a reduced price.

On the other hand, a new order, which distinguished itself by its spiritual activity, was readily received and greatly favored in Austria. This was the order of the Redemptorists, or Liguori-

16 Abel und Wallerstein, Beitrage zur neuesten Geschichte bayerischer Zustände, nach authentischen Quellen bearbeitet, Stuttgart, 1840, 12.
FOURTH PERIOD.—DIV. III.—SINCE A.D. 1814.

ans, which had been founded in 1732 by a Neapolitan named Alfonso Maria di Liguori, under the title of Congregatio Sanctissimi Redemptoris, and was confirmed by Benedict XIV. in 1749. This new order shared with the Jesuits the aim of promoting the growth of Catholic piety by the cure of souls and the education and instruction of youth; even the dress which it assumed resembled that of the Jesuits. It is only recently that this order has spread abroad more. It was introduced into Austria by one of its members named Hoffbauer, who came to Vienna in 1809, there accepted a spiritual office, and prepared the way for the reception of his order. A month after his death an imperial decree was issued, April 19, 1820, which sanctioned the admission of the Redemptorists to the Austrian states. They thereupon immediately founded educational institutions at Vienna, and showed great zeal in the pulpit and the confessional. But, like the Jesuits, they, too, interfered in family relations, in order to gain in this way advantages, distinction, and influence for their order; and, by their attempts at conversion, annoyed the Protestants. The Pope had previously honored the order by canonizing its founder (who had died in 1782) in 1817.

Not long after this the Jesuits likewise re-established themselves in Austria. After they had been expelled from Russia, a number of them went to Galicia, settled in various towns of that province under the protection of the Bishop of Tyniec, Gregor Thomas Ziegler, and on September 1, 1823, opened a large school at Tarnopolis, which consisted of a gymnasium and a lyceum, even before the government had sanctioned their admission to the country. It did so only in 1827, and they thus obtained permission to found four colleges in Galicia. Subsequently they have also established institutions in Austrian Italy, Upper Austria, Styria, and the Tyrol; in particular, they have gained a foothold at Innspruck.

Thus it is unmistakably the aim of the government in Austria to retain the Catholic religion in its old, unaltered form, and to promote and quicken the attachment of the people to it. But, at the same time, it jealously asserts its rights with regard to the Pope and the clergy, and does this in a way which is in many points opposed to the principles of canon law. This is most apparent in the marriage-laws. The Austrian marriage-laws

1 Biography of Dr. B. Bolzano, Sulzbach, 1886.
make a distinction, in marriage, between the civil contract and the sacrament. With regard to the former, the secular government has reserved to itself the whole legislative power, and determined that the sacrament can be administered by the Church only after the civil contract has been legally sanctioned; that without this sanction, the sacrament can not be administered; and that if it be thus administered, it is null and void. In this way marriages have frequently been declared invalid by the secular authorities, which proceeding is in reality, though not in name, equivalent to the Protestant divorce. By these same marriage-laws a decision has been given with regard to the religion of children issuing from mixed marriages, which is, indeed, to the advantage of the Catholic Church, but not in accordance with the Roman Catholic principles which have been elsewhere asserted. For the law decrees that if the father be a Catholic, all the children are to be Catholics; while if the contrary be the case, the sons follow the father, the daughters the mother. In like manner, care is taken that all communications of the spiritual authorities with Rome are inspected by the government, and that no decree of the Church is published without the placetum regium. And in order that no canonical principles opposed to these national laws may gain access, it has been strictly enforced, since the time of Maria Theresa, that the canon law shall be taught only from books designated by the government. The work in present use is Georg Rechberger's Manual of Common and Austrian Canon Law, Linz, 1819.

That the Roman Curia highly disapproves of all these regulations, and that it secretly uses every means to effect their aboli-
tion, can be easily imagined; but, as it can not accomplish any thing, it silently tolerates and ignores that which it can not alter. It is said, indeed, that the Emperor Francis is personally quite inclined to yield various points to Rome, but the canonical prin-
ciples in question have, since the time of Joseph II., so pene-
trated the whole official world and the greater part of the clergy that any change would have involved the greatest difficulties, and would not easily have broken through the ranks of the closely united official aristocracy. Thus religious bigotry and canonical liberalism are allied in a remarkable manner in Austria.

The Protestants, who in Austria are still obliged strictly to observe the separation between the Augsburg and the Helvetian
Confessions, fare very differently in the different states. In the actual archduchy they form, indeed, only a tolerated Church; their houses of worship are called chapels, and are not allowed to have any towers, bells, or exits on public streets; they are obliged to pay the surplice fees to Catholic priests, notwithstanding that they have to defray the entire expenses of their own divine worship; they must refrain from work on Catholic holidays; no Catholic is permitted to be present at the Protestant worship. But yet they have no oppressions to complain of, even though they are sometimes annoyed by attempts at conversion, as on the part of the Redemptorists in Vienna.

The Protestants in Hungary, however, fared much worse, although they once composed two thirds, and still number one third, of the population of that country, and although, in the fundamental laws of the state, they are allowed equal rights with the Catholics. The reason for this is that the Catholic clergy in Hungary is quite as crude and intolerant as it is rich in revenues and influence, and that it made every use of these means to attract as many Protestants as possible to the Catholic Church. Thus it often happened that Protestants were persecuted because of their ostensibly belonging by birth to the Catholic Church, and therefore having done wrong in going over to the Protestant Church without previous instruction. Such persons were arrested and subjected to severe imprisonment until they yielded. In particular, mixed marriages were a continual source of dissension. For the Catholic priests did all in their power to extort from the Protestant party the promise to have the children brought up Catholics, and often subsequently laid forcible claim to the children of such marriages. In addition, Protestants were inveigled into joining the Catholic Church by the promise of rewards or the remission of punishments. All complaints of these disorders addressed to the emperor were ineffectual; and as the great majority of offices and all higher positions are held by Catholics, the interpretation and application of all ecclesiastical laws invariably fell out to the disadvantage of the Protestants.

* For a list of the different congregations, see Tzschirner's Archiv, ii. 470.
* Tzschirner's Archiv, ii. 673.
* Nachrichten über den jetzigen Zustand der Evangelischen in Ungarn, by Gregor von Berzevicy (district inspector of Evangelical churches and schools), Leipsic, 1823. Vertraute Briefe über die äussere Lage der Evangelischen Kirche in Ungarn, by Ferdinand Friedrich, Leipsic, 1825.
Meanwhile, these oppressions of the Protestants were frequently the subject of discussion at the diets, and the liberal party gave loud expression to their disapprobation of them. When, in recent times, the encroachments of the Catholic clergy increased, and the government abetted them by sanctioning the above demand of a promise with regard to the Catholic education of the children of mixed marriages, the Diet decidedly took the part of the Protestants, and endeavored to procure complete equality of rights for all Christian confessions. These efforts were continued for several years. Finally, the government conceded several important points by a law of November 13, 1844, by which the condition of the Protestants was materially improved. This law decrees that no Protestant males over eighteen, or females after they are married, nor their children, shall be claimed by the Catholic Church as if they belonged to it by right. Mixed marriages shall be valid in future even if consecrated by a Protestant clergyman. In cases of conversion from the Catholic to the Protestant Church, the six weeks' instruction may be omitted; the convert must declare his intention before his pastor, in presence of two witnesses, and repeat this after an interval of four weeks. When the Protestant pastor has had proof that this has been done in due form, he may receive the convert into his congregation.*

Of all the Austrian states, Transylvania enjoys the greatest freedom in religious matters. The administration of that province is in the hands of estates which are formed from the three nations to which the inhabitants belong, i.e. the Hungarian, the Szeklian, and the Saxon. There are four receptae religiones with equal rights—the Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Reformed, and the Unitarian or Socinian; and as but a small portion of the population is Catholic, and the other religions are sufficiently represented in the estates, no religious oppression takes place.6

The most noteworthy event in the latest history of the Protestant Church in Austria is the establishment of an Evangelical Theological Seminary in Vienna. Formerly, the young Protestant theologians of the Austrian dominions attended foreign uni-

---

* Die Religionswirren in Ungarn, by Johann, Count Mallath, Ratisbon, 1845, 2 vols.
* Zustand der Unitarier in Siebenbürgen, Tszcherner's Archiv, iv. 149.
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versities; and the Protestant Hungarians, in the religious edict of 1791, had been expressly conceded the right to send their sons abroad to pursue their studies. This privilege was first restricted in 1810 by an imperial decree, to the effect that no one should attend a foreign university without a special imperial permission. Subsequently, when, after the peace of 1815, demagogical disturbances began at the German universities, and soon attracted the attention of the German Diet and gave rise to general measures against those institutions, Austria forbade all its subjects the attendance of foreign universities. But, on the other hand, the Emperor in 1819 decreed the establishment of a complete theological faculty for Protestants at Vienna, and this institution went into operation in April, 1821. This new arrangement, however, justly caused great dissatisfaction in Hungary. The theological school in Vienna could not supply to the Protestant Hungarians the place of a university; for it was entirely isolated, without possessing the necessary complement of a philosophical faculty: its chairs could not be filled by distinguished men, as the government would not allow any but Austrian subjects to be called to them. Liberty of instruction was restricted there too, according to the general principles of the Austrian government, by immediately prescribing the text-books to be used by the professors; nor could it fail to be still more circumscribed by local conditions and the observation of the Catholic clergy. Vienna, moreover, was too expensive as a place of residence, and the stipends were wanting there which existed for Hungarian students at foreign universities. In consequence, the new institution had very few students from Hungary and Transylvania, for these countries possessed several colleges where the theological sciences were quite as thoroughly taught as by the faculty of Vienna. The frequent complaints which arose from Hungary had for result, indeed, that the Emperor consented once more to let individuals attend foreign universities with a special imperial permission; but in consequence of the events which have taken place since 1830 this privilege was again withdrawn, until in 1840 the attendance of a few special German universities was once more permitted.
One of the most important events of this period is the reunion of the United Greek Christians in the western provinces of the Russian empire—the Ukraine, Podolia, Volhynia, and Lithuania—with the Greek National Church of Russia, which was effected in the beginning of the year 1839.

In all these provinces, as in Russia in general, Christianity had first been proclaimed from Constantinople. But the Grand-duke Jagello of Lithuania, to whom they were subject, after his marriage with Hedwig, Queen of Poland (1386), joined the Roman Catholic Church, which after this was so favored in Lithuania that the Greek Church diminished greatly, though it never disappeared entirely. After the Synod of Florence (1439), an attempt was made to introduce the union there agreed upon in the provinces in question; but a radical result was achieved only by the Jesuits, among whom Antonius Possevinus especially distinguished himself. Through their educational establishments they acquired an influence over the youth of the Greek Church, contrived to have the episcopal offices filled with incumbents devoted to their cause, and made shrewd use of rewards and promises. Thus they succeeded, supported by King Sigismund III. of Poland, in gaining the majority of the Greek clergy and nobility in the Polish realm in favor of the union at three synods of Brzesc, in Lithuania (1590–1596). Those of the Greek clergy who resisted were deposed; and on December 15, 1596, the King issued a general order by which he proclaimed the union, and threatened the adherents of the Greek Church with loss of the royal favor.

After this the union was enforced by many severe measures: the non-unionists had their churches taken from them, and their educational affairs were purposely neglected, in order to compel
them to send their children to the Jesuit schools which were established everywhere.

This union, however, was merely regarded as a transition to complete Roman Catholicism. By its provisions the liturgy and Church ceremonies were to remain intact, and divine service was to be held, according to the old usage, in the ancient Slavonic language. But gradually all these ordinances were likewise altered and made more conformable to the Romish Church. The liturgy was changed, organs were introduced, and more altars erected in the churches, and the bishops of the Union were compelled to apply for the Papal sanction. In order to effect these alterations, Roman Catholic monks, in particular, joined the United Church, and were then by degrees promoted to the highest offices. At the same time, the adherents of the Union, in order to make them more willing to go over to the Catholic Church, were perceptibly neglected for the Roman Catholics. This had the result that the nobles almost all joined the Catholic Church, and that the United Church was called by the Poles the "peasant's faith" (chlopska wiara).

Among the United Greek people all these occurrences fostered an aversion to the Roman Catholics, which was increased by all the innovations made in favor of the latter. And for this reason it was not very difficult, when all these provinces reverted to Russia, to annul the whole Union.

At first several of the provinces in question fell to Russia under Catharine II., at the first division of Poland, in 1772. Russia had weighty political reasons for annulling the Union, for the latter stood in the way of a complete inner coalescence of these provinces with Russia, and attracted them to the Polish side. Catharine II., therefore, hastened to invite the United Greeks to return to their old Church, and in course of time a million persons went over to the latter. Through the political changes which followed, the remainder of the provinces also fell to Russia; but under Alexander nothing was done for the above object. Nicholas took up the matter again, and began by instituting, April 22, 1828, a Greek United Spiritual Council for the direction of the United Greeks, by means of which, through corresponding vigorous measures, the way could be prepared for further action. This council began by restoring the old liturgy and exchanging the altered rituals for those previously in use;
while the young theologians of the United Church received in the newly established seminaries a decided impulse toward the Oriental Church.

The Polish Revolution of 1830 increased the old animosity between the Poles and Russians in a terrible degree. With it there mingled, also, the religious hatred between Latins and Greeks. The United population was Russian by descent, and also in its form of worship; and thus the above revolution contributed largely to attract the United Greeks to the Russian side, and to make an abolition of the Union possible.

The three bishops of the Greek United Church, Joseph of Lithuania, Weselij of Orsha, and Antonius of Brzesc, placed themselves at the head of this movement. They convoked a synod at Polozk (February 12, 1839), at which it was decided that the United Church should return to the Russian Greek Church, and submit itself to the Sacred Synod of St. Petersburg. The same synod, on March 23, 1839, issued a statute regarding the ecclesiastical relations of the congregations in question by which the Greek United Spiritual Council, under the name of the Lithuanian College of White Russia, was placed under the authority of the Sacred Synod, and Bishop Joseph, as archbishop, was chosen its president. The union accomplished, it was generally proclaimed by a ukase of July 5, 1839. Twelve hundred parishes with two million members were thus reunited to the Greek Church. In memory of this event a medal was struck, containing on one side the inscription: "Triumph of the orthodox faith;" the reverse bears an image of Christ, with the words: "Divided by force, 1596; reunited by love, 1839."

The Pope could not, of course, remain indifferent to these events, by which several millions of believers were wrested from him; he could, however, do nothing but express his grief on the subject in a published allocution of November 22, 1839. Russia's sole reply was a law of December 28, 1839, according to which priests who attempted to make converts to the Roman Catholic Church were to be delivered over to the criminal authorities.

The people belonging to the congregations hitherto United are evidently satisfied with their return to their old Church. It is very evident in this case that the lower classes feel more
bound by the external features—the liturgy—of a Church than by its doctrines; that a union of churches which is merely founded on dogmas is weaker than one based on a similarity of Church ceremonies; and that the habit of external forms of worship has more influence than the belief.

Another important measure ensued in the beginning of the year 1842. Catharine II. had consigned all ecclesiastical property to the administration of the crown, and conferred upon the clergy, in exchange, fixed salaries, on the plea that the management of worldly affairs would distract them from their spiritual vocation. This order was extended by the Emperor Nicholas, through a ukase of January 5, 1842, to the Greek Church of the Western departments which had since been added to Russia, and, by a ukase of January 6, to the other churches of these departments. In consequence, only the pastors remained in enjoyment of their parochial property; that of the bishoprics, foundations, and convents was placed in charge of the ministry of the imperial domains, and the individuals and institutions who formerly had the benefit of it receive salaries. In addition to the Greek Church, this ordinance affects only the Roman Catholic Church, which numbers many members in Lithuania. At first sight such an arrangement appears very beneficial to the latter, for the ecclesiastical property in its possession was designated as insufficient, and it was decreed that the revenues of the religious institutions and functionaries should be increased by the income realized by confiscated property. But two results will ensue from this measure which can not be pleasing to the clergy: In the first place, it loses its influence on those persons who were dependent on it through its administration of such property—i.e., the great number of free peasants, stewards, etc., who will now be dependent on the crown; and, secondly, the clergy themselves are made more dependent on the government, which can punish any case of non-compliance by withholding or discontinuance of their salary. It will therefore in future be more for the interest of the clergy to side with the administration than with Rome. In view of this, the latter has already remonstrated with the Russian government, but it is hardly to be supposed that any change will be effected.
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